

1 UNITED ACADEMICS PROPOSAL

2
3 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

4
5 **Preamble.** The purpose of these guidelines is to provide common procedures for promotion and
6 tenure for all Oregon State University faculty members.

7
8 **Section 1.** The granting of promotion and tenure is based on merit. Promotion and tenure are
9 never automatic or routine.

10
11 **Section 2.** Responsibility for promotion and tenure recommendations rests principally with the
12 senior members of the faculty, academic unit heads, and academic deans. Final responsibility
13 rests with the Provost. Reviewers base their recommendations on carefully prepared dossiers that
14 document and evaluate the accomplishments of each candidate measured relative to the duties
15 enumerated in their position description.

16
17 **Section 3.** Promotion and tenure are awarded to recognize faculty members' contributions to the
18 missions of OSU in their assigned job duties in:

- 19 ● teaching, research, and service;
20 ● equity, inclusion, and diversity; and
21 ● extension, clinical practice, librarianship, and other assignments.

22
23 The classification of work into these categories is flexible to accommodate the diversity of work
24 done by OSU faculty members. Evaluations for promotion and tenure will not depend on how a
25 faculty member's work is classified into these categories.

26
27 **Section 4. Communication of Expectations.** The Administration will inform faculty members
28 of promotion and tenure expectations in their Notice of Appointment. Supervisors will inform
29 faculty members, in a constructive way, of their progress toward promotion and tenure using
30 Annual Reviews and, if applicable, the Midterm Review.

31
32 **Section 5. Position Descriptions.** Faculty members are hired with expectations of performance
33 of assigned job duties that are established in their position descriptions, which may then be
34 revised as the academic unit's needs and as the faculty member's assignments change.

35
36 If position descriptions change during the review period, the expectations of performance of
37 assigned job duties during the review period will be adjusted proportionally.

38
39 **Section 6. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure Review.** Candidates for promotion and tenure
40 will be evaluated objectively for excellence in the performance of their assigned job duties.
41 Position descriptions may enumerate specific expectations. The performance of assigned job
42 duties is documented in the dossier. Evaluation will focus on the quality of work performed and
43 the candidate's success in achieving the work. Evaluation will consider innovation, creativity,
44 and evidence of effectiveness.

1 Further criteria for evaluating faculty members' performance of assigned job duties for
2 promotion and tenure review will be developed with faculty input by academic units, colleges,
3 and Faculty Senate.

4
5 **Section 7. Joint and Multiple Appointments.** The head from the reviewing academic unit will
6 also work in cooperation with any other supervisors to whom the faculty member reports. The
7 expectations for promotion and tenure, including the review process, are documented at the time
8 of hire, as per Article XX, Notice of Appointment.

9
10 **Section 8. Promotion and Tenure Calendar.** Promotion and tenure clocks begin on September
11 16 following the faculty member's hire, unless otherwise stipulated in the offer letter. Promotion
12 and tenure decisions will be announced by June 1. Promotion and tenure are instituted on
13 September 16 following the promotion and tenure decision.

14
15 **Section 9. Years of Service towards Promotion and Tenure.** Annual appointment at any FTE
16 counts as one year of service towards promotion and tenure.

17 **FACULTY DOSSIERS**

18 **Section 10. Compilation of the Dossier.** Promotion and tenure decisions are based primarily on
19 an evaluation of the candidate's achievements as described in their dossier. The dossier must
20 document evaluation of the candidate's performance, consistent with the candidate's position
21 description.
22

23
24 Although the candidate prepares much of the material for the dossier, the academic unit head will
25 ensure that the candidate receives assistance as needed. The academic unit head is responsible
26 for seeing that the final dossier is complete and conforms to university guidelines.
27

28 **Section 11. Access to the Dossier and Personnel Records by the Faculty Member.** Faculty
29 members will be allowed full access to their own dossiers, personnel records, and records kept
30 by the university, college, or academic unit, except for:

- 31 ● letters of evaluation submitted as part of a pre-employment review at OSU and
- 32 ● solicited letters of evaluation for faculty members who signed voluntary waivers of
33 access to those letters as part of a promotion or tenure review.

