

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 1987-1988

## Promotion & Tenure Committee

### Annual Report 1987-1988

Robert R. Becker, Biochemistry and Biophysics  
 Victor Brooks, Entomology  
 Robert L. Krahmer, Forest Products  
 Dale D. McFarlane, Business Administration, (Chair)  
 Frederick W. Obermiller, Agriculture and Resource Economics  
 Dale D. Simmons, Psychology

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee (FSP&TC) has responsibility for reviewing policy and observing activities related to the promotion and tenure process. Deliberations on individual candidates for promotion and tenure usually are not completed until after the June meeting of the Senate, consequently the annual report of the Committee is presented at the first meeting of the subsequent academic year.

The FSP&TC had a particularly active year during 1987-88. In addition to its usual activities the Committee was responsible for the review and evaluation of a major revision and updating of promotion and tenure policy as described in the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" developed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### 1. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Partially at the suggestion of the FSP&TC, the Provost and Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs began developing the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" document during the summer of 1987. Early drafts of the document were reviewed by vice presidents, deans and individual members of the FSP&TC and their comments were forwarded to Provost Spanier. After several revisions, the FSP&TC asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to schedule a Faculty Forum for the purpose of allowing individual faculty to express their views on the contents of the Guidelines. The Forum was held on October 13, 1987 and attended by approximately 150 faculty members.

After listening to the concerns of faculty at the Forum and in subsequent discussions of issues discussed at the Forum, the members of the FSP&TC were placed before the Senate at the November 5 meeting. Discussion at the meeting concluded with a motion to return the recommendations to the FSP&TC for further review and consideration. The elimination of the section allowing the waiver of the right of faculty to view all records in the dossier including reviewers evaluations (ORS 351.065) was the primary focus of attention. In the subsequent review, the members of the FSP&TC reaffirmed their position on the waiver issue. The reasons for taking this stand were presented to the Senate on December 3, 1987 in the form of a position paper. In summary, the members of the Committee found no reliable and effective means for protecting the individual rights of faculty under the waiver provision.

The recommendations of the FSP&TC, including the striking of the waiver of confidentiality provision, were placed before the Senate again on January 14, 1988. This time the recommendations were passed with only minor modification.

In a letter to the Faculty dated August 1, 1988, President John Byrne indicated that the revised Guidelines as approved by the Faculty senate "with some minor revisions" will be in effect for the 1988-89 academic year. The President, at the request of the Faculty Senate, has asked for the formal opinion of the Oregon Attorney General on the use of voluntary waivers of confidentiality but to date no opinion has been rendered. The President stated in the letter to the Faculty that the Office of Academic Affairs will continue to make the "Voluntary Waiver of Confidentiality" forms available to faculty.

#### 2. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

The promotion and tenure process under Provost Spanier was described in the 1986-87 annual report of the FSP&TC, additional details are contained in the Guidelines. Few changes were made in the process during the current year. All dossiers of candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed at several levels before they reach the Provost's Office. The dossiers are usually reviewed by a departmental committee, the department chair, a college committee and the dean of the school or college. The dossiers are then forwarded to Associate Vice President Fullerton who checks the dossier for proper form and content and if the dossiers are complete they are then reviewed by the Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee (AP&TC) consisting of Provost Spanier, Vice President Keller, Associate Vice President Fullerton and Dean Calvin. The dossiers of each candidate for promotion or tenure are carefully examined by each member of the AP&TC. The AP&TC functions more as a group than a committee. The members provide Provost Spanier with information and their individual recommendations, but the final decision rest with the Provost. Generally, academic deans were invited to meet with the AP&TC only in those situations where additional information was desired or when the initial decision of the AP&TC regarding a faculty member's promotion and/or tenure differed from the dean's recommendation. At least two members of the FSP&TC were present as observers during the deliberations of the AP&TC.

The quality and completeness of the dossiers improved again this year as additional information of both recommended from and content was provided to faculty and administrators responsible for the preparation of the dossiers. (See the "Dossier Preparation Guidelines" prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs).

### 3. FACULTY SENATE PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE OBSERVATIONS

The new Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the accompanying Dossier Guidelines provide a far more accurate description of the procedures and criteria being applied in the promotion and tenure process than information that was previously available. Provost Spanier and Associate Vice President Fullerton should be commended for their efforts in developing these documents.

