

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY
FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES**

Dated May 17, 1996

Adopted by the PSU Faculty Senate June 12, 1996

**[2017 Revised Post Tenure Review Guidelines](#)
[follow the P&T Guidelines](#)**

Revisions and amendments:

2017 March 10 revised

2014 April 07 revised, effective 2014 07 July 01

2014 January voted

2013 October to add new non-tenure-track faculty ranks

2009 July to incorporate new guidelines for promotion within selected research ranks

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. SCHOLARSHIP	5
A. Overview of Faculty Responsibilities	5
B. Scholarly Agenda	6
1. Individual Faculty Responsibility	6
2. Departmental, School and College Responsibilities	7
3. The Uses of a Scholarly Agenda	7
C. Scholarship	7
D. Quality and Significance of Scholarship	8
E. Evaluation of Scholarship	10
1. Documentation	11
2. Research and Other Creative Activities (Research)	12
3. Teaching, Mentoring, and Curricular Activities (Teaching)	13
4. Community Outreach	15
F. Governance and Other Professionally-Related Service	16
III. RANKS	17
Emeritus:	17
Professor:	17
Associate Professor:	17
Assistant Professor:	18
Senior Instructor II:	18
Senior Instructor I:	18
Instructor:	19
Professorial Research Appointments:	19
Senior Research Associate II:	19
Senior Research Associate I:	20
Research Associate:	20
Senior Research Assistant II:	20
Senior Research Assistant I:	20
Research Assistant:	21
Appointments as Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor:	21
Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor:	21
Associate Professor of Practice or Associate Clinical Professor:	22

Assistant Professor of Practice or Assistant Clinical Professor:	22
Fellow:	22
IV. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS	22
A. Regulations	22
B. Use of Faculty Ranks	24
C. Definition, Use, and Conditions of Faculty Appointments.....	24
1. Non-tenure track Appointments.....	24
2. Tenure Track Appointments	27
V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES/PROMOTION AND TENURE	29
TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS (AND NTTF RESEARCH ASSISTANT, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, & RESEARCH FULL PROFESSOR)	29
A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility.....	29
B. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator.....	34
C. Responsibilities of the Provost	35
NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS- PROMOTION	36
A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility.....	36
B. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator.....	41
C. Responsibilities of the Provost.....	42
NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS – CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENT – RELATED EVALUATIONS.....	42
A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility.....	43
B. Initial Appointment	43
C. Type of Appointment	43
D. Faculty Offer and Position Descriptions	44
E. Annual Review	44
F. Timing for Continuous Employment Consideration and Appointment	46
G. Milestone Review for Continuous Employment.....	46
H. Procedures for Milestone Review	49
I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment	52
NON-TENURE TRACK RESEARCH POSITIONS (RESEARCH ASSISTANT & RESEARCH ASSOCIATE)	54
A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility.....	54
B. Responsibility of the Dean.	55
C. Responsibilities of the Provost.....	55
VI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON MERIT INCREASES	55

APPENDIX I: CURRICULUM VITAE	57
REVERSE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)	57
Refereed Publications or Other Creative Achievements	57
Non-Refereed Publications or Other Creative Achievements	58
Presentations at Professional Meetings	58
Honors, Grants, and Fellowships	58
APPENDIX II	60
1. SAMPLE 30-DAY NOTIFICATION LETTER	61
2. REPORT ON EXTERNAL LETTERS*	62
3. SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND FULL PROFESSOR	63
4. SAMPLE LETTER TO EVALUATORS OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT FOR PROMOTION OF NTTF	64
APPENDIX III	65
1. ROUTING OF RECOMMENDATION	66
2. APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM	67
3. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM	68
APPENDIX IV: ADDENDUM FOR OPTIONAL PROMOTIONAL PATHS FOR NON- TENURE TRACK FACULTY EMPLOYED AT PSU PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER 16, 2014	69
A. Promotional Options for Non-Tenure Track (NTTF, formerly Fixed-Term) INSTRUCTIONAL Faculty employed at PSU prior to September 16, 2014:	69
B. Promotional Options for Non-Tenure Track (NTTF, formerly Fixed-Term) RESEARCH Faculty employed at PSU prior to September 16, 2014:	70
C. The following Motions approved by the PSU Faculty Senate in 2014 offer guidance on the adoption and implementation of new NTTF instructional and research ranks:	71

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES

I. INTRODUCTION

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty are established to provide the means whereby the performance of individual faculty members and their contributions to collective university goals may be equitably assessed and documented. In the development of these policies and procedures, the university recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty members, of the departments of which they are a part, and of their specific disciplines; and, because of that uniqueness, the main responsibility for implementation of formative and evaluative procedures has been placed in the departments¹.

Departmental guidelines should set forth processes and criteria for formative and evaluative activities which are consistent with the department's academic mission. For example, departmental guidelines might identify evaluative criteria which are appropriate to the discipline, or might delineate which activities will receive greater or lesser emphasis in promotion or tenure decisions. They should also include appropriate methods for evaluating the interdisciplinary scholarly activities of departmental faculty. The Deans and the Provost review departmental procedures in order to ensure that faculty are evaluated equitably throughout the university.

Evaluation instruments provide a means for gathering information that can provide a basis for evaluation, but these instruments do not constitute an evaluation in themselves. "Evaluation" is the process whereby the information acquired by appropriate instruments is analyzed to determine the quality of performance as measured against the criteria set by the department.

Policies and procedures shall be consistent with sections 580-21-100 through 135 of the Oregon

Administrative Rules of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. However, Oregon Senate Bill SB 270 (2013) establishes a Board of Trustees (BOT) of Portland State University. The BOT assumes governing control of PSU from the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) on July 1, 2014. The administrative rules and policies of the SBHE, including those regarding promotion and tenure, may be replaced by PSU-specific policies after this transition occurs. It is anticipated that these Guidelines would then be revised to correct obsolete references to SBHE and Oregon University System rules and policies.

Approval and implementation of these policies and procedures shall be consistent with the agreement between Portland State University (PSU) and the American Association of University Professors, Portland State Chapter, and with the internal governance procedures of the

¹ "Departments" includes departments, schools, and other similar administrative units.

University. University-wide promotion and tenure guidelines shall not be suspended or modified without prior approval by the Faculty Senate.

Each year the Provost will establish a timeline to ensure that decision makers at each level of review will have sufficient time to consider tenure and promotion recommendations responsibly.

At present, PSU faculty can be appointed as tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty. Appointments at less than 5 FTE are not covered by these Guidelines.

II. SCHOLARSHIP

A. Overview of Faculty Responsibilities

The task of a university includes the promotion of learning and the discovery and extension of knowledge, enterprises which place responsibility upon faculty members with respect to their disciplines, their students, the university, and the community. The University seeks to foster the scholarly development of its faculty and to encourage the scholarly interaction of faculty with students and with regional, national, and international communities. Faculty have a responsibility to their disciplines, their students, the university, and the community to strive for superior intellectual, aesthetic, or creative achievement. Such achievement, as evidenced in scholarly accomplishments, is an indispensable qualification for appointment and promotion and tenure in the faculty ranks. Scholarly accomplishments, suggesting continuing growth and high potential, can be demonstrated through activities of:

- Research, including research and other creative activities,
- Teaching, including delivery of instruction, mentoring, and curricular activities, and
- Community outreach.

All faculty members should keep abreast of developments in their fields² and remain professionally active throughout their careers.

At PSU, individual faculty are part of a larger mosaic of faculty talent. The richness of faculty talent should be celebrated, not restricted. Research, teaching, and community outreach are accomplished in an environment that draws on the combined intellectual vitality of the department and of the University. Department faculty may take on responsibilities of research, teaching, and community outreach in differing proportions and emphases. Irrespective of the emphasis assigned to differing activities, it is important that the quality of faculty contributions be rigorously evaluated and that the individual contributions of the faculty, when considered in aggregate, advance the goals of the department and of the University.

² Faculty fields may be disciplinary or inter-disciplinary in nature.

Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach, when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities, must meet an acceptable standard as determined by the faculty in each unit and approved by the University. In addition, each faculty member is expected to contribute to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the University, school/college, and department, as appropriate. All tenure-track faculty have a further responsibility to conduct scholarly work in research, teaching, or community outreach in order to contribute to the body of knowledge in their field(s).

B. Scholarly Agenda

1. Individual Faculty Responsibility.

The process of developing and articulating one's own scholarly agenda is an essential first step for newly-appointed faculty and is a continuing responsibility as faculty seek advancement. Each faculty member, regardless of rank, has the primary responsibility for planning his or her own career and for articulating his or her own evolving scholarly agenda.

- a. The purpose of a scholarly agenda is not to limit a faculty member's freedom nor to constrain his or her scholarship, but, primarily, to provide a means for individuals to articulate their programs of scholarly effort. The scholarly agenda needs to be specific enough to provide a general outline of a faculty member's goals, priorities, and activities, but it is not a detailed recitation of tasks or a set of detailed, prescribed outcomes. A scholarly agenda:
 - articulates the set of serious intellectual, aesthetic or creative questions, issues or problems which engage and enrich an individual scholar,
 - describes an individual's accomplished and proposed contributions to knowledge, providing an overview of scholarship, including long-term goals and purposes,
 - clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, or governance, and
 - articulates the manner in which the scholar's activities relate to the departmental mission and programmatic goals.

As a faculty member grows and develops, his or her scholarly agenda may evolve over the years. New scholarly agendas may reflect changes in the set of questions, issues, or problems which engage the scholar, or in the individual's relative emphases on teaching, research, community outreach, and governance.

- b. The process of developing or redefining a scholarly agenda also encourages the individual scholar to interact with and draw upon the shared expertise of his or her departmental peers. This process promotes both individual and departmental development, and contributes to the intellectual, aesthetic, and creative climate of the department and of the University.

2. Departmental, School and College Responsibilities.

The development of a scholarly agenda supports a collective process of departmental planning and decision-making which determines the deployment of faculty talent in support of departmental and university missions. Departments, schools, and colleges have the primary responsibility for establishing their respective missions and programmatic goals within the context of the University's mission and disciplines as a whole. Recognizing that departments often accomplish such wide-ranging missions by encouraging faculty to take on diverse scholarly agendas, departments and individual faculty members are expected to engage in joint career development activities throughout each faculty member's career. Such activities must:

- recognize the individual's career development needs,
- respect the diversity of individual faculty interests and talents, and
- advance the departmental mission and programmatic goals.

Departments shall develop processes for establishing, discussing, agreeing upon, and revising a scholarly agenda that are consistent with the focus upon individual career development and collective responsibilities and shall establish regular methods for resolving conflicts which may arise in the process of agreeing upon scholarly agendas. Finally, departmental processes shall include periodic occasions for collective discussion of the overall picture resulting from the combination of the scholarly agendas of individual faculty members.

3. The Uses of a Scholarly Agenda.

The primary use of a scholarly agenda is developmental, not evaluative. An individual's contributions to knowledge should be evaluated in the context of the quality and significance of the scholarship displayed. An individual may include a previously agreed upon scholarly agenda in his or her promotion and tenure documentation, but it is not required. A scholarly agenda is separate from such essentially evaluation-driven practices as letters of offer, annual review of tenure-track faculty, and institutional career support-peer review of tenured faculty, and from the consideration of individuals for merit awards.

