

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2008-2009 Annual Report

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2008-2009 Annual Report

Committee Members: Jim Liburdy (chair), Bill Braunworth, Dwaine Plaza, Maret Traber, Ray Brooks, Eric Hansen

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure committee was given three specific charges as of July 2008:

1. Finalize a proposal for the Student Evaluation Letter for the promotion and tenure dossier process and submit to the full senate for consideration;
2. Finalize a proposal for the Post-Tenure Review process and submit to the full senate for consideration; and
3. Review the college level process for promotion and tenure and make proposed changes as deemed necessary and submit to the full senate for consideration.

In addition, several other topics arose that were discussed:

1. Faculty Senate P&T Committee participation in University level P&T review;
2. Faculty representation on the University level P&T processes;
3. FTE definitions across the University with regard to the P&T evaluation; and
4. Evaluation of the unit level review process for P&T.

In the sections below, the committee's actions are described for each of the items. Additional information exists as part of other Faculty Senate meeting minutes, such as the actual documents proposed and the outcome of the Faculty Senate votes, and will not be reproduced here.

1. **Guidelines for the student evaluation letter for the promotion and tenure dossier**

Guidelines were originally developed in the previous year (see P&T Comm. Annual report 07-08). These were reviewed and slight wording changes were made and then sent forward to the Faculty Senate. They have been passed and are now part of the University P&T Guidelines.

2. **Post Tenure Review process for tenure-track faculty**

The Committee was charged with starting with the preliminary recommendations developed by the Post Tenure Review Ad Hoc Committee of 07-08 (Arp, Carson, Johnson, Jovanovic and Nielson), which were approved by the Faculty Senate, and develop a proposed set of Post Tenure Review Guidelines. As written, the primary goal of the post tenure review process is to provide supportive feedback and process to faculty who have been identified as underachieving. The outcome is a professional development plan unique to the faculty member developed by a faculty committee and unit head. The final document was presented to the Faculty Senate for consideration and was passed.

3. **College level process for promotion and tenure**

The review of the college level review process for P&T was undertaken based on recommendations made in last year's FS P&T Committee Annual Report. The goal of the review was to evaluate the degree of uniformity across the University but allowing each college flexibility in implementation, and to assure that the process was fair and there were independent and merit based reviews by the College Committee and the Dean. The proposed guidelines that were developed identify the process for forming and make-up of the college-wide committee. The dean is provided the opportunity to formulate a second committee to assist in the dean's evaluation. It should be noted that the development of the guidelines included several iterations between the P&T Committee and the Faculty Senate as a whole. The P&T Committee believes that to be successful the unit and college leadership need to provide

detailed and consistent expectations to all faculty, clearly identified in the annual review process.

Other Business and Discussions

1. The degree to which the FS P&T Committee participates in the University review process was evaluated. New Guidelines for this participation were drafted and sent to the Provost and Vice-Provost for consideration. Wording changes were made to assure that the Faculty Senate P&T Committee representative "participates" in the deliberations of those candidates that have received "mixed recommendations at the unit or college level". This extends the faculty voice beyond observation of procedural evaluation. These changes were adopted beginning 2008-2009.
2. There was considerable discussion on the proper representation at the University review for P&T. This discussion was generated by a faculty member who had concerns of the current faculty representation. The P&T Committee deliberated possible changes to the representation by the members of the FS P&T Committee, such as the past Faculty Senate President and explicit inclusion of a faculty member of the Liberal Arts and Humanities, as was suggested by the faculty member. Both of these options were deemed not acceptable by the Faculty Senate P&T Committee, but rather favored maintaining the existing faculty representation through the Faculty Senate P&T Committee members. The former was thought to be restrictive in potential conflict of interest (candidates from the same college) and may require undue time constraints on the past FS President. The suggestion of a faculty member from a specific unit or college was deemed unacceptable in that it singles out a specific college or unit in favor of others and the degree to which the current system has representation across the University seems adequate.
3. Discussions took place on the acceptable means of defining FTE equivalence across the University. The level of effort in teaching, research and service and how it is defined in terms of FTE does depend on the history, culture, needs and goals of specific units. It is not obvious that there needs to be an effort to develop some uniform definition of FTE, but in the P&T evaluation and review process these differences need to be recognized. As a related issue, questions arose as to how institutes and centers provide adequate input in the University P&T deliberations. The goal of providing fair, knowledgeable and diverse opinions in the P&T process needs to be assured.
4. The Committee believes that there needs to be a review of the unit level P&T review process to assure consistency with the revised College level review. The goal is to provide proper representation to assure fair and knowledgeable evaluation at the unit level, and to assure that the faculty committee input is indeed independent of the unit head/chair. Guidelines for the unit level faculty committee should provide a diverse and adequately broad representation to assure a balanced review.
5. It was suggested last year that the Evaluation section of the P&T Guidelines be rewritten for clarity. This was not addressed in 2008-2009 due to the need to complete the rewriting of the various guidelines and proposals indicated above.
6. After the Faculty Senate P&T Committee participation in the University review several observations were made. The "problem" cases under review tended to have one or more of the following attributes:
 1. Unit level guidance to assist the candidate in dossier preparation was lacking – should there be a more University-wide means of "educating" unit heads/chairs on this important task?
 2. Unit and college level expectations were not made clear to the candidate – again can guidelines be made to assure proper position descriptions and annual evaluation feedback as two specific issues and concerns and how remedies can be achieved?
 3. The ability to properly and effectively define scholarship is problematic when the FTE for research/scholarship is below 25% - do we need more quantitative measures or some innovative way to define achievements at low FTE levels?
 4. Outside reviewers, in some cases, were poor choices (personal friends seemed to be selected and a lack of a broad-based evaluators occurred) – do stricter guidelines need to be put in place for the selection of outside reviewers?
 5. The evaluations are often difficult when considering faculty at the Cascades campus based on local needs and expectations – should these have a different evaluation criteria?