

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2009-2010 Annual Report

Promotion & Tenure Committee

2009-2010 Annual Report

Committee Members: Ray Brooks, Jennifer Field, Eric Hansen, Michelle Kutzler, Jim Liburdy (chair), Dwaine Plaza

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure committee was given four specific charges

1. Review the unit level process for promotion and tenure and make proposed changes as deemed necessary and submit to the full senate for consideration.
2. Examine the Standing Rules of the FS P&T Committee and propose changes as needed to be consistent with its operations.
3. Examine the role of FS P&T representatives to the University level review process and propose changes to the Guidelines as needed.
4. Review the Guidelines for Position Description and propose changes as needed to better provide a clear understanding of faculty duties.

In addition, several other topics arose that were discussed:

1. A proper and effective definition of scholarship when applied to a relatively low FTE component of a faculty member's position description may be needed.
2. A clearer understanding may be needed of what is implied and expected of individuals going up for promotion and tenure prior to their final year of consideration.
3. Considerations and expectations of post-tenure promotion from associate to full professor is not well understood by many units and may require some more detailed documentation.

In the sections below the committee's actions are described. 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 is not reproduced here.

1. Review the unit level process for promotion and tenure

The P&T Committee examined the existing unit level review guidelines and drafted several proposed changes. These were brought to the Executive Committee for review and comments. Several iterations occurred and a final draft was presented to the Faculty Senate. Again after several iterations a final proposal was presented and passed by the Faculty Senate in March. This was finally approved by President Ray and is anticipated to be part of the new Guidelines beginning with the 2010-11 academic year. See [Appendix 1](#)

The primary changes are (i) reorganization of the guidelines to identify specific responsibilities, (ii) rewording to assure that the committee fairly represents the diversity and breadth within the unit and that representation includes individuals with a similar area of expertise as the candidate in all areas of the position description and (iii) wording was added addressing peer evaluation such that all areas of the position description are evaluated with some means of peer input.

2. Examine the Standing Rules of the FS P&T Committee

The Standing Rules were reviewed and proposed to be modified to indicate that representatives to the University review process are involved in all deliberations of candidates where there is mixed recommendations. These changes were passed by the Faculty Senate in May. See [Appendix 2](#).

3. Examine the role of FS P&T representatives to the University level review

Changes to the guidelines were proposed under the University Review section to indicate that the

Faculty Senate P&T Committee representative shall participate in all deliberations concerning candidates who have mixed recommendations. This change was accepted. See [Appendix 3](#).

4. **Review the Guidelines for Position Description**

The Guidelines for Position Description were reviewed, particularly in light of clarity regarding scholarship. The only change that was recommended was that the sentence regarding the need to identify the portion of FTE that is assigned to scholarship be moved from the third to fifth paragraph which is the paragraph discussing scholarship. See [Appendix 4](#).

Other Business, Discussions and Recommendations

1. There is still concern that the understanding of scholarship for low scholarship FTE expectations given in the position description is poor. It might be best to include at the university level, and be reinforced at the college or unit level, some documentation of what is expected. This could include statements as to differences in expectations between high and low FTE situations such as leadership role expectations in publications, proposals or research collaborations.
2. There needs to be a university-wide understanding of what is meant by "going up early" for promotion and tenure. This should include a delineation of expectations as well as a discussion of possible ramifications.
3. There seems to be vast differences in the culture associated with promotion from associate to full professor across campus. Some units "expect" promotion to full to occur in a timely fashion if they are doing their job as described in the position description and others interpret the process to be one of "extraordinary accomplishment." This difference of views is detrimental to the overall well being of the faculty and a more uniform understanding and application should be applied.
4. There seems to be some confusion and/or ambiguity with the College Review guidelines that were passed last year. The intent of the proposed changes, as was presented at the FS meetings, was that each college committee provide an evaluation of the qualifications of the candidate as well as assure that the dossier is properly prepared. Wording may want to be added/changed in the current document to reflect this. This could be done by inserting "also" in the first sentence of the third paragraph after "should."
5. The tenure unit guidelines passed this year also posed some questions regarding the interpretation of peer evaluation review. The P&T committee may want to add some language to the guidelines to provide more details on how this can be interpreted.
6. In the University Review guidelines there is mention that the "dean and supervisor will be invited" by the provost for discussion if a case has mixed recommendations (end of third paragraph). This might want to be changed to "dean or supervisor or both."
7. The current level of documentation of all specific procedures used at the unit and college levels should be made available for ease of access by faculty. Although these may currently be available, it is recommended that the committee survey all units and determine the level of documentation that exists.
8. The P&T Committee met with Becky Warner and Sara Eklund on March 1, 2010 for discussion of the University level review and the role of the P&T Committee representative. The following items were discussed and or explained to the Committee (i) the University Committee does not vote on candidates but rather provides individual input directly to the Provost after their discussions, (ii) it was stated that it is not appropriate for FS P&T Committee representatives to have access to dossiers other than that of the candidate(s) being reviewed, (iii) it was agreed that the Committee representative could provide a written input to the Provost as to their opinion/concern regarding a specific case, (iv) the Committee representatives should be given a copy of all questions that are given to the dean and/or supervisor prior to the meeting, (v) it was agreed that the Provost's office will send to the FS P&T Committee a listing of all the issues raised by the University Committee to help in writing the final report by the FS P&T Committee.
9. After the Faculty Senate P&T Committee participation in the University review several observations were made. It should be recognized that the cases under review were only ones with a negative or mixed recommendation. The cases under review tended to have one or more of the following attributes:

- Unit level guidance to assist candidates in dossier preparation was lacking - although a University-wide means of "educating" unit heads/chairs is in place, it is not apparent that all heads/chairs are paying attention.
- Unit and college level expectations were not made clear to the candidate - guidelines at the unit/college level that address questions by faculty would be useful. Maybe a college-wide forum would be useful (similar to the ones conducted by Becky Warner). This would provide a more direct interaction between candidates and the first line of review.
- The interpretation of proper scholarship is problematic especially for fairly low FTE assignments. Candidates may feel they are doing what is required only to find out too late that more of "something else" was needed.
- Outside reviewers need to be more carefully selected to best provide input on scholarship of candidates. Attention needs to be paid to selection of outside reviewers who "live in a different environment" so that evaluations can be made based on the promotion and tenure expectations at OSU.

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344
[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)
[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)
Valid [xhtml](#).