C. Scholarship

The term *scholar* implies superior intellectual, aesthetic, or creative attainment. A scholar engages at the highest levels of life-long learning and inquiry. The character of a scholar is demonstrated by academic achievement and rigorous academic practice. Over time, an active learner usually moves fluidly among different expressions of scholarship. However, it also is quite common and appropriate for scholars to prefer one expression over another. The following four expressions of scholarship (which are

presented below in no particular order of importance) apply equally to Research, Teaching, and Community outreach (see E.2-4).³

1. Discovery. Discovery is the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory or models of how phenomena may operate. It is active experimentation, or exploration, with the primary goal of adding to the cumulative knowledge in a substantive way and of enhancing future prediction of the phenomena. Discovery also may involve original creation in writing, as well as creation, performance, or production in the performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related technologies.
2. Integration. Integration places isolated knowledge or observations in perspective. Integrating activities make connections across disciplines, theories, or models. Integration illuminates information, artistic creations in the literary and performing arts, or original work in a revealing way. It brings divergent knowledge together or creates and/or extends new theory.
3. Interpretation. Interpretation is the process of revealing, explaining, and making knowledge and creative processes clear to others or of interpreting the creative works of others. In essence, interpretation involves communicating knowledge and instilling skills and understanding that others may build upon and apply.
4. Application. Application involves asking how state-of-the-art knowledge can be responsibly applied to significant problems. Application primarily concerns assessing the efficacy of knowledge or creative activities within a particular context, refining its implications, assessing its generalizability, and using it to implement changes.

D. Quality and Significance of Scholarship

Quality and significance of scholarship are the primary criteria for determining faculty promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty. Quality and significance of scholarship are overarching, integrative concepts that apply equally to the expressions of scholarship as they may appear in various disciplines and to faculty accomplishments resulting from research, teaching, and community outreach (see E.2-4).

A consistently high quality of scholarship, and its promise for future exemplary scholarship, is more important than the quantity of the work done. The criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly accomplishments include the following:

³ The contributions of Ernest Boyer are acknowledged in providing the inspiration for sections II.C and II.D.

1. Clarity and Relevance of Goals. A scholar should clearly define objectives of scholarly work and clearly states basic questions of inquiry. Clarity of purpose provides a critical context for evaluating scholarly work.
 - Research or community outreach projects should address substantive intellectual, aesthetic, or creative problems or issues within one's chosen discipline or interdisciplinary field. Clear objectives are necessary for fair evaluation.
 - Teaching activities are usually related to learning objectives that are appropriate within the context of curricular goals and the state of knowledge in the subject matter.

2. Mastery of Existing Knowledge. A scholar must be well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in his or her field. The ability to educate others, conduct meaningful research, and provide high quality assistance through community outreach depends upon mastering existing knowledge.
 - As researchers and problem solvers, scholars propose methodologies, measures, and interventions that reflect relevant theory, conceptualizations, and cumulative wisdom.
 - As teachers, scholars demonstrate a command of resources and exhibit a depth, breadth, and understanding of subject matter allowing them to respond adequately to student learning needs and to evaluate teaching and curricular innovation.

3. Appropriate Use of Methodology and Resources. A scholar should address goals with carefully constructed logic and methodology.
 - Rigorous research and applied problem solving requires well-constructed methodology that allows one to determine the efficacy of the tested hypotheses or chosen intervention.
 - As teachers, scholars apply appropriate pedagogy and instructional techniques to maximize student learning and use appropriate methodology to evaluate the effectiveness of curricular activities.

4. Effectiveness of Communication. Scholars should possess effective oral and written communication skills that enable them to convert knowledge into language that a public audience beyond the classroom, research laboratory, or field site can understand.
 - As researchers and problem solvers, scholars make formal oral presentations and write effective manuscripts or reports or create original artistic works that meet the professional standards of the intended audience.
 - As teachers, scholars communicate in ways that build positive student rapport and clarify new knowledge so as to facilitate learning. They also should be able to disseminate the results of their curricular innovations to their teaching peers.

Scholars should communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review. Usually the results of scholarship are communicated widely through publications (e.g., journal articles and books), performances, exhibits, and/or presentations at conferences and workshops.

5. Significance of Results. Scholars should evaluate whether or not they achieve their goals and whether or not this achievement had an important impact on and is used by others. Customarily, peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., students, community participants, and subject matter experts) evaluate the significance of results.
 - As researchers, teachers, and problem-solvers, scholars widely disseminate their work in order to invite scrutiny and to measure varying degrees of critical acclaim. They must consider more than direct user satisfaction when evaluating the quality and significance of an intellectual contribution.
 - Faculty engaged in community outreach can make a difference in their communities and beyond by defining or resolving relevant social problems or issues, by facilitating organizational development, by improving existing practices or programs, and by enriching the cultural life of the community. Scholars should widely disseminate the knowledge gained in a community-based project in order to share its significance with those who do not benefit directly from the project.
 - As teachers, scholars can make a difference in their students' lives by raising student motivation to learn, by developing students' life-long learning skills, and by contributing to students' knowledge, skills, and abilities. Teaching scholars also can make a significant scholarly contribution by communicating pedagogical innovations and curricular developments to peers who adopt the approaches.
6. Consistently Ethical Behavior. Scholars should conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and responsibilities. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's objectivity. They should foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, peers, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty standards for academic integrity represent a code of ethical behavior. For example, ethical behavior includes following the human subject review process in conducting research projects and properly crediting sources of information in writing reports, articles, and books.

E. Evaluation of Scholarship

Scholarly accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and community outreach (see E.2.4) all enter into the evaluation of faculty performance. Scholarly profiles will vary depending on individual faculty members' areas of emphasis. The weight to be given factors relevant to the determination of promotion, tenure, and merit necessarily varies with the individual faculty member's assigned role and from one academic field to another. However, one should recognize that research, teaching, and community

outreach often overlap. For example, a service-learning project may reflect both teaching and community outreach. Some research projects may involve both research and community outreach. Pedagogical research may involve both research and teaching. When a faculty member evaluates his or her individual intellectual, aesthetic, or creative accomplishments, it is more important to focus on the general criteria of the quality and significance of the work (II.D) than to categorize the work. Peers also should focus on the quality and significance of work rather than on categories of work when evaluating an individual's achievements.

The following discussion is intended to assist faculty in formative planning of a scholarly agenda and to provide examples of the characteristics to consider when evaluating scholarly accomplishments.

1. Documentation

The accomplishments of a candidate for promotion or tenure must be documented in order to be evaluated. Documentation and evaluation of scholarship should focus on the quality and significance of scholarship rather than on a recitation of tasks and projects.

Each department should judge the quality and significance of scholarly contributions to knowledge as well as the quantity.

In addition to contributions to knowledge, the effectiveness of teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness.

Documentation for promotion and tenure normally includes:

- Self-appraisal of scholarly agenda and accomplishments. A self-appraisal should include:
 - A discussion of the scholarly agenda that describes the long-term goals and purposes of a scholarly line of work, explains how the agenda fits into a larger endeavor and field of work, and demonstrates how scholarly accomplishments to date have advanced the agenda.
 - A description of how the agenda relates to the departmental academic mission, within the context of the University mission and the discipline as a whole.
 - An evaluation of the quality and significance of scholarly work (see II.D).
 - An evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching, research, or community outreach when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities.
- A curriculum vitae including a comprehensive list of significant accomplishments.
- A representative sample of an individual's most scholarly work rather than an exhaustive portfolio. However, a department may establish guidelines requiring review of all scholarly activities that are central to a faculty member's scholarly agenda over a recent period of time.

- Evaluations of accomplishments by peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., students, community participants, and subject matter experts). Peers include authoritative representatives from the candidate's scholarly field(s).

2. Research and Other Creative Activities (Research)

A significant factor in determining a faculty member's merit for promotion is the individual's accomplishments in research and published contributions to knowledge in the appropriate field(s) and other professional or creative activities that are consistent with the faculty member's responsibilities. Contributions to knowledge in the area of research and other creative activities should be evaluated using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see II.D). It is strongly recommended that the following items be considered in evaluating research and other creative activities:

- a. Research may be evaluated on the quality and significance of publication of scholarly books, monographs, articles, presentations, and reviews in journals, and grant proposal submissions and awards. An evaluation should consider whether the individual's contributions reflect continuous engagement in research and whether these contributions demonstrate future promise. Additionally, the evaluation should consider whether publications are refereed (an important form of peer review) as an important factor. In some fields, evidence of citation or use of the faculty member's research or creative contributions by other scholars is appropriate.
- b. The development and publication of software should be judged in the context of its involvement of state-of-the-art knowledge and its impact on peers and others.
- c. In certain fields such as writing, literature, performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related fields, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in scientific and technical research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music and drama, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate's creativity. Creative works often are evaluated by the quality and significance of publication, exhibiting, and/or performance of original works, or by the direction or performance of significant works. Instruments that include external peer review should be used or developed to evaluate artistic creation and performance. Including critical reviews, where available, can augment the departmental evaluations. The evaluation should include a chronological list of creative works, exhibitions, or performances.
- d. Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, or inter-institutional research programs are highly valued. Mechanisms for evaluating

such contributions may be employed. Evaluating collaborative research might involve addressing both individual contributions (e.g., quality of work, completion of assigned responsibilities) and contributions to the successful participation of others (e.g., skills in teamwork, group problem solving).

- e. Honors and awards represent recognition of stature in the field when they recognize active engagement in research or creative activities at regional, national, or international levels.
- f. Effective participation in disciplinary or interdisciplinary organizations' activities should be evaluated in the context of their involvement of state-of-the-art knowledge and impact on peers and others. For example, this participation might include serving as editor of journals or other learned publications, serving on an editorial board, chairing a program committee for a regional, national, or international meeting, or providing scholarly leadership as an officer of a major professional organization.

3. Teaching, Mentoring, and Curricular Activities (Teaching)

A significant factor in determining a faculty member's merit for promotion is the individual's accomplishments in teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities, consistent with the faculty member's responsibilities. Teaching activities are scholarly functions that directly serve learners within or outside the university. Scholars who teach must be intellectually engaged and must demonstrate mastery of the knowledge in their field(s). The ability to lecture and lead discussions, to create a variety of learning opportunities, to draw out students and arouse curiosity in beginners, to stimulate advanced students to engage in creative work, to organize logically, to evaluate critically the materials related to one's field of specialization, to assess student performance, and to excite students to extend learning beyond a particular course and understand its contribution to a body of knowledge are all recognized as essential to excellence in teaching.

Teaching scholars often study pedagogical methods that improve student learning. Evaluation of performance in this area thus should consider creative and effective use of innovative teaching methods, curricular innovations, and software development. Scholars who teach also should disseminate promising curricular innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review. PSU encourages publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally-focused presentations at disciplinary and interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovations or practice.

Evaluation of teaching and curricular contributions should not be limited to classroom activities. It also should focus on a faculty member's contributions to larger curricular goals (for example, the role of a course in laying foundations for other courses and its contribution to majors, or contributions to broad aspects of general education or interdisciplinary components of the curriculum). In addition, PSU recognizes that

student mentoring, academic advising, thesis advising, and dissertation advising are important departmental functions. Faculty may take on differential mentoring responsibilities as part of their personal scholarly agenda.

To ensure valid evaluations, departments should appoint a departmental committee to devise formal methods for evaluating teaching and curriculum-related performance. All members of the department should be involved in selecting these formal methods. The department chair⁴ has the responsibility for seeing that these methods for evaluation are implemented.

Contributions to knowledge in the area of teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities should be evaluated using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see II.D). It is strongly recommended that the following items be considered in the evaluation of teaching and curricular accomplishments:

- contributions to courses or curriculum development
- outlines, syllabi, and other materials developed for use in courses
- the results of creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning,
- the results of assessments of student learning
- formal student evaluations
- peer review of teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities
- accessibility to students
- ability to relate to a wide variety of students for purposes of advising
- mentoring and guiding students toward the achievement of curricular goals
- the results of supervision of student research or other creative activities including theses and field advising
- the results of supervision of service learning experiences in the community
- contributions to, and participation in, the achievement of departmental goals, such as achieving reasonable retention of students
- contributions to the development and delivery of collaborative, interdisciplinary, university studies, extended studies, and inter-institutional educational programs
- teaching and mentoring students and others in how to obtain access to information resources so as to further student, faculty, and community research and learning
- grant proposals and grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques
- professional development as related to instruction, e.g., attendance at professional meetings related to a faculty member's areas of instructional expertise
- honors and awards for teaching.

