

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Promotion & Tenure Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 1997-1998

Promotion & Tenure Committee

Final Report To The Faculty Senate Of The 1997 - 98 Promotion And Tenure Committee

Members of the 1997 - 98 Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee were:

John Farrell	Department of Economics
Joe Hendricks	University Honors College
Duane P. Johnson	4 - H Youth Development Education, Chair
Michael Mix	Department of Biology
Tom Savage	Department of Animal Science
Sandra Woods	Department of Civil Engineering

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews statements of policy, advises on matters pertaining to promotion and tenure of faculty, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. During the annual promotion and tenure review process, Committee members have access to all dossiers under consideration and observe deliberations/discussions of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee, to ensure an equitable process for all faculty. The Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee includes the Provost, the Vice Provost for Research and International Programs, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Dean and Director of the Extension Service.

When the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee does not reach consensus on their recommendation, or when circumstances warrant discussion of a particular case, the candidate's Dean and Department Head or Supervisor meets with the committee. In these instances, one member of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure is present as an observer at the meeting to represent the Faculty Senate. This observer notes adherence to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the nature of the decision - making process, but does not evaluate the merits of the particular case.

In 1997-98, Sixty dossiers were forwarded to the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee. A summary of the disposition of those 60 cases was prepared by Andrew Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and is appended to this report.

The Committee submits the following remarks and recommendations, based on our reading of the dossiers and observations during the University Promotion and Tenure process.

1. The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee should continue to sponsor campus - wide workshops, that focus on the development of Candidate Position Descriptions, Candidate Statements, conducting and documenting peer review of teaching, conducting and documenting review of advising responsibilities, documentation of scholarship, and other areas relevant to dossier preparation and candidate review.
2. We reiterate the importance of a candidate's Position Description as an important document used as the basis for evaluation. Position Descriptions are unique for each position and must be reviewed and updated for all faculty and must address all areas of faculty responsibility (Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments; Scholarship and Creative Activity; Service). Each of these areas also need to reflect the percentage of time to be allocated to each.
3. As indicated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, "scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated." Other definitions of scholarship should not be used as a basis in the evaluation of candidates' scholarly work. If there are unique expectations regarding Scholarship they should be articulated in the candidates

Position Description.

4. According to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, "tenure is granted for achievement, not for years in rank, but under normal circumstances faculty will be considered for tenure in their sixth year of service in professorial rank." Therefore, we reiterate our concern about the relative success rates of "early" promotion/tenure proposals (those submitted before the "normal" six year period has elapsed) and again suggest that the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs develop a system to track and evaluate early proposals.
5. We support a policy of returning the incomplete dossiers back to the department unit by college units prior to review at the university level. We also suggest this be done for colleges by University Administration if needed.
6. We continue to have concern over early submission (before sixth year on annual tenure tract) of the dossiers of faculty without a "Prior Service Agreement". These faculty members, in most situations, have not had appropriate time to demonstrate their excellence or distinction in teaching, advising, scholarship and service while at Oregon State University. This puts them at disadvantage in the evaluation process and significantly increases the potential for deferral or denial of promotion and/or tenure at the time they are considered.
7. In the area of scholarship & external funding standards for split appointments we made the following observation. While most position descriptions noted careful division of responsibilities, it is not clear that different scholarship requirements were expected for a faculty member with a .2 FTE devoted to research as opposed to a .6 FTE. It appears that many times external reviewers, deans and department heads did not seem to take this into account systematically. This seems to be an open question that might merit further consideration.
8. The committee continues to be highly supportive of the roles and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee in adherence to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. We believe the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee continues to maintain consistently high standards for faculty review.
9. The committee observed fair treatment of faculty with Extended Education responsibilities. At the same time the committee is concerned over what appears to be the lack of total adoption of the University P&T guideline procedures in some colleges. The Provost and Associate Provost have agreed to follow up with Deans on this observation.

