

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 1989-1990

## Promotion & Tenure Committee

### Annual Report 1989-1990

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing policy and observing the activities of the promotion and tenure process. The activities of the administration concerning promotion and the compilation of statistics related to the process are not completed until the end of the year and after the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. The annual report of the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee, therefore, is submitted at the beginning of the next academic year.

#### PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

The promotion and tenure process is conducted under the direction of Provost Spanier as described in the 1986-87 annual report of the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee, and following the procedures described in the most recent guidelines. Each dossier is reviewed by (1) a committee and the chairperson of the department sponsoring the candidate, (2) by the Dean of the College, and, if applicable, (3) by the director of an administrative unit within which the candidate may serve. The dossiers are forwarded to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who reviews them for completeness and presents them to the other members of the University Promotion & Tenure Committee. The university committee consists of the Provost, the Vice President for Research, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School. Each member reviews the dossiers and makes a recommendation to the Provost, with whom the final decision rests. In those instances where some question exists about the qualifications of a candidate, the university committee meets as a group, and may confer with the academic Dean (and Director) of the administrative unit sponsoring the candidate. It is these meetings that members of the Faculty Senate Promotion and tenure committee attend. The procedures followed this year and in the past two years represents a considerable departure from those followed by President MacVicar, where every dossier was discussed by the committee as a whole.

The qualifications for promotion and tenure are stated in the guidelines and include scholarship and creative work, service to the university and to the public, and teaching and advising. In the past two years, considerable emphasis has been placed on teaching and advising. Evidence for this emphasis varies although faculty committee participants, without exception, have observed that emphasis. Emphasized in the review are teaching evaluations, evaluations by former students, and evaluations by faculty after attendance at lectures and student advising.

In 1989-90, the university committee reviewed 115 dossiers, of which 108 (94%) were approved. This number includes 102 individuals promoted and 59 tenured, and is a significant increase over the number approved in the previous two academic years. The number of individuals discussed by the university committee as a group, because of some question of qualification, was very small. The low number would indicate the thoroughness of the reviews conducted before the final submission of dossiers. The results of this year's promotion and tenure decisions as well as those from previous years (taken from the report of 1987-88), are presented in the appended tables.

The members of the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee attending the discussions of the questionable candidates made few comments on the review process. Some differences of opinion seem to exist regarding the criteria by which members of non-academic units, such as the library and the Extension service, are evaluated. Although a consensus in the decision of the university committee was reached this year, it is an area in which problems may arise again in the future. Other problems associated with the evaluation of administrators or those on special assignments, which have been experienced in the past, did not come up.

#### THE WAIVER OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee was asked by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to comment on a letter submitted by Professor C. Smith in February, regarding the waiver of confidentiality requested of candidates by the Administration. The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee could find no reason to reverse previous decisions by the Faculty Senate. The Senate subsequently reaffirmed its position, notably that use of the waiver should be discontinued. On July 25, 1990, Provost Spanier sent a memorandum to Faculty Senate President Martin reaffirming the Administration's position and stating that current policy will remain in effect.

This matter has come before the Senate at least three times over the past several years. The question was raised whether or not requesting the waiver was legal under Oregon Statutes. The administration requested an opinion from the Attorney General but apparently a consensus could not be reached. The Chancellor withdrew the request and asked that the matter be settled locally.

On January 9, 1990, a U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of the University of Pennsylvania vs Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) regarding the alleged discrimination of an associate professor by the university in a tenure decision, on the basis of race, sex, and national origin. The Court ruled that "(1) the EEOC is entitled, under 42 USCS 2000e-8a, to have access to relevant evidence, and (2) if an employer refuses to provide such evidence voluntarily, the EEOC is authorized, under 2000e-9 to issue a subpoena and to seek an order enforcing the subpoena" (taken from the summary of the Supreme Court decision). An article published by the respected newspaper The Scientist indicates that this decision is being taken very seriously by major universities. Although the court decision was fairly explicit with respect to discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and national origin, the newspaper article indicates that confidentiality of peer review may be history, and those asked to provide peer reviews will consider that what they provide may not be held confidential in the event of a legal contest. In other words, those signing the waiver will know that it means nothing if the candidate petitions the EEOC.

In view of this court decision, the Faculty Senate may want to ask again for clarification of the Administration's position.

#### THE FACULTY SENATE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The way in which the university committee operates has made the participation by members of the faculty senate committee in the deliberations of the university committee very difficult. As stated above, the number of files examined by the university committee is small and this committee meets on an irregular basis, often with very little prior notice. The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee tries to have two representatives at each meeting. These individuals examine the dossier of the candidates being discussed. The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee does not examine the dossiers of those candidates that were successful. This makes evaluation by the faculty committee members of the fairness of the review process difficult.

According to Provost Spanier's wishes, the faculty senate representatives cannot be from the same administrative unit as the candidate under discussion. The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee consists of only six members and often they are drawn from only two or three administrative units. This year, for example, two members were from science, one from CLA, one from home economics, one from agriculture, and one from extension. Thus, when candidates from the College of Science were discussed, only four members were eligible to attend. The activities of members of the extension service are such that they are often away from campus or heavily committed to various tasks. This year the representative from extension was unable to attend any of the meetings of the committee or any of the deliberations of the university committee. The Faculty Senate committee was really only five strong.