34
35 **Section 12. Certification of Completeness.** Prior to the dossier receiving its first formal reviews
36 by the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and academic unit head, the
37 candidate must sign and date a certification that the open part of the dossier is complete. Should
38 the candidate and academic unit head disagree on the inclusion of some materials, the candidate
39 may indicate their objection in the statement of certification.
40

41 **Section 13.** Once the dossier is certified by the candidate, the only material that may be added
42 subsequently are:

- 43 ● student letter of evaluation,
- 44 ● administrative letters of evaluation,
- 45 ● the candidate's letters of response to administrative letters of evaluation,
- 46 ● other letters and materials as described in Section 15, and

- manuscripts accepted for publication and grants funded after the dossier is certified.

Section 14. Throughout the process of review, the open part of the dossier remains available to the candidate at their request. The candidate will receive copies of all letters of evaluation by reviewers at the academic unit and college levels when they are added to the dossier.

Section 15. Dossier Guidelines. Dossiers will include, as applicable, in order:

Cover page: The cover page includes the name of the candidate, their academic unit and college, and what action is being requested (e.g. promotion to Professor).

Waiver of Access: Candidates must choose whether to sign a waiver of access for outside letters of evaluation. Execution of the waiver is voluntary; promotion and tenure decisions will be made without regard to whether the candidate has signed the waiver. The signed waiver of access or a statement that the candidate chose not to sign the waiver of access must be included. Section 16 further describes the waiver of access.

Position Description: All of the candidate's position descriptions during the review period must be included to ensure accurate evaluation. A table that summarizes FTE and the allocation of effort among assigned job duties during the review period must be included.

Candidate's Statement: The candidate will include a two- to four-page statement of their contributions to teaching, research, and service; equity, inclusion, and diversity; and extension, clinical practice, librarianship, and other assignments. Any of these categories of job duties that are not assigned may be omitted from the candidate's statement.

Student Letter of Evaluation: Students will be invited to participate in the review of faculty for promotion and tenure. Section 20 further describes the student letter of evaluation.

Administrative Letters of Evaluation: Administrative letters of evaluation will be completed, signed, and added to the dossier in the following order, as applicable:

- direct supervisor(s);
- academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;
- academic unit head;
- other administrators with supervisory responsibility of the candidate;
- college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; and
- dean, director, vice president, or vice provost.

Sections 21–29 further describe administrative letters of evaluation.

The candidate may request that Faculty Senate appoint and authorize a committee to verify that the letters from the academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the academic unit head have properly summarized the solicited letters of evaluation. If the candidate requests this review, the report from this committee will be placed after the academic unit head's letter. Section 24 further describes this Faculty Senate review.

1 The candidate may include in their dossier a rebuttal letter after each of the administrative letters
2 of evaluation are added and before the dossier is passed on to the next level of review. Each
3 rebuttal letter will be placed in the dossier immediately after the letter to which it applies.
4 Sections 25 and 29 further describe rebuttal letters.

5
6 ***Promotion and Tenure Curriculum Vitae:*** All of the candidate’s assigned job duties must be
7 documented in the curriculum vitae to ensure an accurate evaluation. The curriculum vitae for
8 promotion or tenure review must be formatted according to current Faculty Senate policy.

9
10 ***Letters of Evaluation:*** Letters of evaluation solicited from leaders in the field will be included:
11 • six to eight letters of evaluation for candidates in the Tenure-Track classification and
12 Fixed-Term Professorial categories, and
13 • four letters of evaluation for candidates in Fixed-Term Instructional categories and Fixed-
14 Term Research categories.

15 Sections 17–19 further describe letters of evaluation.

16
17 ***Other Letters and Materials (optional):*** Other than the administrative letters of evaluation
18 described above, the student letter of evaluation, and internal or external letters of evaluation,
19 letters from other sources are not generally necessary. Signed letters of support or advocacy from
20 colleagues, students, and clients should be included only if they are required for fairness and
21 balance. If there is a compelling reason to include such letters, the academic unit head should
22 write a statement identifying the significance of the letters, whether solicited or unsolicited, and
23 the need to include them in the dossier. All letters should be letters of evaluation and should be
24 open to the candidate. The academic unit head should include any other material that may be
25 relevant to a full and fair review.