The result of this year's promotion and tenure deliberations, along with comparable data for the last twenty years are given in Table I and Figure I in the appendix to this report. The data indicate a substantial decline in the number of promotions during the last two years when compared to the twenty year average. The decline is most apparent at the level of promotion from assistant to associate and associate to professor. There are a number of factors that could contribute to this decline including the possibility that there are fewer eligible faculty or that higher standards are being employed. Analysis of these factors to date indicates the following. First, fewer dossiers were transmitted to the level of the Office of Academic Affairs than in past years. So the drop occurred despite a relatively high approval rate by the AP&TC (Provost). As reported to the Faculty Senate by Associate Vice President Fullerton, the approval rate by the AP&TC this year was 87% as compared to a 15 year total of 66% approval at the University level. Second, most of the drop in the number of promotions from assistant to associate can be accounted for by a reduction in the number of assistant professors within the "zone of promotion". (See the attached letter of September 22 from Associate Vice President Fullerton for Additional information on zones and number being recommended). Third, the decrease in the number of promotions to professor cannot be attributed to a reduction in the number of eligible faculty. The number of faculty in the "zone of promotion" for this group actually increased slightly over the period from 1985 to 1988 while the number of faculty recommended for promotion dropped substantially. For 1985-86 combined, 16.3% of those in the "zone of promotion" were recommended for promotion, whereas in 1988 5.4% were recommended for promotion. The reasons for this drop and the implications of a continuing reduced level of recommendations for promotion to professor needs further examination.

Members of the FSP&TC made the following comments with regard to the conduct of the evaluation process by the members of the AP&TC. As in the past, all dossiers were carefully evaluated by each member of the Committee. All criteria as outlined in the P&T Guidelines were applied in the process of evaluating candidates for tenure or promotion. However, if a candidate was denied tenure or promotion the most likely cause was lack of sufficient activity in the area of scholarship (publications). Within this area members of the FSP&TC were concerned that refereed journal articles were possibly given disproportionate weight. If a faculty member has disseminated the results of their work in a manner different than publication as a journal article, the quality and importance of the work needs to be carefully specified and documented within the candidates dossier.

It was observed that heavy reliance was placed on outside letters of evaluation, often obtained from

individuals who had never had direct contact with the faculty member. Ambivalent outside letters of evaluation could depreciate the value of an otherwise strong dossier review, while in some situations positive outside letters went a long way toward bolstering a weak dossier. Members of the FSP&TC felt a more balanced weighting of internal reviews and outside letters could improve the consistency and integrity of the evaluation process.

The promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide for the establishment of unit criteria which "reflect the particular characteristics of the field and the corresponding responsibilities of (the unit's) faculty." To date the International Programs, Veterinary Medicine, the Library and Agricultural Extension have submitted unit criteria for promotion and tenure evaluation. To date, the Library criteria have been approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

In several instances over the last few years, members of the P&T Committee have observed the difficulties encountered in gaining promotion by those individuals who have assumed major administrative responsibilities early in their academic performance as an administrator will not offset a less than superior performance in other areas of evaluation. For example, department chairs are being held responsible for having a record in scholarship that approaches that of their nonadministrative colleagues. In the view of the members of the FSP&TC, such early appointments are unwise and potentially damaging to the faculty member's eventual promotion. The practice of appointment of assistant professors, and in most instances associate professors, to positions of major administrative responsibility should be avoided. If such appointments are made, the faculty member should insist on a written statement from the dean, with approval by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, that clearly outlines how the administrative responsibilities will affect future promotion and tenure evaluations of the faculty member.

---

May 6, 1988

To: Stephanie Sanford, Director of Affirmative Action  
Thurston Doler, Senate President  
Dale McFarlane, Chair, Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee

From: D.S. Fullerton  
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: 1987-88 Promotion and Tenure Summaries

All promotion and tenure dossiers received by Academic Affairs to this date have now been reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. (Two or three additional dossiers may be forthcoming from academic units during the next few weeks.) Eighty-nine percent (87% without Senior Research Assistants) of all departmental recommendations for promotion and tenure were approved, considerably above the 15-year total of 66%. The 15-year average does not include Senior Research Assistants, a rank begun in the State System just during the last few years.

There were 25 individuals reviewed for tenure, 14 for promotion to Professor, 19 to Associate Professor, 3 to Assistant Professor or Senior Instructor, and 12 to Senior Research Assistant. All these faculty have now received letters from Vice President Spanier informing them of his decision.

Attached are the Promotion and Tenure Summaries for the last two years, along with 15-year totals 1973-1988. We have added a table with 4-year totals for Senior Research Assistants.