⁴ "Department Chair" includes chairs of departments and directors, Deans, or other heads of other similar administrative units designated in the unit's promotion and tenure guidelines.

4. Community Outreach

A significant factor in determining a faculty member's advancement is the individual's accomplishments in community outreach when such activities are part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Scholars can draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of community outreach. Such activities can include defining or resolving relevant local, national, or international problems or issues. Community outreach also includes planning literary or artistic festivals or celebrations. PSU highly values quality community outreach as part of faculty roles and responsibilities.⁵

The setting of Portland State University affords faculty many opportunities to make their expertise useful to the community outside the University. Community-based activities are those which are tied directly to one's special field of knowledge.

Such

activities may involve a cohesive series of activities contributing to the definition or resolution of problems or issues in society. These activities also include aesthetic and celebratory projects. Scholars who engage in community outreach also should disseminate promising innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review.

Departments and individual faculty members can use the following guidelines when developing appropriate community outreach. Important community outreach can:

- contribute to the definition or resolution of a relevant social problem or issue
- use state-of-the-art knowledge to facilitate change in organizations or institutions
- use disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise to help groups organizations in conceptualizing and solving problems
- set up intervention programs to prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes for individuals or groups or to optimize positive outcomes
- contribute to the evaluation of existing practices or programs
- make substantive contributions to public policy
- create schedules and choose or hire participants in community events such as festivals
- offer professional services such as consulting (consistent with the policy on outside employment), serving as an expert witness, providing clinical services, and participating on boards and commissions outside the university.

⁵ Not all external activities are community outreach in the sense intended here. For example, faculty members who serve as jurors, as youth leaders and coaches, or on the PTA do so in their role as community citizens. In contrast, community outreach activities that support promotion and tenure advancement fulfill the mission of the department and of the University and utilize faculty members' academic or professional expertise.

Faculty and departments should evaluate a faculty member's community outreach accomplishments creatively and thoughtfully. Contributions to knowledge developed through community outreach should be judged using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see II.D). It is strongly recommended that the evaluation consider the following indicators of quality and significance:

- publication in journals or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach
- honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition received for community outreach
- adoption of the faculty member's models for problem resolution, intervention programs, instruments, or processes by others who seek solutions to similar problems
- substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice
- models that enrich the artistic and cultural life of the community
- evaluative statements from clients and peers regarding the quality and significance of documents or performances produced by the faculty member.

F. Governance and Other Professionally-Related Service

In addition to contributions to knowledge as a result of scholarly activities, each faculty member is expected to contribute to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the University. Governance and professionally-related service create an environment that supports scholarly excellence and the achievement of the University mission. Governance and professionally-related service activities include:

- 1) **Committee Service.** Service on University, school or college, and department or program committees is an important part of running the University. Department chairs may request a committee chair to evaluate the value a faculty member's contributions to that committee. Such service also may include involvement in peer review of scholarly accomplishments.
- 2) **University Community.** Faculty are expected to participate in activities devoted to enriching the artistic, cultural, and social life of the university, such as attending commencement or serving as adviser to student groups.
- 3) **Community or professional service.** Faculty may engage in professionally-related service to a discipline or inter-disciplinary field, or to the external community, that does not engage an individual's scholarship. For example, a faculty member may serve the discipline by organizing facilities for a professional meeting or by serving as treasurer of an organization.

III. RANKS

The following definitions of academic rank are based on the premise that a vital University depends on the active participation of all of its members. Inherent in this charge are the basic activities of research, teaching, community outreach, and governance and professionally related service. All personnel decisions will reflect the need to create and maintain a diverse faculty. The academic ranks in the faculty and the minimum criteria for each rank are:

Emeritus:

The Emeritus rank may be awarded upon retirement in recognition of outstanding performance.

Professor:

A tenure track position. A faculty member will normally not be considered for promotion to Professor until the fourth year in rank as an Associate Professor. Exceptions will be made only in extraordinary cases. Consideration for the promotion immediately upon eligibility should occur only on the basis of extraordinary achievement. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires the individual to have made significant contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship, whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach. The candidate's scholarly portfolio should document a record of distinguished accomplishments using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see II. D). Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Finally, promotion to the rank of professor requires the faculty member to have provided leadership or significant contributions to the governance and professionally-related services activities of the university.

Associate Professor:

A tenure track position. A faculty member will not be eligible for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor until the third year in rank as an Assistant Professor. In the usual course of events, promotion to Associate Professor and granting of indefinite tenure should be considered concurrently, in the sixth year in rank as an Assistant Professor. Exceptions which result in the consideration for the promotion immediately upon eligibility should occur only on the basis of extraordinary achievement. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the individual to have made contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship, whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach. High quality and significance (see II.D) are the essential criteria for evaluation. Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable

standard when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Finally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the faculty member to have performed his or her fair share of governance and professionally-related service activities of the University.

Assistant Professor:

A tenure track position. Appointees to the rank of Assistant Professor ordinarily hold the highest earned degree in their fields of specialization. Rare exception to this requirement may be made when there is evidence of outstanding achievements and professional recognition in the candidate's field of expertise. In most fields, the doctorate will be expected.

For non-tenure track faculty members whose initial date of hire was prior to September 16, 2014, see **Appendix IV: Addendum For Implementation of Amended Guidelines**

Senior Instructor II:

Normally, a faculty member will not be eligible for promotion to Senior Instructor II until the completion of the third year in rank as a Senior Instructor I at PSU. Recommendations for early promotion in cases of extraordinary achievement can be made at the department's discretion. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Senior Instructor II is based on such criteria as: demonstrated expertise in the development and delivery of new instructional materials; ongoing engagement with the pedagogy of the discipline; ability to play a lead role in assessment and curriculum design; demonstrated excellence in advising and mentoring; ongoing engagement with the profession; evidence of the application of professional skills and knowledge outside the department as demonstrated by activities such as professionally-related university and community engagement and scholarly or creative activity that contributes to knowledge in one's field and, where appropriate, the community; evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations; and effective participation in departmental, college/school and university governance as appropriate to assignment and contract.

Senior Instructor I:

Normally, a faculty member will not be eligible for consideration for promotion to Senior Instructor I until the completion of the third year in rank as an Instructor at PSU. Recommendations for early promotion in cases of extraordinary achievement or special circumstances can be made at the department's discretion. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Senior Instructor I is based on criteria such as: quality of instruction, as determined by classroom observation, assessment of student-learning outcomes, and review of student evaluations and course materials; expertise in the discipline, as demonstrated by activities such as ongoing revision of course materials, curricular

innovations, participation in continuing education, conferences, and other professional activities; evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations; and participation in departmental, college/school, and university governance as appropriate to assignment and contract.

Instructor:

A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals whose responsibilities are primarily devoted to academic instruction. Such appointments include teaching, advising, and mentoring expectations congruent with creative and engaged instruction. Normally, this appointment requires an advanced degree in the field of specialization

Professorial Research Appointments:

A non-tenure track appointment for a faculty member who is primarily engaged in research at a level normally appropriate for a professorial rank.

Ranks for these appointments are Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.

Conversion of a Senior Research Associate II to Research Assistant Professor is based on the nature of the position, its intended duration and responsibilities, and the incumbent's record of scholarly accomplishment and responsibilities. The conversion must be approved by the Dean and Provost.

For non-tenure track faculty members whose initial date of hire was prior to September 16, 2014, see **Appendix IV:** Addendum for implementation of amended guidelines.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor requires review outlined in Section V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty.

Senior Research Associate II:

Typically, candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Research Associate II will meet the following requirements: six or more years of progressively responsible research or evaluation experience and demonstrated ability to conduct research independently. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Senior Research Associate II will be based on such criteria as: years of research experience and demonstrated ability to conduct research independently. Responsibilities may include designing, developing, and conducting research or evaluation projects; taking a lead or major role in writing grant proposals; leading in developing and sustaining community or interdisciplinary research partnerships; authoring and co-authoring publications for scholarly or community audiences; taking a lead role in developing new qualitative or quantitative methodologies and data collection protocols.

Senior Research Associate I:

Typically, candidates for the promotion to the rank of Senior Research Associate I will meet the following requirements: four or more years of progressively responsible research or evaluation experience; demonstrated ability to participate in developing funding for research and/or disseminating results; demonstrated ability to take the lead role in designing and implementing research or evaluation studies. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Senior Research Associate I will be based on such criteria as: years of research experience and demonstrated ability to take the lead in research and evaluation. Responsibilities may include assisting in writing grant proposals and scholarly or community publications; taking a lead role in designing, developing, and executing one or more studies; designing and overseeing the delivery of intervention protocols to fidelity; developing qualitative and quantitative data collection protocols and methodologies; establishing and fostering community or interdisciplinary research partnerships; co-authoring reports, presentations and scholarly papers.

Research Associate:

A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals who typically have a doctoral degree or another appropriate combination of educational achievement and professional expertise. Typically, candidates for the rank of Research Associate will meet the following requirements: four or more years of progressively responsible research experience and demonstrated ability to participate in the design, implementation and oversight of quantitative or qualitative research or evaluation studies. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Senior Research Assistant II:

Typically, candidates for promotion to Senior Research Assistant II will meet the following requirements: two years of experience at the Senior Research Assistant I rank or its equivalent; demonstrated ability to perform a variety of research or evaluation tasks; demonstrated ability to independently manage or coordinate research and evaluation activities. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Senior Research Assistant I:

Typically, candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Research Assistant I will meet the following requirements: two years of experience at the Research Assistant rank or its equivalent and demonstrated ability to perform focused research or evaluation tasks. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Senior Research Assistant I will be based on criteria such as: years of research experience and demonstrated ability to perform focused research or evaluation tasks. Responsibilities may include assisting in the coordination of research activities; communicating with community and interdisciplinary collaborators; basic

qualitative or statistical analysis; maintaining databases; collecting, processing and reporting of data; assisting in the preparation of reports and presentations.

Research Assistant:

A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals who typically have a bachelor's or master's degree. Exceptions may include individuals with specific expertise required for the research project. Typically, individuals in the rank of Research Assistant will gather research or evaluation data using a pre-determined protocol, carry out routine procedures, gather materials for reports, perform routine data processing or lab work, data management, and basic quantitative or qualitative data analysis. Individuals with the ranks of Senior Research Assistant I and II perform a wider variety of research and evaluation tasks and are expected to perform tasks with increasing independence.

Appointments as Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor:

A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals who are licensed or certified professionals or practitioners recognized within professional fields. Unique discipline-specific criteria for professional certification may be defined by departments for classification of professors of practice and clinical professors. The major responsibilities involve the education and support of students/learners in academic, clinical, and/or practice settings, supervising clinical experiences, and/or professionally related community engagement. The title Clinical Professor may be used by some departments instead of or in addition to Professor of Practice as appropriate for the discipline. Ranks for these appointments are Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor, Associate Professor of Practice/ Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant Professor of Practice/ Assistant Clinical Professor.

Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor:

Typically, candidates meet the following requirements unless there is remarkable achievement: at least 10 years of part- or full-time professional experience in the clinical/professional discipline post-certification; at least six years of clinical/professional teaching in an academic setting, with a minimum of four years at Portland State University; and a high degree of academic maturity and responsibility. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor is based on criteria such as: documented evidence of a consistent pattern of high quality professional productivity and impact in the professional field that is illustrative of professional productivity at regular intervals over a period of years and evidence of national and/or international recognition in the professional field. Such evidence may be indicated by, for example: appointments as a reviewer of peer-reviewed journals; invited papers and presentations given beyond the state and region; honors, grants, awards; and committee service and leadership with national or international professional associations.

