FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF
PROMOTION AND PRACTICES AT OSU

In March, 1973, the AAUP Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure (then consisting of W. P. Stephen, Chairman; Peter C. List, G. J. Masilionis, David W. Schacht) distributed a questionnaire to almost all regular OSU faculty at the rank of instructor and above. The questionnaire dealt with existing practices at OSU with respect to tenure and promotion of faculty. The findings summarized below, represent the perceptions of roughly 29% (396 people) of the faculty at OSU, in all its various schools and colleges. In explaining their findings, the Subcommittee decided to use a narrative scale of language based on percentages of responses to individual questions. The scale follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% response:</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narrative language:</td>
<td>hardly anyone</td>
<td>a small number</td>
<td>a small minority</td>
<td>a significant majority</td>
<td>a near majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>76-90</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a small majority</td>
<td>a vast significant majority</td>
<td>everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report does not discuss all of the results of the questionnaire, but rather those which the Subcommittee took to be most important. The findings are split into three sections: Section A reports the perceptions of faculty about practices and procedures on promotion and tenure at the institutional level; Section B reports on perceptions in respect to the Dean's office level; Section C reports on perceptions at the departmental level. The greatest depth of response occurs in this last section due to the fact that the questionnaire concentrated on perceptions of faculty at the departmental level. In each section, perceptions about the desirability of certain practices are also reported.
Section A: General Procedures and Practices in the University

1. A significant majority of the respondents feel that it is not desirable that tenure should be accompanied by promotion in rank.
2. A vast majority of respondents feel that promotion in rank should be accompanied by significant increase in salary.
3. A vast majority of respondents think it desirable that there be periodic evaluation of the tenure of chairmanships and deanships.

Section B: Procedures and Practices of the Dean's Office in the respective Schools and Colleges at OSU

1. A significant minority of respondents at the time the questionnaire was distributed (March 12, 1973), either had not been given and/or had not read the tenure and promotion guidelines distributed by the Dean of Faculty's Office, yet nearly all respondents thought it desirable that they do so.
2. A significant minority believe that their school or college does not have a promotion and tenure committee to review recommendations from departments. Yet a vast majority think it desirable that they have such a committee.
3. A significant minority feel that discriminatory practices of an unjustifiable sort (36%) have been evident in respect to promotion and tenure on the part of their Dean's office. And nearly all respondents think that such practices are undesirable, when they exist.

Section C: Procedures and Practices at the Departmental Level

1. A near majority of respondents claim that they have not been informed of changes in departmental policies on tenure and promotion prior to their implementation, yet nearly everyone thinks it desirable that they should be so informed.
2. A significant minority of respondents believe that they have not been given a statement of departmental policy on tenure and promotion, yet nearly everyone thinks it desirable that they be given such a statement.
3. A small majority claim that they have not been given detailed information as to the exact nature of their duties and responsibilities in their departments.
(A near majority have not been given a verbal statement of such duties and responsibilities, though a vast majority think it desirable that they should. And a significant majority claim not to have been given a written statement, though a significant majority think it desirable that they should.)

4. The vast majority claim that a departmental committee is used to screen and recommend faculty for tenure, and nearly everyone thinks this is desirable. As for the method of choosing the committee members, a significant majority claim that the department head or chairman is involved, but only a small majority believe this is desirable. A near majority claim that the members are elected by departmental faculty, yet a significant majority believe this is desirable. Hardly anyone thinks the dean is involved, and the vast majority think it is desirable that he is not.

5. A small minority claim that departmental committee recommendations accompany in toto those of the departmental chairman or head to the dean, and the vast majority think this is desirable.

6. Criteria for granting promotion and tenure: presently a significant majority of respondents think the most significant criteria are currently prepared by departmental faculty; a vast majority think them currently prepared in addition by the departmental head or chairman; a majority think them prepared by the president's office; and a small number think them prepared by the faculty at large (faculty senate). Yet a vast majority think departmental faculty should be involved; only a majority think the departmental head or chairman should be involved; while a significant majority think the president's office should not be involved; and a significant minority think the faculty at large in the institution (faculty senate) ought to be involved.

7. Materials considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure: a vast majority of respondents think that teaching effectiveness, research effectiveness, service to the institution and the community, are considered, and that letters of evaluation are currently used, in such evaluations. Nearly everyone thinks that teaching effectiveness is a desirable criterion for evaluation; while a vast majority think that the other criteria are also desirable. Only a small number of respondents presently claim that classroom visitation by peers and by department head or chairman are used in evaluating teaching effectiveness, yet a significant majority believe both methods are desirable. A vast
majority claim that formal evaluation by students is presently used as a method in such teaching evaluations, while a significant majority think this is desirable. In addition a significant majority of respondents claim that other means are used in such evaluations and a vast majority think these other means are desirable.

8. Departmental procedures on promotion and tenure: only a small minority of respondents claim that they were asked to appear before the review committee, the department head, and/or the dean, yet a significant majority think it is desirable that they should be allowed to appear. A vast majority believe that faculty peers should be interviewed by either the review committee or the department head in making the evaluation about tenure and promotion, yet only a near majority think this is presently done.

9. Nearly everyone thinks it desirable that a faculty member not recommended for promotion and/or tenure be given reasons for this decision, yet a small minority claim this is not being done. When asked whether current standards for awarding promotion and tenure contribute to high morale, low morale, or do not make an important contribution to morale in their departments, only a small number (18%) thought that they contribute to high morale, while a majority (52%) thought that they contribute to low morale, with the rest maintaining that they do not contribute in an important way to morale.

10. Only a small minority of the respondents claimed to have been denied either a promotion or tenure award. Of these, a significant majority were given a verbal statement to this effect by the departmental head or chairman, while only a small minority were given a written statement. Yet a vast majority of respondents would like to have both a written and a verbal statement.

11. A small number of respondents were not aware that denial of promotion and tenure could be appealed (18%).

12. A significant minority (37%) of faculty respondents claim that unwarranted discriminatory practices in respect to promotion and tenure were evident in their departments while nearly everyone finds this to be undesirable. Perceptions about the frequency of such discrimination varied considerably within schools and colleges in the university, from a low of 9% of the faculty respondents in one school to a high of 80% in another.
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