Promotion & Tenure Committee
September 23, 2016
Minutes

Members present: Gary Delander, Theo Dreher, Janet Lee, Mei-Ching Lien, Deb Pence

As Mei-Ching will rotate off committee after this year, Gary Delander agreed to serve as co-chair. Minute taking will rotate (Theo Dreher for this meeting).

Discussion Items

a) **Evaluation of P&T Faculty Qualifications and Procedures** (a new item)
During AY2018 there will be an overall review of the P&T process at OSU. For the next meeting, Mei-Ching will find out relevant details, esp. whether this will be an internal or external-OSU review, and what will be needed from this committee.

b) **Review Processes for Ecampus Instructors** (a new item)
- It was interpreted that the request is for processes for reviewing Ecampus instruction for all professors/instructors, not just for full-time Ecampus instructors.
- We should ask Ecampus administration what the breakdown among instructors is for teaching Ecampus courses: how many full-term Ecampus-only instructors are there? In what other combinations are Ecampus courses taught?
- We should ask Ecampus what metric/assessment/review they use for Ecampus courses. Items that are covered in on-campus instruction that may be missing for Ecampus courses include: peer review, student input or participation in the student committee.

c) **Review Processes for Faculty Research Assistants (FRA) and Non-tenure Track Instructors** (a continued item)
- Reviewed the working document from last year's committee work on "Simplified review process for non-tenure track instructors"
- Discussed different practices in different colleges in collecting the peer review info; some colleges form a committee to do this, others don't; proposed changing point c. iv. "letter from peer review committee" to "peer teaching letters" to allow college interpretation
- Discussed evaluation letters and OSU practice to have equal numbers of candidate-nominated and administratively-nominated letters. This would mean an even number of letters is required, so it was recommended that four letters instead of three be required (point c. vii); correct numbering 1-4 for the possible sources of letters
- To protect letter anonymity, recommended requiring the candidate to nominate four evaluators, instead of two. (point c. viii)
- Points should be added under a section d. to indicate a letter will be provided by the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee, and by the Department Chair/Head en route to a decision by the Dean.

d) The Committee was asked to consider drafting separate Waiver of Access forms to allow candidates to selectively decline/agree to waive access to outside evaluation letters and to student input. It was felt that this would imply differential importance attached to these two sources of input and it was advised to keep the current Waiver form.

Minutes prepared by Theo Dreher