Associate Professor of Practice or Associate Clinical Professor:

Typically, candidates will meet the following requirements, unless there is remarkable achievement: A minimum of six years post-certification professional experience to include at least three years of clinical/professional practice teaching in an academic setting, with a minimum of two years at PSU. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice or Associate Clinical Professor is based on evidence of effectiveness in clinical/professional instruction to include materials indicating command of the academic and/or clinical subject matter, ability to motivate, mentor/advise, and assess students, and creative and effective use of teaching methods and evidence of effective engagement of a professional nature.

Assistant Professor of Practice or Assistant Clinical Professor:

A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals whose primary work is in the areas of instruction in clinical or professional practice or in professionally-related community engagement. Faculty hired in this category must hold an advanced degree in their field of specialization from an accredited program in their discipline and/or have comparable experience.

Fellow:

This rank may be used in a variety of cases when individuals are associated with the institution for limited periods of time for their further training or experience.

IV. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

A. Regulations

Academic appointments in the State System of Higher Education are governed by four sets of regulations that define the conditions under which faculty ("unclassified academic employees") may be appointed. Highlights are summarized below.

1. Board Rules

The Board of Higher Education Administrative Rules (OAR 580-020-0005): Graduate ranks are GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT, GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANT, and FELLOW.

Faculty titles and ranks are (in alphabetical order): AFFILIATED FACULTY, CLINICAL PROFESSOR (assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, clinical professor) or PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE (assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice), INSTRUCTOR (instructor, senior instructor I, senior instructor II), LECTURER (lecturer, senior lecturer I, senior lecturer II), LIBRARIAN (assistant librarian, associate librarian, senior librarian), RESEARCH ASSISTANT (research assistant, senior research assistant I, senior research assistant II), RESEARCH ASSOCIATE (research

associate, senior research associate I, senior research associate II), RESEARCH FACULTY (research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor), TENURE TRACK OR TENURED FACULTY (assistant professor, associate professor, professor, distinguished professor). Faculty titles will not be given to graduate students. The Board Rules further note that each institution can select from among these ranks and titles those appropriate to the hiring and retention of their faculty members as it relates to their institutional mission. PSU has elected not to use the Lecturer and Librarian ranks and not to limit the Instructor rank to undergraduate instruction only.

2. Oregon State Board of Higher Education Financial Administration Standard Operating Manual (FASOM)

The Board's Financial Administration Standard Operating Manual ("FASOM"), Section 10.012-82, allows for faculty to be appointed with "No Rank." In addition, the Chancellor's office has implemented a new class code, 2971 "Unranked," to assist in processing faculty appointments. These facilitate the appointment of faculty in academic support, student support, and administrative support positions with professional titles, with or without faculty rank. A series of professional titles reflecting responsibilities will provide opportunities for greater clarity as well as appropriate recognition and promotion for many professionals in these units.

3. Oregon Revised Statutes

The Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 240-207) designate specific State System of Higher Education positions as unclassified (i.e., faculty) "the President and one private secretary, Vice President, Comptroller, Chief Budget Officer, Business Manager, Director of Admissions, Registrar, Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer, Research

Assistant, Research Associate, Director of Athletics, Coach, Trainer." The Revised Statutes include "all...members in the State System of Higher Education...whether the type of service is teaching, research, extension or counseling" as being unclassified. The Revised Statutes thereby provide a primary guide for determining if a State System of Higher Education position should be designated faculty (unclassified) or classified.

4. Personnel Division Rules

Under authority granted to the Personnel Division by ORS 240-207, the following positions have also been designated as unclassified: Librarian; Director of Alumni; Director of University Development; General Managers; Directors; Producers; and Announcers of the State Radio and Television Service; Interpreters for Hearing-Impaired Students; Director of Information Services; and Director of Publications.

B. Use of Faculty Ranks

1. As mandated by OAR 580-20-005(4), Deans, Vice Presidents where appropriate, and the President shall have the academic rank of Professor.
2. For tenure-track faculty hired after September 16, 2014, the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor will be limited to
 - a. teaching-related positions with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
 - b. librarians with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
 - c. research-related appointments with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
 - d. as mandated by state statute for those in administrative positions.
3. Faculty in non-tenure track positions hired after September 16, 2014 that do not have an associated expectation for scholarly accomplishment will be appointed with one of the five following designations:
 - a. at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor I or II;
 - b. at the rank of Research Assistant or Senior Research Assistant I or II;
 - c. at the rank of Research Associate or Senior Research Associate I or II;
 - d. at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor;
 - e. at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice or Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Professor of Practice or Associate Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor.

C. Definition, Use, and Conditions of Faculty Appointments

Faculty appointments are defined as (a) non-tenure track or (b) tenure track. Non-tenure track appointments are (a) fixed-term appointments, (b) probationary appointments, or (c) continuous appointments. Tenure track appointments are (a) annual tenure appointments or (b) indefinite tenure appointments:

1. Non-tenure track Appointments

- a. Fixed-term appointments

Circumstances occasionally warrant the hiring of non-tenure track instructional faculty on a fixed-term appointment for a specific and limited period of time. For example, a fixed-term appointment is appropriate for visiting faculty, to fill a temporary vacancy (such as a vacancy caused by another employee being on leave

or pending a search for a vacant position), when a program is newly established or expanded, when the specific funding for the position is time-limited, or for a specific assignment or to fill a discrete need that is not expected to be ongoing. The letter of offer for a fixed-term instructional faculty appointment shall state the reason that warrants the fixed-term appointment.⁶

Fixed term appointments are made for a specified period of time and are not eligible for tenure. Although fixed term appointments do not require timely notice under the provisions of OAR 580-21-305, notices of intent to reappoint or not to reappoint should be sent by April 1 of the first year of a non-tenure track fixed term appointment and by January 1 of subsequent years. Such notices of intent may be based on the availability of funds. Departments are required to provide an annual evaluation of the performance of fixed term faculty after the first year consistent with the practices specified in their promotion and tenure guidelines. It should be understood that non-tenure track fixed term appointments are for specified times and no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

In the event that the University intends to extend a fixed-term appointment beyond three years of continuous service, the University will provide notice to the Association at least 60 days in advance of the extension.⁷ This notice shall provide a rationale for the position remaining a fixed-term appointment.

In the event that a fixed-term instructional faculty member is to be appointed to a position eligible for a continuous appointment, the University will notify the Association and the parties agree to discuss, as necessary, the appropriate probationary period and whether any time served as a fixed-term faculty member is to be credited to the probationary period.⁸

b. Probationary appointments

Non-tenure track instructional faculty members with a probationary appointment will be employed on annual contracts during the first six (6) years of employment as non-tenure track instructional faculty members. Annual contracts during the probationary period will automatically renew unless timely notice is provided. Notice of non-renewal of an annual contract during the probationary period must be provided by April 1 of the first year of the probationary period and by January 1 of the second through fifth years of the probationary period, effective at the end of that academic year.⁹ Such notices may be based on the availability of funds. It should be understood that no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

⁶ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 3

⁷ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 3

⁸ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 3

⁹ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 2b

c. Continuous appointments

A continuous appointment is provided to a non-tenure track faculty member who has completed the necessary probationary period in a continuous appointment-eligible position. A continuous appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only under the following circumstances¹⁰:

1. Pursuant to Article 22 (Retrenchment).
2. When a sanction of termination is warranted and imposed pursuant to Article 27 (Imposition of Progressive Sanctions).
3. Due to a change in curricular needs or programmatic requirements made in accordance with applicable shared governance procedures. In such a case:
 - i. As soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days prior to issuing a notice of termination, the Department Chair must provide written justification for the decision and explanation of the applicable shared governance procedure to the faculty members, the Dean, the Provost and the Association.
 - ii. If the employment of multiple faculty members in equivalent positions, and with equivalent position-related qualifications, skills and expertise, are to be terminated due to the same change in curricular needs or programmatic requirements, then lay-off shall be in order of seniority. Faculty will be laid off in inverse order to length of continuous service at the University.
 - iii. The faculty member is to be given at least six months notice of termination of employment, with such termination effective at the end of the academic year.
 - iv. The School/College will make a good faith effort to find a comparable position within the University for the faculty member.
 - v. If the reason for the decision that led to the layoff is reversed within three years from the date that notice of termination was provided to the faculty member, the affected faculty members will be recalled in inverse order of layoff. To exercise recall rights, a faculty member must:
 1. Notify Human Resources in writing, within 30 days of the termination notice, of intent to be placed on the recall list. If/when there is a need for a recall list, the University and the Association will meet promptly for the purpose of negotiating a process for administering the recall list.
 2. Inform Human Resources of any change in telephone, email or address.
 3. In the event of a recall, Human Resources will contact the faculty member by phone and email, and notify the Association, of the recall.

¹⁰ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 2e

4. The recalled faculty member will have ten (10) working days to accept or reject the position. Failure to contact Human Resources within ten (10) working days will be considered a rejection of the position.
 5. A recalled faculty member who rejects a position will be removed from the recall list.
4. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and fails to remediate the deficiencies during the subsequent academic year.
- d. Non-tenure track appointments considered for tenure track appointment

A non-tenure track appointment does not foreclose the possibility that a department may wish to consider that faculty member for a tenure-related appointment. In such cases, the years spent under a non-tenure track appointment may be considered as a part of the probationary period for tenure at the time the individual is placed on the annual-tenure track. A mutually acceptable written agreement shall be arrived at between the faculty member and institutional representative as to the extent to which any prior experience of the faculty member shall be credited as part of the probationary period, up to a maximum of three years.

2. Tenure Track Appointments

a. Conditions Governing Tenure Track

Annual appointments are given to faculty employed .50 FTE or more who will be eligible for tenure after serving the appropriate probationary period. Only in exceptional circumstances will appointments under 1.0 FTE be tenure track.

Termination other than for cause or financial exigency requires timely notice (see OAR 580-21-100 and 580-21-305). Termination other than for cause or financial exigency shall be given in writing as follows: during the first year of an annual appointment, at least three months' notice prior to the date of expiration; during the second year of service, at least six months; thereafter, at least twelve months.

Probationary Service and Consideration for Tenure. Tenure should be granted to faculty members whose scholarly accomplishments are of such quality and significance and demonstrate such potential for long-term performance that the University, so far as its fiscal and human resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. The granting of tenure should be even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and is exercised only after careful consideration of a faculty member's scholarly qualifications and capacity for effective continued performance over a career.

The granting of tenure reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-range value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. In addition, tenure insures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University.

Tenure normally is considered in the sixth year of a tenure-track appointment, with a tenure decision to be determined prior to the beginning of the seventh year. Recommendations to award tenure earlier can be made at the department's discretion. If a faculty member is not awarded tenure at the end of six years, termination notice will be given. The six consecutive probationary years of the faculty member's service to be evaluated for the granting of tenure may include prior experience gained in another institution of higher education whether within or outside of the state system. Ordinarily, this is instructional, research, or clinical experience at an accredited institution of higher education. Whether such experience will be included, and to what extent must be decided at the time of initial appointment in a mutually acceptable written agreement between the faculty member and Portland State University. The maximum time to be allowed for prior service is three years.

The accrual of time during the probationary period preceding the granting of indefinite tenure is calculated in terms of FTE years. An FTE year is the total annualized, tenure-related FTE in a given fiscal year. Therefore, the minimum probationary period may require more than six calendar years if the faculty member's FTE was below 1.00 during the first six years. This could occur for various reasons, including initial appointment date after the beginning of the fiscal or academic year (i.e., in the Winter Term), leave without pay for one or more terms, or a partial FTE reduction during the probationary period. Care should be taken to be sure to consider a person who has accumulated, for example, 5.67 FTE years. Delay for another year would not allow for timely notice. Should circumstances warrant full tenure review prior to the sixth year, this review should include the external peer review as well (cf. IV,A,1,c).

