Faculty Senate P&T Committee Proposal: November 24, 2008

College Review and Recommendation.

The candidate's dossier – including the letters of evaluation and recommendation from the supervisor, the faculty committee, and the student or client representatives; together with the candidate's response to the departmental evaluation when one is added – is forwarded for review at the college level by both a college P&T faculty committee and by the dean of the college.

The college P&T committee shall be comprised solely of college faculty members elected by tenured or tenure track college faculty. The college P&T committee is intended to be an independent voice of evaluation. College P&T committee members are not to be members of the unit-level P&T review committee. The size and qualifications of the committee shall be decided within the college to provide fair and equitable faculty representation based on the diversity within the college.

The college review should ensure that each dossier has been carefully and properly prepared, and that uniform or equivalent standards are applied to all candidates within the college. The reviewers at the college level are to determine whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation accurately assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier. College-level processes must be consistent with these procedural guidelines.

A letter of evaluation from the college faculty P&T committee and a letter of evaluation from the dean are to be added to the dossier as it is forwarded for review at the University level. The candidate may add a written statement regarding these reviews, to be included in the dossier.
Proposed Representation of Faculty on the University P&T Committee:
November, 2008

The following is a draft of a proposed change to the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee Standing Rules

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee Faculty provides representation on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The role of this representative is to provide a voice for faculty in the University decisions on promotion and tenure with regard to both process and merit in those cases that do not receive recommendation of success at all levels of evaluation. A single representative from the Faculty Senate Committee who is not within the same college as the candidate under review will be selected for each case.

Comments:

The FS P&T Committee may discuss cases to provide a broader perspective. The FS P&T Committee is expected to review the cases that have transpired at the end of each academic year to provide awareness of the issues and decisions of past cases.
Jim, I think I read it too quickly and didn’t see this as being a revision to the committee's standing rules rather than a statement of a change in process. But it does bring up that this change will need to be reflected in a revision of the P&T Guidelines that speak to the committee’s representation at the review of ‘mixed recommendation’ cases (from the Guidelines):

**University Review and Recommendation**

Each dossier will be reviewed for completeness by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs. Where additional information is needed, the candidate's supervisor or dean will be contacted.

Completed dossiers that have received uniformly positive recommendations at the previous levels of review will be forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President, who will assure that University-wide standards have been met. In reaching a final decision, the Provost and Executive Vice President may confer with others as appropriate. All dossiers that have received mixed recommendations at the unit or college level will be reviewed by the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee, which is chaired by the Provost and Executive Vice President and consists of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, the Vice President for Research, the Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

The purpose of the University review is to ensure that all faculty are held to common standards, and to resolve disagreements in previous recommendations. In cases in which the members of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee are divided over the final recommendation, or in which their recommendation differs from those of the college or unit, the candidate's dean and supervisor will be invited for discussion.

The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee will have access to all dossiers under consideration, and representatives of the committee will observe the deliberations of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee on cases where clarification or discussion with deans and/or supervisors takes place, to ensure an equitable process for all faculty.

I’ve noted two sections by underlining them. The first speaks to the Univ P&T Committee reviewing only the ‘mixed recommendation’ cases, but I think in practice they go on a retreat and review all of them. The old guidelines called for a
representative of the FS P&T Committee at this review, too, but that was deleted in the recent guidelines revision, in part because it had ceased to be done anyway.

The second section underlined (the last paragraph) is where revisions will need to occur to state the the FS P&T Committee member will have full participation in these reviews, as it currently gives only an observational role.

I'll send a note to Lynda clarifying the intent of your committee and copy you in, so that she can feel that she's closed the loop about Lani's recommendations.

Thanks,
Tony

> From: James Liburdy <james_liburdy@oregonstate.edu>
> Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2008 08:58:21 -0800
> To: Tony Wilcox <anthony_wilcox@oregonstate.edu>
> Subject: Re: pandt
>
> Tony,
> Well I had words in there saying "voting member" but then we didn't know if they vote or not, so we decided to go with what we presented - the meaning of "representative" is a full member of the committee. We say "voice for faculty in the University decisions" again with the implication that the voice is present for the entire process. I am more than happy to modify this to be more explicit so as not to provide any wiggle room.
> What about changing the second sentence to read something like:
>
> "The role of this representative is as a full member of the committee to provide a voice for faculty in the University decisions on....."
>
> Jim
> On Dec 3, 2008, at 8:47 AM, Tony Wilcox wrote:
>
>> Jim, this recommendation doesn't speak to the issue of the faculty representative from your committee having a "vote" or being at the same level of input in the cases under consideration as the other members of the University P&T Committee. Do you think that should be made explicit?
>>
>> Thanks,
>> Tony
>>
Tenure Unit Review and Recommendation

In all but rare cases, the supervisor of the tenure unit and a promotion and tenure review committee formed from among the faculty within the unit (at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered). The supervisor and the promotion and tenure review committee will each independently evaluate the materials in the dossier, and recommend either for or against the candidate's promotion or tenure. If there are not enough faculty of the appropriate rank within the unit (there should be at least three on the committee), the supervisor can invite faculty from outside the unit to serve as voting members on the committee. Retired faculty (even those on 1040 assignments) are not eligible to vote at the tenure unit level. If the individual serving in the department chair/head role is on a 1040 assignment, he/she can write the supervisor's letter of evaluation. Committees may include faculty at all ranks who can contribute to the discussion, but not every committee member may be eligible to vote. For fixed-term candidates being considered for promotion, only faculty members above the current rank of the candidate may vote. For tenured candidates being considered for promotion or untenured candidates being considered for both promotion and tenure, only tenured faculty members above the current rank of the candidate may vote. For untenured candidates being considered solely for tenure, only tenured faculty members at or above the current rank of the candidate may vote.

The supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. In the supervisor's letter of evaluation, he or she will comment on any information in that file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, scholarship, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments.

If both the supervisor's and the committee's recommendations are negative, the dossier will not be forwarded to the next level of review, unless the candidate, following discussion with the supervisor, insists, or the candidate is in the final year of annual tenure. In such cases the dossier must be forwarded for consideration, unless the candidate submits a letter of resignation.

The letters from the supervisor and the promotion and tenure review committee are to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each should be included. These letters should summarize and comment on key points in the letters of evaluation solicited from qualified reviewers in the candidate's field. Evaluators should be identified only by a coded
reference number or letter when referring to a comment in a confidential letter.

As required by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, students will be invited to participate in the review of faculty for promotion and tenure. The purpose of the student evaluation letter is to document the student perspective of the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. In order to provide the university with a consistent source of information for the process, the unit P&T committee and the unit supervisor should endeavor to organize student committees for faculty evaluation using the process outlined in section VI of the dossier guidelines http://oregonstate.edu/factystaff/handbook/dosguide.html.

Faculty with teaching and/or Extension/outreach assignments should have a letter from their peer teaching review committee that summarizes all peer teaching reviews over the evaluation timeframe.

Prior to the dossier leaving the unit, the supervisor will meet with the candidate to share the outcomes of the unit reviews. The candidate may add a written statement regarding these reviews, to be included in the dossier. In addition, at any time during the review process the candidate may withdraw his or her dossier.