The number of university committee meetings, plus the irregularity and short notice, made it very difficult to have representatives of the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee at the meetings; on several occasions it was possible to have only one representative attend.

Considering the way the process works under the new guidelines and the small number of deliberations expected to be held each year, the faculty senate committee discussed whether or not a recommendation should be made to the Executive Committee that the observance of P&T deliberations by the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee be discontinued. The process is being competently done and, at the moment, the Faculty Senate committee may not be necessary. However, we do feel that the committee and its observations should be continued to maintain the principle of its right to observe the process against the possible future day when we have less confidence in the administration.

At present, the committee hears only the deliberations over the files that have been questioned for one

reason or another. The committee felt that it could be more effective if it were informed as to what final decision was taken in each questionable case.

The faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee strongly recommends to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate that the problems referred to here be thoroughly discussed and resolved. This recommendation is made to ensure that the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate continues to function efficiently.

Victor J. Brookes - Entomology  
 Frederick W. Obermiller - Range Resources  
 T. Darrah Thomas - Chemistry  
 Starr McMullen - Economics  
 Mary Kelsey - Foods/Nutrition  
 Roger Fletcher - Extension

**TABLE I**

**SUMMARY OF TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS - 1989-90**

**HC - Head count of faculty in this category**

**Totals in each category are underlined**

Year of Annual Review:	1989-90	1988-89	18-year Total 1973-90	
	HC (%)	HC (%)	HC	(%)
1. <u>Faculty on Annual Tenure</u>	335	323	5284	
Male	283 (71)	237 (73)	4011 (75.9)	
Female	97 (29)	86 (27)	1273 (24.0)	
Minority	20 (6)	15 (5)	266 (5.0)	
2. <u>Recommended for Indefinite Tenure</u>				
a. <u>by the department</u>	55	39	958	
Male	43	27	772	
Female	12	12	186	
Minority	1	1	42	
b. <u>by the dean/director</u>	<u>60</u> (100)	<u>39</u> (92)	<u>789</u> (81.9)	
Male (% of 2a)	47 (100)	27 (88)	625 (81.0)	
Female (% of 2a)	13 (100)	12 (100)	164 (88.2)	
Minority (% of 2a)	1 (100)	1 (100)	35 (83.3)	
3. <u>Granted Indefinite Tenure</u>				
a. <u>HC (% of 2b)</u>	<u>59</u> (100)	<u>39</u> (96)	<u>718</u> (91.0)	
Male	47 (100)	27 (93)	574 (92.0)	
Female	12 (93)	12 (100)	144 (87.3)	
Minority	1 (100)	1 (100)	31 (88.6)	

**TABLE V**

**SUMMARY OF APPROVED PROMOTIONS IN RANK**

**AND CHANGES IN STATUS TO INDEFINITE TENURE****1989-90****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:	1990-91	1989-90	18-year Total 1973-91
	HC (%)	HC (%)	HC (%)
A. <u>To Professor</u>	<u>30</u> (87)	<u>26</u> (86)	<u>444</u> (56)
Male	25 (86)	23 (82)	398 (56)
Female	5 (100)	3 (100)	44 (55)
Minority	2 (100)	1	14 (70)
B. <u>To Associate Professor</u>	<u>54</u> (96)	<u>29</u> (84)	<u>588</u> (70)
Male	40 (95)	23 (72)	485 (69)
Female	14 (100)	6 (100)	103 (73)
Minority	2 (100)	1 (100)	25 (69)
C. <u>To Assistant Professor or Senior Instructor</u>	<u>6</u> (100)	<u>9</u> (100)	<u>153</u> (85)
Male	5 (83)	5	83 (80)
Female	1 (100)	4 (100)	70 (91)
Minority	0	0	11 (100)
D. <u>To Senior Research Asst.</u>	<u>12</u> (100)	<u>10</u> (100)	<u>98</u>
Male	9 (100)	9 (100)	65
Female	3 (100)	1 (100)	33
Minority	1	0	3
E. <u>Promotion Totals (All Ranks)</u>	<u>102</u> (94)	<u>64</u> (86)	<u>1185</u> (65)
Male	79 (92)	51 (77)	968 (64)
Female	23 (100)	13 (100)	217 (72)
Minority	5 (100)	2 (100)	50 (75)
F. <u>Indefinite Tenure</u>	<u>59</u> (100)	<u>39</u> (88)	<u>659</u> (73)
Male	47 (100)	27 (82)	528 (72)
Female	12 (100)	12 (100)	131 (75)
Minority	1 (100)	1 (100)	30 (73)
G. <u>All Promotion and Tenure Combined Totals</u>	<u>111</u> (95)	<u>113</u> (87)	<u>1844</u> (68)
Male	87 (94)	87 (79)	1496 (66)
Female	24 (100)	26 (100)	348 (73)
Minority	5 (100)	3 (100)	80 (74)
Total Reviewed	<u>115</u>		
Total Approved	<u>108</u> (94% Approval Rate)		