Indefinite tenure appointments are appointments of .50 FTE or more given to selected faculty members by the institutional executive under authority contained in IMD 1.020 and OAR 580-21-105 in witness of the institution's formal decision that the faculty member possesses such demonstrated professional competence that the institution will not henceforth terminate employment except for (a) cause, (b) financial exigency, or (c) program reductions or eliminations.

Because tenure is institutional, not system-wide, faculty who have achieved tenure status in one state system institution cannot hereby claim tenure in other institutions of the state system (OAR 580-21-105).

Annual and Third Year Reviews. Faculty on annual tenure must be reviewed after the completion of the first year of their appointment and each subsequent year. In order to assure that candidates for tenure have a timely assessment of their progress so as to permit correction of deficiencies, there must be a review at the end of the third year. For faculty who have brought in prior service at another institution, the review will not be conducted until the end of at least one complete academic year at Portland State University. As a result of this review, candidates should be given an assessment of their progress toward tenure and of any deficiencies that need to be addressed. The review shall be in accordance with regular department and university procedures and should specifically evaluate the progress of the faculty member in meeting the standards for the award of tenure; however, reviews prior to the sixth year are normally only for evaluative purposes and do not have to include outside evaluation. Upon the completion of the third year review, the faculty member reviewed will be given an assessment of progress toward tenure as perceived from all appropriate administrative levels.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES/PROMOTION AND TENURE

TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS (AND NTTF RESEARCH ASSISTANT, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, & RESEARCH FULL PROFESSOR)

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for recommendations for promotion and tenure, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The criteria to be used for promotion and tenure must be consistent with university and college or school policy and must be formulated early to allow maximum time for making decisions.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of existing or newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the Provost for resolution.

After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic Dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

In cases where a faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is to initiate personnel actions, and the faculty member is to be so informed. In cases where a faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research,

evaluation must be solicited and provided by all appropriate academic departments. When a faculty member's research has clear impact on members of the external community, including civic groups, practitioners or others, evidence of the value of this work should be solicited from those most affected.

1. Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

- a. The department chair notifies the committee chair of those faculty who are eligible for review. Faculty members on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence shall be given equal consideration for promotion in rank with faculty members who are on campus.
- b. Faculty Curricula Vitae. All faculty members being reviewed should provide to the departmental committee an updated curriculum vitae. Curricula vitae should follow the format provided in Appendix I. A curriculum vitae should be updated at each stage of the review process.
- c. External Peer Review. To substantiate the quality and significance of a faculty member's scholarship, a representative sample of an individual's most scholarly work should be evaluated by peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., authoritative representatives from a faculty member's field, students, community participants, and subject matter experts). External peer reviews must accompany recommendation for tenure and for promotion to associate and full professorships. For faculty to be reviewed for one of these personnel decisions, a list of potential external reviewers, which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and significance of scholarship shall be compiled in the following manner.
 - i. The department chair will ask the faculty member for a list of reviewers (at least four) from outside the University. The faculty member may also provide a list of possible reviewers perceived as negative or biased; although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, the faculty member's exception will be included as a matter of record, if an evaluation is requested.
 - ii. At least three additional external reviewers will be selected by the department chair or the chair of the departmental committee. The chair will send the list to the Dean for review and the Dean may add names to the list.
 - iii. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee will select evaluators from the combined list of outside reviewers. A sample letter of solicitation is provided in Appendix II. *(Please note, as suggested in the sample letter, the evaluator should be advised that the letter is not confidential and will*

be available for the faculty member's review.) Requests for external evaluations shall include a copy of the University and departmental criteria for promotion and tenure. The faculty member being reviewed, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, shall choose which samples of the faculty member's work shall be sent to external reviewers. Upon receipt of the evaluations, the chair of the department will send them to the departmental committee. A complete evaluation file must include at least three letters from external reviewers. In cases when promotion or tenure decisions are deferred, external evaluations may be used in subsequent considerations for a period of three years.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Establishment and Authority

All recommendations for promotion and tenure originate with formally established departmental committees; for example, an elected advisory committee, or an elected committee on promotion and tenure. The department as a whole shall determine the composition of the committee and the method of selection of its members and chairperson. Student participation in the consideration of promotion and tenure is mandatory. When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the departmental promotion or tenure committee will include a faculty representative from a mutually agreed upon second department or program. Since the department chair is required to make a separate evaluation of the department faculty, the chair cannot be a member of the committee. The committee may invite other faculty members to participate in its deliberations. This committee acts as an independent reviewer of the performance of department faculty and initiates recommendations for all department faculty except the department chair. Committee members being considered for promotion or tenure shall not participate in the committee review of their cases.

Upon notification of the status of eligible faculty from the department chair, the committee will review and evaluate the curriculum vitae of faculty members eligible for tenure or promotion, and where required, external peer evaluation. Faculty members being evaluated may submit pertinent materials to the committee, but such data may not be included as a part of the committee's recommendations unless fully evaluated within the committee report.

3. Committee Decision and Narrative Report

The Committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each affected faculty member. The report must address the following areas: contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship (whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach), effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach when it is

part of a faculty member's responsibilities, and governance and professionally-related service.

The departmental committee must make one of four decisions for each member of the department being considered and the votes of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form (Appendix III).

- a. **Ineligible:** This decision is appropriate for faculty who do not have minimum time in rank or who are on fixed term appointments. The committee may also provide a written evaluation of faculty on fixed term appointment.
- b. **Deferral:** This decision is appropriate for faculty who have met the minimum time in rank to qualify for promotion but who request not to be considered, and for faculty whose requests for promotion are not accepted. A request for deferral by a faculty member should not be accepted by the committee without consideration. The committee should indicate, in writing, that such a discussion was held. Deferrals for faculty who have requested evaluation for promotion must be accompanied by a written report.

The committee must review each faculty member on annual tenure and prepare a written report for the department chair evaluating the progress of the faculty member in meeting the standards for the award of indefinite tenure. A deferral vote related to a tenure decision is normally appropriate for faculty members being reviewed in the first five years of an annual appointment. However, for a faculty member in the sixth year of an annual appointment, the committee must make a positive or a negative recommendation.

- c. **Positive Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant promotion and/or tenure. For faculty members recommended for tenure, the committee's evaluation report should survey all years being counted toward tenure, including years of prior service that have been extended to the faculty member in his or her original letter of offer. For faculty members recommended for promotion, the committee's evaluation should survey the faculty member's years at Portland State. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III must accompany the recommendation form.
- d. **Negative Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty on annual tenure when in the committee's judgment, termination should be recommended. If in its review of a faculty member on an annual appointment, even within the first five years of such an appointment, the committee does not find that a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the committee may indicate a negative decision. Negative recommendation must be accompanied by a written report following the format in Appendix III.

4. Responsibilities of Department Chair

The department chair must be satisfied that the departmental committee has followed the departmental guidelines and that the appraisals are complete and in proper form. Department chairs are to make a separate recommendation for each member of the department and take the following actions:

- a. confirm that all eligible faculty have been considered
- b. provide an evaluation to faculty on fixed term appointments;
- c. review justification for deferral at the faculty member's request and decision for deferral made by the committee. For faculty on annual appointments who have been deferred for tenure, the department chair should review the committee's report, add any additional evaluation, and discuss the report with the faculty member; and,
- d. review positive and negative recommendations and the curriculum vitae and supporting materials of the faculty member in question. The chairs will make a separate recommendation, adding their own written narrative to the committee's. (The narrative must address the following areas: contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship (whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach), effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities, and governance and professionally-related service. *It should also address the general expectations of your discipline's promotion and tenure guidelines and for the candidate in relation to these expectations. Discuss the specific contributions of the candidate to the Departmental curriculum, i.e. upper and lower division courses taught, difficulty of courses, major requirements, enrollments.* If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for specific difference.

The department chair informs each faculty member in a timely manner in writing of the departmental committee's and of his/her own recommendations (ineligible, deferred, recommended for promotion and/or tenure, or termination). The faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost and should indicate they have done so by signing the "Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form". A copy of the complete appraisal and any additional material added by the department chair, should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The department chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department chair. If a department member questions either departmental recommendation, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation.

5. Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision

Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of department action, the faculty member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation. If the request is for reconsideration of the departmental committee recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the committee chair. Otherwise, only the department chair need be notified in writing.

The review may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever supportive material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair, or department chair, as appropriate, within two weeks of written notification of intention to request the reconsideration.

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The departmental committee and/or department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The committee chair and/or department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation or statements with their recommendation(s). The department chair shall forward the appraisal, which shall then proceed through the normal administrative review procedure in a timely manner.

6. Chair's Report to the Dean

The department chair must submit the following to the Dean:

- a. *statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed;*
- b. recommendation form for each faculty member; and,
- c. the committee's and the chair's written narratives for all faculty members who have received positive or negative recommendation for promotion and tenure.

Upon receipt of the Dean's recommendation, the chair must inform the faculty member of that recommendation in a timely manner.

B. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator

The Dean shall use an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and departmental committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the Dean.

All actions taken by the Dean must be reported in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair and chairperson of the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. If the department chair or the chairperson of the promotion and tenure committee requests a conference with the Dean, within five days of being notified by the Dean, a conference shall be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded. If the Dean's recommendation should differ from the recommendation of either the departmental committee or department chair, the Dean must notify the affected faculty member in writing of action taken at the college/school level and state the reason for specific difference. The Dean shall provide the affected faculty member with a copy of any material added to the file. The affected faculty member may attach a statement in response to the action of the Dean. This statement shall be forwarded to the Provost at the same time as the recommendations go forward. *Individual files of faculty reviewed for promotion and/or tenure shall be assembled by the Dean's office, following the format specified in the Promotion and Tenure Checklist and submitted to the Provost.*

The Dean initiates recommendations for promotion of department chairs. The Dean's recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost only after consultation with departmental committees.

C. Responsibilities of the Provost

The Provost makes all recommendations for promotion and tenure to the president for final approval according to the following process:

The Provost shall review the appraisals forwarded from the various colleges, schools, and other units. In doing so, the Provost shall determine whether recommendations are in conformity with the Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines, reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required procedures. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the Provost shall consult with the Dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.

After reaching a decision, the Provost shall notify the affected faculty member, in writing, of his or her recommendation. A faculty member who wishes to request a reconsideration of the Provost's decision must schedule a conference with the Provost within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. Only after a requested conference is held shall the Provost make a final recommendation to the president.

Copies of the Provost's recommendation shall be sent to the Dean and department chair.

Upon receiving the Provost's recommendation and a summary of the outcome of any reconsideration requested by a faculty member, the president shall make a final decision. Appeals of the president's decision should follow the grievance procedure

found in the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42- 005).

NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS- PROMOTION

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines in writing, including the criteria to be used for recommendations for promotion, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The procedures and criteria to be used for promotion must be consistent with university and college or school policy, approved by the Dean and Provost, and must be formulated early enough to allow maximum time for making decisions.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the Provost for resolution.

After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be in writing and be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic Dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

Guidelines should be clear and unambiguous and include a calendar for a cycle of reviews. Department chairs must distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty with their appointment letter.

Reviews must take account of job-relevant evaluation criteria in keeping with those specified in the letters of appointment. Faculty may submit all relevant materials to the evaluators. Departments shall require the use of quantitative summaries of student evaluations to assure the confidentiality of student responses. To aid review committees in their evaluation, departments shall require a narrative or self-evaluation from each member under review. Faculty must have reasonable notice of their evaluations.