#### TABLE I

#### SUMMARY OF TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS - 1986-87 and 1987-88

HC - Head count of faculty in this category

Totals in each category are underlined

Year of Annual Review:	1986-87	1987-88	15-year Total 1973-88	
	HC (%)	HC (%)	HC	(%)
<b>1. <u>Faculty on Annual Tenure</u></b>	288	331	4626	
Male	207(72)	236(71)	3536 (76.4)	
Female	81 (28)	95 (29)	1090 (23.6)	
Minority	14 (5)	14 (4)	231 (5.0)	
<b>2. <u>Recommended for Indefinite Tenure</u></b>				
a. <u>by the department</u>	30	25	864	
Male	20	17	702	
Female	10	8	162	
Minority	1	1	40	
b. <u>by the dean/director</u>	<u>28</u> (93)	<u>23</u> (92)	<u>690</u>	(80.0)
Male (% of 2a)	19 (95)	15 (88)	551 (78.5)	
Female (% of 2a)	9 (90)	8 (100)	139 (85.8)	
Minority (% of 2a)	0	1 (100)	33 (82.5)	
<b>3. <u>Granted Indefinite Tenure</u></b>				
a. <u>HC (% of 2b)</u>	<u>22</u> (79)	<u>22</u> (96)	<u>620</u>	(89.9)
Male	17 (89)	14 (93)	501 (90.9)	
Female	5 (55)	8 (100)	119 (85.6)	
Minority	0	1 (100)	29 (87.9)	

**TABLE II****SUMMARY OF APPROVED PROMOTIONS IN RANK****AND CHANGES IN STATUS TO INDEFINITE TENURE****1986-87 and 1987-88**

**HC - Head Count of faculty promoted or granted indefinite tenure**

**(%) - Percent of departmental recommendations approved**

**Totals in each category are underlined**

Year of Annual Review:	1986-87	1987-88	15-year Total 1973-88	
	HC (%)	HC (%)	HC	(%)
<b>A. <u>To Professor</u></b>	<u>24</u> (77)	<u>12</u> (86)	<u>418</u>	(55)
Male	22 (81)	9 (82)	377 (54)	
Female	2 (50)	3 (100)	41 (53)	
Minority	0	0	13 (68)	

B. To Associate Professor	16 (84)	16 (84)	559 (69)
Male	16 (84)	8 (72)	462 (68)
Female	0	8 (100)	97 (71)
Minority	0	1 (100)	24 (69)
C. <u>To Assistant Professor or Senior Instructor</u>	<u>6</u> (75)	<u>3</u> (100)	<u>144</u> (84)
Male	5 (100)	0	78 (79)
Female	1 (33)	3 (100)	66 (90)
Minority	0	0	11 (100)
D. <u>Promotion Totals (All Ranks)</u>	<u>46</u> (75)	<u>31</u> (86)	<u>1121</u> (64)
Male	43 (84)	17 (77)	917 (63)
Female	3 (33)	14 (100)	204 (70)
Minority	0	1 (100)	48 (74)
E. <u>Indefinite Tenure</u>	<u>22</u> (73)	<u>22</u> (88)	<u>620</u> (72)
Male	17 (85)	14 (82)	501 (72)
Female	5 (50)	8 (100)	119 (73)
Minority	0	1 (100)	29 (73)
F. <u>All Promotion and Tenure Combined Totals</u>	<u>68</u> (75)	<u>53</u> (87)	<u>1741</u> (66)
Male	60 (83)	31 (79)	1414 (65)
Female	8 (42)	22 (100)	323 (71)
Minority	0	2 (100)	77 (73)

**TABLE III****SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS TO SENIOR RESEARCH ASSISTANT****AND CHANGES IN STATUS TO INDEFINITE TENURE****1986-87 and 1987-88****HC - Head Count of faculty promoted or granted indefinite tenure****(%) - Percent of departmental recommendations approved****Totals in each category are underlined**

Year of Annual Review:	1986-87	1987-88	4-year Total 1984-88
	HC (%)	HC (%)	HC
A. <u>To Senior Research Asst.</u>	<u>9</u> (75)	<u>12</u> (100)	<u>98</u>
Male	6 (86)	6 (100)	65
Female	3 (60)	6 (100)	33
Minority	0	0	3
B. <u>All Promotions and Tenure Combined Totals</u>			15-year Totals <u>1973- 1988</u>

Total Reviewed	<u>103</u>	<u>73</u>	----
Total Approved	<u>77</u> (75)	<u>65</u> (89)	<u>1753</u>
Male	66 (84)	37 (82)	1424
Female	11 (46)	28 (100)	329
Minority	0	2 (100)	77

Totals as of 5/1/88

| [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](#).