26
27 ***Certification of Completeness:*** Section 12 describes the candidate’s certification of
28 completeness.

29 **WAIVER OF ACCESS**

30
31 **Section 16.** A faculty member shall not be denied full access to their personnel records kept by
32 the university or its colleges or academic units. All faculty members have a right to view any
33 letter of evaluation submitted in connection with the faculty member's promotion or tenure
34 review, although faculty members may waive the right to review letters of evaluation requested
35 from internal and external evaluators.

36
37 Faculty members are not required to waive their right to review letters of evaluation. All faculty
38 members are entitled to and will receive full and fair evaluation of dossier materials submitted in
39 support of promotion and tenure, including letters of evaluation, whether they have waived their
40 right to view them or not.

41
42 All faculty members retain their right of access to written evaluations prepared by their academic
43 unit, their academic unit head, their college, their dean, and the Provost, although the
44 confidentiality and identity of other evaluators referred to in these evaluations will be maintained
45 if a waiver has been signed.

1 **SOLICITED LETTERS OF EVALUATION**

2 **Section 17.** For candidates in the Tenure-Track classification and Fixed-Term Professorial
3 categories, six to eight external letters of evaluation will be obtained.

4
5 Letters should generally be from people in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to
6 evaluate the parts of the dossier for which they have specific expertise. The evaluators should be
7 chosen so that at least one evaluator has the expertise to evaluate each of the candidate's
8 assigned job duties. Letters should generally be from people who hold a rank at or above the
9 level for which the candidate is being considered, or an experience level equivalent to such a
10 rank.

11
12 Letters should not be solicited from people who have collaborated with the candidate in the last
13 five years. Letters should not be solicited from former postdoctoral advisers or graduate mentors
14 of the candidate, nor from students advised or mentored by the candidate. If letters from any of
15 these generally excluded evaluators are critical to candidate assessment, a detailed explanation of
16 why their participation is essential and how objectivity can be maintained must be provided by
17 the academic unit head who requested the letter.

18
19 The candidate must submit to the academic unit head a list of five to eight evaluators who meet
20 the criteria in this Section. In the final dossier, at least three of the letters of evaluation will be
21 from the candidate's list of evaluators, but no more than half of the letters of evaluation can be
22 from the candidate's list of evaluators.

23
24 If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the academic unit
25 head. The other evaluators will be selected by the academic unit head or academic unit
26 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee according to practices within the academic unit.

27
28 If an evaluator was suggested by both the candidate and others, that evaluator will be considered
29 among the candidate's pool of evaluators unless there is clear indication why they should be
30 included in the pool of other evaluators.

31
32 All letters must be requested by the academic unit head or the academic unit Promotion and
33 Tenure Review Committee chair, not the candidate.

34
35 **Section 18.** For candidates in the Fixed-Term Instructional categories and the Fixed-Term
36 Research categories, four letters of evaluation will be obtained.

37
38 Letters should generally be from individuals in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to
39 evaluate the parts of the dossier for which they have specific expertise. The evaluators should be
40 chosen so that at least one evaluator has the expertise to evaluate each of the candidate's
41 assigned job duties. Letters should generally be from people who hold a rank at or above the
42 level for which the candidate is being considered or an experience level equivalent to such a
43 rank. The ability to objectively evaluate the candidate is the primary criterion in selecting
44 evaluators. Evaluators may be internal or external to OSU. Internal evaluators must be outside of
45 the candidate's academic unit but may be people within or outside the candidate's college who
46 have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier.

1
2 The candidate must submit to the academic unit head a list of four evaluators who meet the
3 criteria in this Section. In the final dossier, two of the letters of evaluation will be from the
4 candidate's list of evaluators.

5
6 If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the academic unit
7 head. The other evaluators will be selected by the academic unit head or academic unit
8 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee according to practices within the academic unit.

9
10 If an evaluator was suggested by both the candidate and others, that evaluator will be considered
11 among the candidate's pool of evaluators unless there is clear indication why they should be
12 included in the pool of other evaluators.

13
14 All letters must be requested by the academic unit head or the academic unit Promotion and
15 Tenure Review Committee chair, not the candidate.