The results of a review must be provided in writing and in sufficient time that one who is reviewed is able to meet with at least one of the reviewers and to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments that shall be attached to the review. Departments with more than one non-tenure track faculty member shall require that at least one non- tenure track faculty member shall be on the non-tenure track faculty

review committee. Faculty may request a review if one has not been provided in the time period provided in the guidelines.

In cases where a non-tenure track faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is to initiate personnel actions and the faculty member is to be so informed. In cases where a faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, evaluation must be solicited and provided by all appropriate academic departments. When a faculty member's research has clear impact on members of the external community, including civic groups, practitioners or others, evidence of the value of this work should be solicited from those most affected.

1. Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

- a. Notification. The department chair notifies the chair of the appropriate departmental committee of those non-tenure track faculty who are eligible for review. Faculty members on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence shall be given equal consideration for promotion in rank with faculty members who are on campus.
- b. Faculty Curricula Vitae. All non-tenure track faculty members being reviewed should provide to the departmental committee an updated curriculum vitae. Curricula vitae should follow the format provided in Appendix I. A curriculum vitae should be updated at each stage of the review process.
- c. Peer Review. Although non-tenure track faculty positions do not carry expectations for scholarly research, departments may require that candidates for promotion be evaluated by peers and other credible sources (e.g., authoritative experts) who are in a position to comment on the candidate's activities that are required of their position when such evaluations are deemed by the faculty member and the appropriate departmental committee as relevant to the faculty member's contribution as assigned by the University. For non-tenure representatives from a faculty member's field, students, community participants, and subject matter faculty to be reviewed for promotion, a list of potential evaluators outside the department which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and significance of the candidate's professional activities, shall be compiled in the following manner:
 - i. When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant, the department chair will ask the faculty member for a list of at least four evaluators from outside the department. The faculty member may also provide a second list of possible evaluators perceived as negative or biased. Although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, if an evaluation

is requested of someone on the second list the faculty member's exception will be included as a matter of record,

- ii. When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant, additional evaluators from outside the department may be selected by the department chair or the chair of the departmental committee. The chair will send the list to the Dean for review and the Dean may add names to the list.
- iii. When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant, the chair of the promotion and tenure committee will select evaluators from the combined list of evaluators from outside the department. A sample letter of solicitation for letters of support for non-tenure track faculty is provided in Appendix II. Please note, as suggested in the sample letter, the evaluator should be advised that the letter is not confidential and will be available for the faculty member's review. Requests for external evaluations shall include a link to University and departmental criteria for promotion. The faculty member being reviewed, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, shall choose which, if any, samples of the faculty member's work shall be sent to external evaluators. Upon receipt of the evaluations, the chair of the department will send them to the departmental committee. A complete evaluation file (when deemed relevant) must include at least three letters from evaluators outside the department. In cases when promotion decisions are deferred, external evaluations may be used in subsequent considerations for a period of three years.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Establishment and Authority

All recommendations for promotion of NTTF Instructional Faculty members originate with formally established departmental committees; for example, an elected advisory committee, or an elected committee on promotion and tenure. The department as a whole shall determine the composition of the committee and the method of selection of its members and chairperson. When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the departmental promotion and tenure committee will include a faculty representative from a mutually agreed upon second department or program. Since the department chair is required to make a separate evaluation of the department faculty, the chair cannot be a member of the committee. The committee may invite other faculty members to participate in its deliberations. This committee acts as an independent reviewer of the performance of department faculty and initiates recommendations for all department faculty except the department chair. Committee members being considered for promotion shall not participate in the committee review of their cases.

Upon notification of the status of eligible faculty from the department chair, the committee will review and evaluate the curriculum vitae of faculty members eligible for promotion, and where required, external peer evaluation. Faculty

members being evaluated may submit pertinent materials to the committee, but such data may not be included as a part of the committee's recommendations unless fully evaluated within the committee report.

3. Committee Decision and Narrative Report

The Committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each affected faculty member. The report must address the following areas: effectiveness in teaching, effectiveness in research, and/or effectiveness in community outreach whenever each is part of a faculty member's responsibilities; and governance and professionally- related service. The departmental committee must make one of three decisions for each member of the department and the votes of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form (Appendix III).

- a. Ineligible: This decision is appropriate for faculty who do not have minimum time in rank.
- b. Deferral: This decision is appropriate for faculty who have met the minimum time in rank to qualify for promotion but whose requests for promotion are not accepted. Deferrals for faculty who have requested evaluation for promotion must be accompanied by a written report.
- c. Positive Decision: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant promotion. For faculty members recommended for promotion, the committee's evaluation should survey the faculty member's years at Portland State. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III must accompany the recommendation form.

4. Responsibilities of Department Chair

The department chair must be satisfied that the departmental committee has followed the departmental guidelines and that the appraisals are complete and in proper form. Department chairs are to make a separate recommendation for each member of the department and take the following actions:

- a. *confirm that all eligible faculty have been considered*
- b. review justification for deferral at the faculty member's request and decision for deferral made by the committee
- c. review positive and negative recommendations and the curriculum vitae and supporting materials of the faculty member in question. The chairs will make a separate recommendation, adding their own written narrative to the

committee's. The chair's narrative must address the following areas: effectiveness in teaching, effectiveness in research, and/or effectiveness in community outreach insofar as each is part of a faculty member's responsibilities; and governance and professionally-related service. It should also address the general expectations of the department's promotion and tenure guidelines and the candidate's activities with regard to these expectations, including the contributions of the candidate to the departmental curriculum, i.e. upper and lower division courses taught, difficulty of courses, major requirements, and enrollments. If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for the specific differences.

The department chair informs each faculty member in a timely manner in writing of the departmental committee's and of his/her own recommendations (ineligible, deferred, recommended for promotion). The faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost and should indicate they have done so by signing the "Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form". A copy of the complete appraisal and any additional material added by the department chair, should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The department chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department chair. If a department member questions either departmental recommendation, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation.

5. Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision

Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of department action, the faculty member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation. If the request is for reconsideration of the departmental committee recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the committee chair. Otherwise, only the department chair need be notified in writing.

The review may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever supportive material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair, or department chair, as appropriate, within two weeks of written notification of intention to request the reconsideration.

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The departmental committee and/or department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The committee chair and/or department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation or

statements with their recommendation(s). The department chair shall forward the appraisal, which shall then proceed through the normal administrative review procedure in a timely manner.

6. Chair's Report to the Dean

The department chair must submit the following to the Dean:

- a. *statement of assurance that all eligible non-tenure track faculty have been reviewed;*
- b. recommendation form for each faculty member; and,
- c. the committee's and the chair's written narratives for all faculty members who have received positive or negative recommendation for promotion.

Upon receipt of the Dean's recommendation, the chair must inform the faculty member of that recommendation in a timely manner.

B. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator

The Dean shall use an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and departmental committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the Dean.

All actions taken by the Dean must be reported in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair and chairperson of the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. If the department chair or the chairperson of the promotion and tenure committee requests a conference with the Dean within five days of being notified by the Dean, a conference shall be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. If the Dean's recommendation should differ with the recommendation of either the departmental committee or department chair, the Dean must notify the affected faculty member in writing of the action taken at the college/school level and state the reason for specific difference. The affected faculty member may seek a meeting with the Dean prior to the finalization of any report that differs with the recommendation of the departmental committee. The Dean shall provide the affected faculty member with a copy of any material added to the file. The affected faculty member may attach a statement in response to the action of the Dean. This statement shall be forwarded to the Provost at the same time as the recommendations go forward. Individual files of faculty reviewed for promotion shall be assembled by the Dean's office, following the format specified in the "Promotion and Tenure Checklist" and submitted to the Provost.

The Dean initiates recommendations for promotion of department chairs. The Dean's recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost only after consultation with college/school committee.

C. Responsibilities of the Provost

The Provost makes all recommendations for promotion to the President for final approval according to the following process:

The Provost shall review the appraisals forwarded from the various colleges, schools, and other units. In doing so, the Provost shall determine whether recommendations are in conformity with the Oregon Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines, reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required procedures. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the Provost shall consult with the Dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.

After reaching a decision, the Provost shall notify the affected faculty member, in writing, of his or her recommendation. A faculty member who wishes to request a reconsideration of the Provost's decision must schedule a conference with the Provost within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. Only after a requested conference is held shall the Provost make a final recommendation to the President.

Copies of the Provost's recommendation shall be sent to the Dean and Department Chair.

Upon receiving the Provost's recommendation and a summary of the outcome of any reconsideration requested by a faculty member, the president shall make a final decision. Appeals of the President's decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42-005).

NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS – CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENT – RELATED EVALUATIONS

This section describes the process through which eligible non-tenure track (NTT) instructional faculty may be considered for continuous appointment, and are evaluated and may be considered for continuous employment. This document covers NTTF hired after September 16, 2016. For NTT instructional faculty hired prior to this date, see also the Implementation Plan.¹¹

¹¹ 2016-2019 CBA, LOA #5

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for evaluation of faculty for continuous appointment, prior to continuous appointment and after continuous appointment, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The procedures and criteria to be used for evaluation of faculty for continuous appointment, to include the evaluations before and after continuous appointment, must be consistent with university and college or school policy, approved by the Dean and Provost, and must be formulated early enough to allow maximum time for making decisions.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the Provost for resolution.

After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic Dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

The guidelines must be in writing and be distributed to all members of the department faculty. Guidelines should be clear and unambiguous and include a calendar for a cycle of reviews. Department chairs must distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty with their appointment letter.

B. Initial Appointment

Initial appointments of NTT instructional faculty are not the responsibility of a sole administrator. Where possible, a committee of at least three faculty including at least one NTT instructional faculty shall seek qualified applicants and forward a recommendation to the chair.¹²

C. Type of Appointment

Initial appointment of NTT instructional faculty may be either probationary or fixed term. In making an appointment of a non-tenure track instructional faculty member, the appointing unit must specify whether the appointment is probationary or fixed term.

¹² 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18

D. Faculty Offer and Position Descriptions¹³

The University will provide template letters of offer for non-tenure track instructional appointments. For non-tenure track instructional appointments, 1.00 FTE will include no more than 36 course credits of assigned teaching per academic year. Assigned university/community/professional service and scholarly work shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of an instructional non-tenure track faculty member's workload without a reduction in instructional load.

The template letter of offer will include a position description. Taken together, a letter of offer and position description for non-tenure track instructional appointments will include the following information: whether the appointment is eligible for continuous appointment or fixed-term, appointment start date, appointment end date (for fixed-term appointments only), the reason warranting the fixed-term appointment (for fixed-term appointments only), FTE, annual salary rate, actual salary, teaching assignment (including, where possible, the list of courses to be taught and the location of those courses if not on the downtown University campus) whether the appointment is renewable, and any expectations for research and scholarly work, university service, professional service, or other responsibilities. Bargaining unit members shall have an opportunity to review the letter of offer and position description and will affirm their acceptance of the offer of employment by signing and returning to the University a copy of both the letter of offer and the position description.

The University will direct departments to complete letters of offer and position descriptions at least 30 days prior to the start of work for the initial term of employment of any nontenure track instructional faculty member so that employment documents are forwarded to the Office of Human Resources according to the published payroll deadline schedule.

E. Annual Review

NTT instructional faculty members are to be evaluated annually through a developmental review process during years one through five of the probationary period.¹⁴ The review should document and evaluate faculty contributions, and provide developmental feedback and guidance in preparation for the Milestone Review for Continuous Appointment. This review should be consistent with the faculty member's letter of appointment.

Prior to the implementation of this annual review process, each department/academic unit shall establish and maintain guidelines for review of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate. Nothing in this provision affects or alters the Association's ability to file a grievance,

¹³ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 4

¹⁴ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 2c

as provided in Article 28, that alleges a violation of such guidelines.¹⁵ In the event that an NTT instructional faculty member has had annual contracts with more than one unit during the probationary period, the department chairs or equivalents and the employee will mutually decide which unit will be responsible for the evaluation. In the event that a mutual decision cannot be made, the Dean or designee of the relevant college, or Provost or designee in the case of multiple colleges, will make a determination.

The departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:¹⁶

- be in writing and be made available to members;
- require each department to identify the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
- establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
- provide that the results of the review be in writing and provided to the member;
- provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
- provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, which shall be attached to the review;
- provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
- provide that the member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
- provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
- in a department with more than one NTT instructional faculty member, provide that at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee; and
- in the event a department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college, or another school or college if necessary.

The departmental guidelines must provide that Annual Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member should, at a minimum, include the following:

- an annual self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and that highlights activities and achievement;
- current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range), or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

¹⁵ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 6a

¹⁶ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 6b.

The departmental guidelines must provide that Annual Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:

- peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- a reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- evidence of scholarly activities, beyond the classroom, as defined by the discipline;
- evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- evidence of service activities related to unit mission.

F. Timing for Continuous Employment Consideration and Appointment¹⁷

In year six (6) of the probationary period, NTT instructional faculty members are to be evaluated for continuous appointment through a Milestone Review. Prior to the end of the final academic year of the probationary period, a NTT instructional faculty member is to be awarded a continuous appointment or provided twelve (12) months' notice of termination of employment.

G. Milestone Review for Continuous Employment

Milestone reviews provide a way to honor and reward a sustained record of commitment and achievement. A milestone review that looks both backward and forward is appropriate when considering the award of a continuous appointment. When the review is clear and consistent, it supports academic freedom and contributes to academic quality.¹⁸

Each department/academic unit shall establish and maintain guidelines for Milestone Review for Continuous Appointment of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate. Nothing in this provision affects or alters the Association's ability to file a grievance, as provided in Article 28, which alleges a violation of such guidelines.¹⁹

The departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:²⁰

- be in writing and be made available to members;
- require each department to identify the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
- establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
- provide that the results of the review be in writing and provided to the member;

¹⁷ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Section 2d

¹⁸ Letter of Agreement, Nov. 5, 2015

¹⁹ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Section 6a

²⁰ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Section 6b.

- provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
- provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, which shall be attached to the review;
- provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
- provide that the member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
- provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
- in a department with more than one NTT instructional faculty member, provide that at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee; and
- in the event a department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college.

A significant factor in determining an NTT instructional faculty member's performance is the individual's accomplishments in teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities, consistent with the faculty member's contractual responsibilities. Teaching activities are scholarly functions that directly serve learners within or outside the university. Scholars who teach must be intellectually engaged and must demonstrate mastery of the knowledge in their field(s). The ability to lecture and lead discussions, to create a variety of learning opportunities, to draw out students and arouse curiosity in beginners, to stimulate advanced students to engage in creative work, to organize logically, to evaluate critically the materials related to one's field of specialization, to assess student performance, and to excite students to extend learning beyond a particular course and understand its contribution to a body of knowledge are all recognized as essential to excellence in teaching. Teaching scholars often study pedagogical methods that improve student learning.²¹

The Milestone Review of teaching and curricular contributions should not be limited to classroom activities. It also should focus on a faculty member's contributions to larger curricular goals (for example, the role of a course in laying foundations for other courses and its contribution to majors, or contributions to broad aspects of general education or interdisciplinary components of the curriculum).²² In addition, the Milestone Review should take into account any documentation of student mentoring, academic advising, thesis advising, and dissertation advising. The Review Committee shall take into account any variations in the letters of appointment during the probationary period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that the Milestone Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member should, at minimum, include the following:

²¹ Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases, 2014, Sec. II, E3

²² Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases, 2014, Sec. II, E3

- a cumulative self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and highlights activities and achievement;
- current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range) or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the six-year review period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that the Milestone Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:

- peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- a reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- evidence of service activities related to unit mission;
- the annual self-appraisals prepared by the faculty member.

Departmental guidelines must provide that the following additional items may be included in the evaluation of teaching and curricular accomplishments, to the extent consistent with a faculty member's letter of appointment:

- contributions to courses or curriculum development;
- materials developed for use in courses;
- results of creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning;
- results of assessments of student learning;
- accessibility to students;
- ability to relate to a wide variety of students for purposes of advising;
- mentoring and guiding students toward the achievement of curricular goals;
- results of supervision of student research or other creative activities including theses and field advising;
- results of supervision of service learning experiences in the community;
- contributions to, and participation in, the achievement of departmental goals, such as achieving reasonable retention of students;
- contributions to the development and delivery of collaborative, interdisciplinary, University Studies, and inter-institutional educational programs;

- teaching and mentoring students and others in how to obtain access to information resources so as to further student, faculty, and community research and learning;
- grant proposals and grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques;
- professional development as related to instruction, e.g., attendance at professional meetings related to a faculty member's areas of instructional expertise;
- honors and awards for teaching.²³

H. Procedures for Milestone Review

1. Notification

The department chair notifies the chair of the appropriate departmental committee of those non-tenure track faculty who are eligible for review.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Establishment and Authority

All recommendations for continuous appointment originate with formally established departmental committees; for example, an elected advisory committee, or an elected committee on promotion and tenure. The department as a whole shall determine the composition of the committee and the method of selection of its members and chairperson. When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the committee will include a faculty representative from a mutually agreed upon second department or program. Since the department chair is required to make a separate evaluation of the department faculty, the chair cannot be a member of the committee. The committee may invite other faculty members to participate in its deliberations. This committee acts as an independent reviewer of the performance of department faculty and initiates recommendations for all department faculty except the department chair. Committee members being considered for continuous appointment shall not participate in the committee review of their cases.

3. Committee Decision and Narrative Report

The Committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each affected faculty member. The report must address and review all areas of the dossier submitted by the faculty member in application for continuous appointment. The departmental committee must make one of two recommendations for each member of the department and the votes of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form.

²³ Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases, 2014, Sec. II, E3

- a. Denial: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose requests for continuous appointment are not accepted. Denials of continuous appointment must be accompanied by a written report.
- b. Approval: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant continuous appointment. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III must accompany the recommendation form.

4. Responsibilities of Department Chair

The department chair must be satisfied that the departmental committee has followed the departmental guidelines and that the appraisals are complete and in proper form. Department chairs are to make a separate recommendation for each faculty member under review and take the following actions:

- a. confirm that all eligible faculty have been considered
- b. review positive and negative recommendations and the supporting materials of the faculty member in question. The chairs will make a separate recommendation, adding their own written narrative to the committee's. The Chair's narrative must address and review all areas of the dossier submitted by the faculty member. If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for the specific differences.

The department chair informs each faculty member in a timely manner in writing of the departmental committee's and of his/her own recommendations. The faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean and should indicate they have done so by signing the "Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form". A copy of the complete appraisal and any additional material added by the department chair, should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The department chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department chair. If a department member questions either departmental recommendation, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation.

5. Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision

Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of department action, the faculty member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation. If the request is for reconsideration of the departmental committee recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the committee chair. Otherwise, only the department chair need be notified in writing.

The review may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever supportive material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair, or department chair, as appropriate, within two weeks of written notification of intention to request the reconsideration.

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The departmental committee and/or department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The committee chair and/or department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation or statements with their recommendation(s). The department chair shall forward the appraisal, which shall then proceed through the normal administrative review procedure in a timely manner.

6. Chair's Report to the Dean

The department chair must submit the following to the Dean:

- a. statement of assurance that all eligible non-tenure track faculty have been reviewed;
- b. recommendation form for each faculty member; and,
- c. the committee's and the chair's written narratives for all faculty members who have received positive or negative recommendation for continuous appointment.
- d. if requests for reconsideration are made, all materials submitted with the request for reconsideration and the committee's and/or the department chairs response after reconsideration.

Upon receipt of the Dean's decision, the chair must inform the faculty member of that recommendation in a timely manner.

7. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator

The Dean shall use an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and departmental committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the Dean. The Dean is responsible for making the decision to approve or deny continuous appointment.

All actions taken by the Dean must be reported in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair and chairperson of the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. If the department chair or the chairperson of the promotion and tenure committee requests a conference with the Dean within five days of being notified by the Dean, a conference shall be held before the Dean makes a decision. If the Dean's decision differs from the recommendation of either the departmental committee or department chair, the Dean must notify the affected faculty member in writing of the decision and state the reason for the difference. The affected faculty member may seek a meeting

with the Dean prior to the finalization of any decision that differs with the recommendation of the departmental committee. The Dean shall provide the affected faculty member with a copy of any material added to the file. The affected faculty member may attach a statement in response to the action of the Dean.

8. Appeals to the Provost

A faculty member may appeal an adverse decision by the Dean to the Provost by submitting an appeal within ten (10) working days of notice of the Dean's decision. The faculty member's appeal must state the basis for the appeal. The faculty member may request a conference with the Provost as part of the appeal process. If a conference is requested, the Provost is to meet with the faculty member before deciding the appeal.

The Provost is to provide a final decision on the appeal in writing to the faculty member and Dean.

I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment

Non-tenure track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment are to be evaluated after three (3) years of continuous appointment and then after every three (3) years following the last evaluation or promotion²⁴

The departmental guidelines must provide that the materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation following continuous appointment should, at minimum, include the following:

- a cumulative self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and highlights activities and achievement;
- current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range), or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation following continuous appointment may include, but are not limited to:

²⁴ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 2f

- peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- a reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- evidence of service activities related to unit mission.

In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the faculty member and department chair or chair equivalent will meet to discuss the deficiencies identified in the review. Following the meeting, the chair will develop a remediation plan to address the deficiencies. If the faculty member disagrees with the remediation plan, the faculty member may appeal to the dean or the dean's designee, who shall review the plan and make the final decision regarding the contents of the plan. The remediation plan is to be developed before the end of the academic year in which the unsatisfactory evaluation occurred. If the chair and faculty member identify resources that would assist with the remediation plan, a request for access to such resources will be made to and considered by the Dean. Resource unavailability could result in modification or extension of the remediation plan.²⁵

Progress on the remediation plan is to be assessed and communicated on a regular basis during the subsequent academic year. At a minimum, the chair and the faculty member will meet near the beginning of the fall term to review the remediation plan and near the end of the fall term to review the faculty member's progress on the remediation plan. Prior to the end of fall term, the chair is to provide the faculty member with a written assessment of progress on the remediation plan, including identification of any issues that have not yet been successfully remediated.

At any point in the process, the chair can determine that the remediation plan has been successfully completed, at which time the chair shall notify the faculty member and conclude the remediation process.

Around the end of the winter term of the academic year following the unsatisfactory evaluation, the chair is to notify the faculty member whether the remediation plan has been successfully completed. If the plan has not been successfully completed, the chair may either extend the plan for an additional academic term or provide the faculty member with notice of termination. A remediation plan may be extended by the chair for up to three academic terms. A notice of termination provided under this section shall be provided to the member, Dean, Provost, and the Association and shall be effective no sooner than the end of the subsequent academic term.

²⁵ 2015-2019 CBA, Article 18, Sec. 2g (also including following three paragraphs)

NON-TENURE TRACK RESEARCH POSITIONS (RESEARCH ASSISTANT & RESEARCH ASSOCIATE)

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

Each academic unit (department, school or college) will be required to develop and submit criteria and procedures for promotion within research ranks that are specific to the research activities of that unit. These guidelines will fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. These criteria will be reviewed and approved by the Dean and Provost.