Faculty Senate P&T Committee Review of P&T Guideline Implementation

Three cycles are now complete using the revised Promotion & Tenure Guidelines. The Faculty Senate P&T Committee met to assess how well the P&T Guidelines are working in practice and what steps should be taken to address problems that have occurred in implementation. The overall consensus of the committee supported the following observations. The first year of implementation went well and the second and third years continued to improve. However, continued improvement is still needed in development of Position Descriptions, Candidate Statements, quality of External Review letters, Peer Review of Teaching, and evaluation of Advising. We also want to emphasize the importance of requiring excellence and distinction in scholarship for all faculty regardless of role.

Position Descriptions:

Funding source does not dictate the breakout of three areas in position description. All faculty have responsibility in each area (Teaching, Advising, or other Assignments), (Scholarship), and (Service). A faculty member who is on 100% Research funding will do teaching to peers or in some situations will teach classes at graduate or under graduate level. A faculty member with 100% Teaching Assignment still needs to have creative work & scholarship that emerges from teaching. All faculty have expectations of service to department, college, university and/or profession.

Position Descriptions need to be specific enough that they describe the expectations in each of the

three categories yet allow flexibility for the faculty member to be creative and perform their responsibilities. Position Descriptions are unique to each faculty member. The committee feels in some colleges the position descriptions still appear to be the "Cookie Cutter" approach. We emphasize the need for departments and colleges to annually review the position description and adjust them to reflect the changing role of the faculty member and department.

Candidate Statement

There has been significant improvement during the past three years. However, the following need additional attention in the future.

- Candidate statements need to be limited to three pages.
- Candidates must give significant evidence of impact and documentation of the scholarship. In team situations an individual's contribution to the scholarship needs to be clear. With the adoption of acceptability of new forms of scholarship it is very important for the candidate to help committees understand how to evaluate the form of scholarship. The candidate's statement is where the candidate has the opportunity to demonstrate their case for promotion or tenure. This needs to be clearly articulated. In too many cases this is not well done.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

This is the area that probably needs the greatest attention in the future. Our observations and recommendations include the following:

- If there is not a college or department process for regular peer evaluation of teaching for all faculty there should be one for faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure.
- Peer evaluation of teaching should be over time (not just the year the faculty is being considered). We recommend that this be at least over three years and at least once each year.
- Peer evaluation of teaching should be done by senior tenured faculty.

Advising

Evaluation of advising responsibility is an area that would benefit from additional attention. Advising is an important function for the success of both undergraduate and graduate students. It should be recognized, respected and sensitivity to faculty who have this function should be evident. Faculty with advising should have evidence of the following:

- The faculty members role in advising
- Evidence of the process and indicators of the quality of advising
- Evidence of the outcomes of excellence or distinction in advising.

Outside Reviewers

Outside reviewers must have a demonstrated expertise in the discipline and must be of equal or greater rank for which the faculty member is being considered. It is important that they not be co-authors, former graduate students, or close personal friends. The outside reviewer needs to be asked to evaluate the individual's scholarship for consideration of promotion and not make a judgment of promotion or not.

Mentoring and Department and College Committees Updating

The Committee observed that the quality of the dossiers and the ability of faculty to meet the rigorous evaluation for tenure and promotion was greatly improved through the utilization of faculty mentors who are

assigned to new faculty upon hire and for tenured faculty when they are beginning the preparation for consideration of promotion. We encourage all departments and colleges consider this approach to insure success of faculty and increase excellence and distinction among faculty.

We believe that all Department and College P&T Committees need to consider asking the Faculty Senate P&T Committee members to assist in updating and understanding of the P&T Guidelines and expectations.

Campus-wide Orientation & Training

The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee sponsored six campus-wide workshops in the 1997-98 year. These focused on the development of Candidate Position Descriptions, Candidate Statements, Understanding the Definition and documentation of Scholarship, conducting and documenting peer review of teaching, conducting and documenting review of advising responsibilities, and other areas relevant to dossier preparation and candidate review. Five workshops will be held during 1998-99.

Department & College Faculty and Committee Training and/or Orientation.