16
17 **Section 19.** Each evaluator will be sent the candidate's position description(s), the table
18 summarizing FTE and the allocation of effort among assigned job duties during the review
19 period, the candidate's statement, and the candidate's current curriculum vitae.

20
21 The letters of evaluation section of the dossier must include:

- 22 ● a description of the process used in the academic unit for the selection of the evaluators;
- 23 ● a copy of the instructions given to the evaluators; and
- 24 ● a short description of the group of evaluators who provided letters and whether the
25 candidate or the academic unit nominated them to be evaluators.

26
27 Letters from evaluators must be available prior to initiating the review of the dossier.

28
29 **Section 20. Student Letter of Evaluation.** The purpose of the student letter of evaluation is to
30 document the students' perspective of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher, mentor, and
31 adviser. In order to provide a consistent source of information for the process, the academic unit
32 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the academic unit head will organize a student
33 committee for faculty evaluation using the following process.

- 34 a. The academic unit head or designee will request a list of current and recent students,
35 including advisees, from the candidate.
- 36 b. The academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the academic unit head
37 will jointly generate an additional list of students.
- 38 c. The academic unit head or designee will request letters of evaluation from the combined
39 lists. An attempt should be made to request input from students whose collective
40 experience represents the profile of the teaching duties of the candidate. For example, if
41 the candidate teaches all undergraduate courses, it is appropriate for all letters to come
42 from undergraduates. If the candidate teaches a combination of courses, the students
43 should have a combination of experiences that provide sufficient information to evaluate
44 the candidate's performance.
- 45 d. Whether the candidate can access student letters of evaluation is determined by whether
46 the candidate has signed the waiver of access. Requests to students for letters of

1 evaluation of a faculty member must inform the students about whether the candidate will
2 see their letters and about who else will see their letters. Students must also be informed
3 that only signed letters will be used as part of the process.

- 4 e. There should be four to twelve total letters, depending on the variety of the candidate's
5 assigned teaching duties. The number of letters from the list generated by the candidate
6 should differ by at most one from the number of letters from the list generated by the
7 academic unit.
- 8 f. The academic unit head or designee will form a student committee whose task is to write
9 a letter summarizing the input from student evaluators. Members of this committee:
 - 10 i. should be current students,
 - 11 ii. should be half from the list provided by the candidate and half from the list
12 generated by the academic unit,
 - 13 iii. may be students from whom letters were solicited, and
 - 14 iv. should not be current advisees of the candidate.
- 15 g. The student committee will be provided with the student letters of evaluation, the student-
16 oriented teaching portion of the dossier (i.e. excluding solicited letters of evaluation),
17 plus any additional information pertinent to their review.
- 18 h. The academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee or academic unit head will
19 select a student chair of the student committee. The only duty of this committee is to
20 write a summary letter that includes information from the student letters of evaluation
21 and the teaching portion of the dossier.
- 22 i. The student committee will be instructed to include in its summary the perspectives
23 represented by all the student letters of evaluation (i.e. not to integrate opinions into an
24 intermediate position).
- 25 j. All members of the committee should sign the summary letter and present it to the
26 academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and academic unit head. The
27 summary letter and the names of the people on the student committee will be open to the
28 candidate even if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.
- 29 k. The student committee section of the dossier must include:
 - 30 i. a description of the process used in the academic unit for the selection of the
31 student committee;
 - 32 ii. a copy of the instructions given to the students;
 - 33 iii. a short description of the group of students who provided letters, the nature of
34 their relationship to the candidate, and whether the candidate or the academic unit
35 nominated them to be evaluators; and
 - 36 iv. the summary letter from the student committee, signed by the members of the
37 committee.