The P&T committee in cooperation with the Provost's office conducted three department or college training and orientation programs during 1997-98. Additional workshops for departments are scheduled in 1998-99.

Post Tenure Review and Assessment of Teaching

The Faculty Senate P&T Committee was actively involved in the process of evaluating and facilitating feed back to the specific committees who are providing leadership for recommendations on Post Tenure Evaluation and Assessment of Teaching.

Executive Summary 1998 Promotion and Tenure Review

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee began its review of 60 dossiers in February and concluded its final meeting on June 9, 1998.

Within this report are tables that summarize requests received and the actions taken. The information presented in Table I analyzes the data for the group as a whole. In Tables II and III summary analyses are presented for female and minority candidates. The others provide information on promotion by rank and granting of indefinite tenure. They also show totals by college, including information on females and minorities.

The level of agreement among department, college, and University Promotion and Tenure Committees is high and consistent with the pattern noted in recent years. Twenty (20) individuals were promoted to Professor; 27 to Associate Professor; and 6 to Senior Faculty Assistant. Twenty-one (21) individuals were granted indefinite tenure.

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee consisted of the following individuals:

Roy Arnold, Provost and Executive Vice President
Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Wilson, "Toby" Hayes, Vice Provost for Research
Lyla Houglum, Dean of Extended Education
Tom Maresh, Dean of the Graduate School
Dick Scanlan, Dean of Research

Faculty Observers to the 1998 University Promotion and Tenure Committee were drawn from the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Observers included:

John Farrell, Department of Economics
Joe Hendricks, University Honors College
Duane Johnson, Department of 4-H Youth Development Education
Michael Mix, Department of Biology

Sandra Woods, Department of Civil Engineering
Tom Savage, Department of Animal Science

ANALYSIS BY RANK AND TENURE

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	6	0	0	0
Associate Professor	27	3	19	2
Professor	20	2	0	0
No change in rank			2	0
TOTAL	53	5	21	1

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS:

6 faculty were promoted to the rank of Senior Faculty Research Assistant
0 faculty were promoted to Senior Instructor, 0 with indefinite tenure
0 faculty were promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor
27 faculty were promoted to the rank of Associate Professor; 19 with indefinite tenure
20 faculty were promoted to the rank of Professor; 0 with indefinite tenure
21 faculty were granted indefinite tenure

ANALYSIS FOR WOMEN

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	3	0	0	0
Associate Professor	8	1	9	0
Professor	2	0	0	0
No change in rank			0	0
TOTAL	13	1	9	0

ANALYSIS FOR MINORITIES

Request by rank	Promotion		Tenure	
	Yes	No	Granted	Denied
Senior Faculty Research Assistant	0	0	0	0
Associate Professor	3	0	2	0
Professor	1	0	0	0
No change in rank			0	0
TOTAL	4	0	2	0

GRANTED INDEFINITE TENURE

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	3	2	0
Business	1	0	1
Engineering	2	0	0
Forestry	1	1	0
Health & Human Perf	1	0	0
Home Economics & Ed	2	1	0
Information Services	1	0	0
Liberal Arts	7	4	1
Pharmacy	1	0	0
Science	2	1	0

TOTAL	21	9	2
--------------	-----------	----------	----------

PROMOTION TO SENIOR FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	2	1	0
Forestry	3	2	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sci	1	0	0
Total	6	3	0

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	4	2	0
Business	1	0	1
Engineering	4	0	1
Forestry	3	1	0
Health & Human Perf	1	0	0
Home Economics & Ed	2	1	0
Information Services	1	0	0
Liberal Arts	6	3	1
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sci	2	0	0
Pharmacy	1	0	0
Science	2	1	0
Total	27	8	3

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

	Total Males and Females	Total Females	Minorities
Agricultural Sciences	9	0	0
Engineering	1	0	0
Forestry	2	0	0
Health & Human Perf	1	1	0
Home Economics & Ed	1	1	0
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sci	1	0	0
Science	5	1	1
Total	20	3	1

| [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](#).