38
39 **Section 21. Academic Unit Review and Recommendation.** The academic unit Promotion and
40 Tenure Review Committee and the academic unit head will each independently evaluate the
41 materials in the candidate's dossier. The academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review
42 Committee and the academic unit head will each recommend either for or against the candidate's
43 promotion or tenure, and will provide rationale for their decision in a formal letter of evaluation.
44

45 **Section 22. Academic Unit Letters of Evaluation of the Candidate.** The letters from the
46 academic unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the academic unit head evaluate

1 the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. These letters should
2 address all assigned job duties identified in the position description and comment on key points
3 in the dossier. These letters should summarize and comment on key points in the solicited letters
4 of evaluation. These letters will include a fair and balanced summary of the candidate's
5 performance relative to tenure or promotion guidelines.
6

7 In addition to the information available in the candidate's dossier, the academic unit head will
8 also consult the candidate's personnel records maintained in the academic unit. The academic
9 unit head may include comments on any information in the candidate's personnel records that are
10 relevant to the evaluation of their assigned job duties.
11

12 If the candidate reports to, or works closely with one or more supervisors or more than one
13 academic unit, letters from each supervisor, academic unit head, and academic unit Promotion
14 and Tenure Review Committee will be included. Letters from supervisors below the academic
15 unit head will evaluate the performance of assigned job duties identified in the position
16 description but need not provide a broader evaluation (e.g. summarize solicited letters).
17

18 **Section 23. Report to the Candidate.** The academic unit head will confer with the candidate to
19 share the outcomes of the academic unit reviews prior to the dossier being forwarded to the
20 college for review. The candidate may have a colleague or United Academics representative
21 accompany them to the meeting as an observer.
22

23 The candidate will receive a copy of the complete dossier forwarded to the college, with the
24 exception of material covered by the waiver of access, if a waiver was signed by the candidate.
25

26 **Section 24. Faculty Senate Review.** Within ten days of receiving all academic unit level
27 reviews, the candidate may request that a faculty committee appointed and authorized by the
28 Faculty Senate examine the contents of the candidate's dossier to verify that all statements
29 therein have properly summarized the solicited letters of evaluation. The Faculty Senate will
30 provide a report on the summaries of the solicited letters of evaluation. This review is added to
31 the dossier at that time. A copy of the report will be sent to the candidate.
32

33 **Section 25. Candidate's Response to the Academic Unit Letters.** If the candidate does not
34 request a Faculty Senate Review, the candidate has ten days after receiving all academic unit
35 level reviews to add, if they desire, a written statement regarding these reviews that will be
36 included in the dossier.
37

38 If the candidate requests a Faculty Senate review, the candidate will have ten days after receiving
39 the Faculty Senate's report to add, if they desire, a written statement regarding the academic unit
40 level reviews and the Faculty Senate report that will be included in the dossier.
41

42 **Section 26. Materials Forwarded to the College.** The candidate's dossier, including the letters
43 of evaluation and recommendation from the academic unit head, the academic unit Promotion
44 and Tenure Review Committee, and the student committee, together with the candidate's
45 response to these evaluations, if added, is forwarded for review at the college level to both the
46 college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the dean of the college.

1
2 **Section 27. College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.** The college Promotion and
3 Tenure Review Committee review letter shall provide:

- 4 ● an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier;
- 5 ● an opinion as to whether the academic unit level letters of evaluation fairly and uniformly
6 assess the merits of the candidate’s performance as documented in the dossier; and
- 7 ● an assessment of whether college promotion and tenure standards were applied
8 consistently to the candidate.

9 This letter will not simply be a restatement of evaluations at the academic unit level.

10
11 This college review process does not preclude deans from forming an advisory group of college
12 administrators whose role is limited to reviewing dossiers and providing input to the dean
13 regarding promotion and tenure practices in the college. Such advisory groups do not vote on any
14 case and will not add a letter to the dossier.

15
16 The letter from the college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee is added to the dossier and
17 forwarded to the dean.

18
19 **Section 28. Dean’s Review.** The dean’s letter shall provide:

- 20 ● an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier,
- 21 ● an opinion as to whether the academic unit level letters of evaluation fairly and uniformly
22 assess the merits of the candidate’s performance as documented in the dossier, and
- 23 ● an assessment of whether college promotion and tenure standards were applied
24 consistently to the candidate.

25 This letter will not simply be a restatement of evaluations at the academic unit level.

26
27 The dean’s letter is added to the dossier.

28
29 **Section 29. Response to the College Letters.** Both college level letters are provided to the
30 candidate. The candidate has ten days after receiving all college level reviews to add, if they
31 desire, a written statement regarding these reviews that will be included in the dossier.

32
33 **Section 30. Provost Review and Recommendation.** Completed dossiers that have received
34 uniformly positive recommendations at the academic unit and college levels of review will be
35 forwarded to the Provost’s Office. In reaching a final decision, the Provost’s Office may confer
36 with others as appropriate.

37
38 All dossiers that have received not uniformly positive recommendations at the academic unit and
39 college levels will be reviewed by the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure
40 Committee, which is chaired by the Provost and consists of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty
41 Affairs, the Vice President for Research, the Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement, and the
42 Dean of the Graduate School.

43
44 The purpose of the Provost review is to ensure that all faculty members are held to common
45 standards and to resolve disagreements in previous recommendations. In cases in which the
46 members of the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee are divided over

1 the final recommendation, or in which their recommendation differs from those of the college or
2 academic unit, the candidate's dean and academic unit head will both be invited for discussion.

3
4 The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee will have access to all dossiers under
5 consideration, and representatives of the committee will observe the deliberations of the
6 University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee on cases where clarification or
7 discussion with deans or academic unit heads takes place, to ensure an equitable process for all
8 faculty members.

9
10 **Section 31. Withdrawal.** At any time during the review process before receiving the decision of
11 the Provost, the candidate may withdraw their dossier.

12
13 **Section 32. Decisions and Appeals.** When all necessary reviews and discussions have been
14 completed, the Provost will make the final decision. Candidates will be informed of the decision
15 in writing.

16
17 In the case of a denial of tenure or promotion, the basis for the denial will be stated, along with
18 information on the right to appeal.

19
20 Candidates not approved for promotion or tenure by the Provost may appeal to the President
21 within fourteen days of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. Extenuating circumstances,
22 procedural irregularities that were not considered by the Provost, and factual errors in the
23 evaluations are grounds for appeal. When appealing, the candidate should write a letter to the
24 President stating which of the above criteria for appeal applies and stating the facts that support
25 the appeal.

26
27 **Section 33. Return of Dossiers.** After the university level review is finished, the complete
28 dossier is retained temporarily in the Office of Faculty Affairs. The dossier is subsequently
29 returned to the appropriate dean, typically at the start of the next academic year. The dean will
30 then return it to the academic unit, where, after confidential letters have been removed if the
31 candidate signed the waiver of access, the dossier is retained as part of the faculty member's
32 personnel records.

33 34 **FORMATION OF REVIEW COMMITTEES**

35 **Section 34. Academic Unit Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.** The academic unit
36 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee is intended to be an independent voice of evaluation.

37
38 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee members should be from ranks at or above the rank
39 sought by the candidate. All faculty members in the same category as the candidate with rank at
40 or above the rank sought by the candidate are eligible to be Promotion and Tenure Review
41 Committee members (e.g. faculty members with Senior Instructor I or Senior Instructor II can
42 serve on Promotion and Tenure Review Committees for promotion to Senior Instructor I).

43
44 Academic units will develop policies describing which ranks within categories different than the
45 candidate's category may vote on tenure and promotion decisions (e.g. whether faculty members
46 with Senior Instructor II rank can serve on Promotion and Tenure Review Committees for

1 promotion to Professor, whether faculty members with Professor rank can serve on Promotion
2 and Tenure Review Committees for promotion to Senior Instructor II). Academic units may
3 choose to allow faculty members in some ranks and categories to participate in the discussions of
4 the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee as non-voting members.

5
6 For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Instructor I (Tenure Track), academic
7 units may also choose to allow faculty members in some ranks and categories to participate in
8 discussions or votes about promotion but not allow participation in discussions or votes about
9 tenure.

10
11 The committee shall be comprised of either all eligible faculty members in the academic unit or
12 an elected subset of these eligible faculty members. The academic unit head is not eligible to be a
13 member of the committee. The composition and size of the committee should provide fair and
14 diverse faculty representation. The composition of the committee should also provide
15 representation to effectively evaluate all of the assigned job duties in the candidate's position
16 description and the candidate's area of expertise, programs of study, location, etc. The committee
17 must include at least three voting members.

18
19 If there are not enough faculty members of the appropriate rank or expertise within the academic
20 unit, members from outside of the academic unit will be elected by a majority of the academic
21 unit's faculty members to serve as voting members on the committee. In the case of candidates
22 who work in locations remote from the majority of the academic unit's faculty members, outside
23 committee members may be particularly necessary.

24
25 Retired faculty members, even those on 1039 appointments, are not eligible to vote on promotion
26 and tenure review at the academic unit level.

27
28 **Section 35. College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.** The college Promotion and
29 Tenure Review Committee is intended to be an independent voice of evaluation that is identified
30 within the college and whose membership is determined by a transparent election process
31 approved by a majority of faculty members. For the purpose of the Promotion and Tenure
32 articles (Articles XX–XX), the OSU Libraries is one of the colleges.

33
34 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee members should be from ranks at or above the rank
35 sought by the candidate. All faculty members in the same category as the candidate with rank at
36 or above the rank sought by the candidate are eligible to be Promotion and Tenure Review
37 Committee members (e.g. faculty members with Senior Instructor I or Senior Instructor II can
38 serve on Promotion and Tenure Review Committees for promotion to Senior Instructor I).

39
40 Colleges will develop policies describing which ranks within categories different than the
41 candidate's category may vote on tenure and promotion decisions (e.g. whether faculty members
42 with Senior Instructor II rank can serve on Promotion and Tenure Review Committees for
43 promotion to Professor, whether faculty members with Professor rank can serve on Promotion
44 and Tenure Review Committees for promotion to Senior Instructor II). Academic units may
45 choose to allow faculty members in some ranks and categories to participate in the discussions of
46 the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee as non-voting members.

1
2 For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Instructor I (Tenure Track), colleges
3 may also choose to allow faculty members in some ranks and categories to participate in
4 discussions or votes about promotion but not allow participation in discussions or votes about
5 tenure.

6
7 The college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall be elected from the group of eligible
8 faculty members and may include academic unit heads.

9
10 The college will determine term limits and frequency of elections. The size and composition of
11 the committee shall be decided within the college to provide fair and equitable faculty
12 representation based on the diversity within the college. The committee shall have representation
13 from multiple academic units within the college and can include members elected at large from
14 the college. The composition of the committee should also provide representation to effectively
15 evaluate all of the assigned job duties in the candidate's position description and the candidate's
16 area of expertise, programs of study, location, etc. The committee must include at least three
17 voting members.

18
19 If there are not enough faculty members of the appropriate rank or expertise within the college,
20 members from outside of the college will be elected by a majority of the college's faculty
21 members to serve as voting members on the committee.

22 In the case of candidates who work in locations remote from the majority of the college's faculty
23 members, outside committee members may be particularly necessary.

24
25 Retired faculty members, even those on 1039 appointments, are not eligible to vote on promotion
26 and tenure review at the college level.

27
28 If a college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee member is a signatory of an academic unit
29 level letter of evaluation, they shall recuse themselves from voting on the candidate's case.

30
31 **Section 36. Limited Purview of Academic Unit Head and College Deans.** In some cases, the
32 head or dean of the candidate's academic unit or college will participate in the preliminary
33 discussions of the academic unit or college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee to provide
34 information on process prior to deliberations. The academic unit head or college dean, however,
35 may participate only if invited by the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and must not be
36 present for the deliberations.

37
38 **Section 37. Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest.** Academic unit Promotion
39 and Tenure Review Committee members, academic unit heads, college Promotion and Tenure
40 Review Committee members, and deans who have a relationship with a candidate should be
41 forthcoming in making that relationship known and act to ensure that their participation in no
42 way undermines the objectivity of the evaluation process. Promotion and Tenure Review
43 Committee members and administrators involved in the promotion and tenure evaluation process
44 must declare any conflicts of interest.

1 A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial,
2 professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the promotion and tenure process
3 or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship.
4 The specific nature of the conflict of interest should be noted in a written statement to the
5 academic unit or college Promotion and Tenure Review Committee chair. If the Promotion and
6 Tenure Review Committee determines that the process would be compromised by the
7 participation of the person with a conflict of interest, that committee member or administrator
8 must recuse themselves from any discussion or voting on that particular case.