1. Procedures for research faculty evaluation.

- a. The request for promotion can be initiated by the supervisor/principal investigator or the individual herself/himself.
- b. The faculty should be in rank at PSU at least one year before requesting promotion to the next rank
- c. Changing rank signals a qualitative difference in what the individual will do on the job; specifically there will be an increase in both the level of responsibility and the initiative required. When responsibilities extend beyond the current job description, this may be reason to consider promotion. The reviewers should assess evidence that the individual is prepared to perform the activities at the next higher rank.
- d. All promotions should be accompanied by an increase in salary as set in the collective bargaining agreement.
- e. Requests for promotions may be forwarded to the Provost typically twice yearly, although exceptions can be made if funding cycles make it necessary. This is consistent with the fluidity of research funding and the fact that research project staffing needs do not follow a nine-month academic schedule. Academic units may choose to set their own timelines for request for promotion to be submitted to the Dean.
- f. Each academic unit will articulate a mechanism for allowing the individual to appeal, should the request for promotion be denied.

2. Responsibility of the reviewer (supervisor/principal investigator) and the review group

- a. Normally, the group that conducts the annual performance review according to Article 18 of the 2009-2011 PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement will receive and review the request for promotion, although the academic unit may wish to constitute a different group.

- b. Requests for promotion will go through the same process as annual reviews. The annual review/promotion committee makes a recommendation to the department chair/research center or institute director/school director. This individual then makes a recommendation to the Dean.

B. Responsibility of the Dean.

The Dean forwards all requests with his/her recommendations to the Provost for his/her review and final decision.

C. Responsibilities of the Provost

The Provost makes all recommendations for promotion to the president for final approval according to the following process:

The Provost shall review the appraisals forwarded from the various colleges, schools, and other units. In doing so, the Provost shall determine whether recommendations are in conformity with the Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines, reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required procedures. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the Provost shall consult with the Dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.

After reaching a decision, the Provost shall notify the affected faculty member, in writing, of his or her recommendation. A faculty member who wishes to request a reconsideration of the Provost's decision must schedule a conference with the Provost within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. Only after a requested conference is held shall the Provost make a final recommendation to the president.

Copies of the Provost's recommendation shall be sent to the Dean and department chair.

Upon receiving the Provost's recommendation and a summary of the outcome of any reconsideration requested by a faculty member, the president shall make a final decision. Appeals of the president's decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the

Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42-005).

VI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON MERIT INCREASES

All members of the bargaining unit shall be included in a department for purposes of evaluation. *Faculty members whose appointments are in research units may constitute themselves as a department for the purposes of this section subject to the approval of the appropriate Dean (s).* All members eligible to vote must decide whether to have a separate

departmental committee to consider salary increases, and, if so, to establish its composition and membership. If a committee is formed, it should work closely with the department chair. Departments should explicitly define the various kinds of meritorious activities. Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost/vice president is required. If a Dean disapproves existing or newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the Provost for resolution. These approved guidelines shall govern the merit pay decision-making process at all levels. Departmental committees shall review, evaluate, and recommend redress of inequities in the same manner as other merit increases. Departments within smaller schools should consider whether they wish to evaluate members and recommend increases as a School, rather than as individual departments.

All participants in the merit pay process shall make merit increase recommendations and awards within designated merit categories. Up to 10% of the available merit pool may be distributed to individuals at the Dean's discretion. The Dean shall inform department chairs and individuals about the distributions, and shall communicate the reasons for them to department chairs.

Department evaluation committees shall make recommendations to department chairs regarding merit pay increases. Department chairs shall meet and confer with evaluation committees to attempt to resolve significant differences. A significant difference, at this stage of the process, as well as at subsequent stages, would occur when (1) the rank order of individuals as recommended by the evaluation committee would change; or (2) an individual who had been among those recommended by the evaluation committee would be dropped; or (3) an individual who had not been recommended by the evaluation committee would be added; or (4) the amount awarded to one or more individuals by the evaluation committee would be changed by 10% or more. If they are unable to resolve significant differences, then the recommendations submitted to the Dean shall include both the evaluation committee's recommendation and the chair's recommendation, and the reasons for the different recommendations shall be stated in writing.

The recommendations made by the evaluation committee and by the chair shall be communicated to the faculty member concerned within one week of their submission to the Dean. Before submitting recommendations to the Provost, the Dean will notify chairs and evaluation committees concerning any significant differences the Dean has with recommendations submitted by them and shall state the reasons for specific differences in writing.

Evaluation committees and chairs will have one week to respond to the reasons the Dean has given. If significant differences remain, then the different recommendations shall be submitted to the Provost, together with documentation supporting the different recommendations. The recommendations the Dean makes to the Provost shall be communicated to department chairs for transmission to the faculty member concerned.

APPENDIX I: CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER

Date of This Vita

**(PLEASE PROVIDE INFORMATION IN
REVERSE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)**

Education

Ph.D. (<i>or highest degree</i>) _____	Year _____	Subject and institution _____
M.A. _____	Year _____	Subject and institution _____
B.A. _____	Year _____	Subject and institution _____

Employment

Title, institution/business name, dates of employment

Dissertation

Title of dissertation, date and name of director

Refereed Publications or Other Creative Achievements

Published or completed works (accepted or in press) only. Works still "in progress" should be included under the category "Scholarly Works in Progress")

1. Books (give author(s),* title, press, date of publication and page numbers) a) Authored
b) Edited
2. Chapters (give author(s),* title, press, date of publication and page numbers)
3. Articles (give author(s),* title, journal, date and page numbers)
4. Book reviews (include full publication data)
6. Completed exhibitions, performances, productions, films, etc. (describe nature of accomplishment, location, dates, etc.)
7. Completed compositions, scripts, scores, commissions, etc. (accepted or installed).
8. Other

* Give author(s) name(s) in same order as they appear in the publication.

Non-Refereed Publications or Other Creative Achievements

1. Books (give author(s),* title, press, date of publication and page numbers) a) Authored
b) Edited
2. Chapters (give author(s),* title, press, date of publication and page numbers)
3. Articles (give author(s),* title, journal, date and page numbers)
4. Book reviews (include full publication data)
5. Completed works (accepted or in press) (Be specific, i.e., author(s),* title, press or journal, chapters completed or title of article, number of pages and expected date of publication.)
6. Completed exhibitions, performances, productions, films, etc. (describe nature of accomplishment, location, dates, etc.)
7. Completed compositions, scripts, scores, commissions, etc. (accepted or installed).
8. Other
* Give author(s) name(s) in same order as they appear in the publication.

Presentations at Professional Meetings

(include meeting name and professional organization, place, date, title of paper, poster, etc., and publication info, if appropriate.)

Honors, Grants, and Fellowships

(List all fellowships and financial support for research and scholarship, both internal and external, indicating period of award and amount awarded and whether principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or other role.)

Other Research and Other Creative Achievements

(See II.E.2)

Other Teaching, Mentoring and Curricular Achievements

(See II.E.3)

Other Community Outreach Achievements

(See II.E.4)

Scholarly Works in Progress

(and expectations as to when each will be completed and in what form it will appear)

Significant Professional Development Activities

Governance and Other Professionally Related Service

Governance Activities for the University, College, Department

(committees, internal lectures of popular nature, etc.)

Professionally-related Service

(List membership, committee service, offices held, editorial boards, etc.)

Memberships in Professional Societies

APPENDIX II

Appendix II consists of the following items:

1. Sample 30-day Notification Letter
2. Report on External Letters
3. Sample Letter to External Evaluators for Tenure and Promotions to Associate Professor and Full Professor
4. Sample Letter to Evaluators outside the Department for Promotion of NTTF

1. SAMPLE 30-DAY NOTIFICATION LETTER

THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR SHALL SEND A LETTER TO EACH CANDIDATE ELIGIBLE FOR EVALUATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND/OR PROMOTION THIRTY DAYS IN ADVANCE OF THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN YOUR LETTER AND YOUR LIST OF REQUESTED MATERIALS:

I write to inform you that you are eligible for consideration for (promotion and/or tenure). The evaluation will commence in thirty (30) days.

For use in your evaluation, please forward to me, within the 30-day period specified above, the following materials:

1. Curriculum Vitae;
2. list of names and addresses of potential external evaluators*;
3. list persons whom you would consider negatively prejudicial;
4. any other supporting materials, copies of articles, books, course syllabi, student evaluations.

**External letters are required only for those faculty who are being considered for tenure or promotion to associate or full professor.*

2. REPORT ON EXTERNAL LETTERS*

Attach one sample letter of solicitation and all responses to this sheet. All letters received must be forwarded with promotion materials. A minimum of three letters is required.

A.

Referees Suggested By Candidate	Date Letter Sent	Date Response Received
(List Institutional Affiliation) Relationship**		

[at least 1 letter must be included from this category]

1.

2.

3.

4.

B.

Referees suggested by Dept., Relationship or Dean or other Evaluating Body	Date Letter Sent	Date Response Received
Field of Expertise*		

[at least 1 letter must be included from this category]

1.

2.

3.

4.

C. Referees who the candidate has listed as possibly negatively biased sources.

* Letters not solicited by the department/professional school or letters from within the University are not considered within this category.

** For each name give relationship to candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, former teacher or colleague, co-author, etc.) or referee's particular expertise.

3. SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND FULL PROFESSOR

(NOTE: Significant deviations from this form must be approved by the Dean and Provost/Vice President.)

Dear (name of evaluator):

The (name of Department) of the (name of College or School) of Portland State University is considering whether it should recommend (rank and name) for promotion to the rank of (Associate Professor, Professor) (with tenure) effective (date).

To assist the Department in such considerations, and for the information of the subsequent levels of review within the University should the department recommend the action, the University requires that written evaluations be obtained from multiple and credible sources in the candidate's scholarly or creative field outside the University.

I am writing to request a letter giving your assessment of the quality and significance (see Portland State University's Promotion and Tenure Criteria enclosed) of Professor _____'s scholarship. Your letter will become a part of the file and will be available for review by the affected faculty member.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of Professor _____'s vita. (I am enclosing reprints.) Since our deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your earliest response. If you are unable to respond by that date, please let me know as soon as possible.

While severe budgetary constraints prevent us from offering you an honorarium, I do hope that you will agree to participate in this important part of our review. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Name

Title

Enclosures

(attach c.v.)

(attach reprint list, if any)

(attach a copy of the departmental and University criteria)

Candidate's Name _____

4. SAMPLE LETTER TO EVALUATORS OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT FOR PROMOTION OF NTTF

(NOTE: Significant deviations from this form must be approved by the Dean and Provost)

Dear (name of evaluator):

The (name of Department) of the (name of College or School) of Portland State University is considering whether it should recommend (name) for promotion to the rank of (rank) effective (date).

To assist in the review of candidates for promotion, the University requires that written evaluations be obtained from multiple and credible sources outside the department.

I am writing to request a letter giving your assessment of the quality and significance of (name's) professional activities. Your letter will become a part of the file and will be available for review by the affected faculty member.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of (name's) vita (and when agreed, additional materials.) Since our deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your earliest response. If you are unable to respond by that date, please let me know as soon as possible.

I do hope that you will agree to participate in this important part of our review. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Name

Title

Enclosures

(attach c.v.)

(attach additional materials, if any)

(attach a copy of the departmental criteria)

Candidate's Name _____

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III consists of the following items:

1. Routing of recommendations
2. Appraisal signature sheet and recommendation form
3. Academic professional appraisal signature sheet and recommendation form

1. ROUTING OF RECOMMENDATION

A timetable will be established each year by the Office of Academic Affairs to ensure that each level of review will have sufficient time for responsible consideration of tenure and promotion recommendations. The responsibility for deferrals owing to late recommendations must be with the delaying body.

New or amended promotion and tenure guidelines incorporating specific departmental criteria and evaluation procedures shall be submitted for approval by the Office of Academic Affairs or appropriate Vice President. When approved, copies shall be distributed to departmental faculty, the Academic Dean, and the Provost or appropriate Vice President. If the departmental guidelines are found not to be in compliance with University guidelines, they will be returned to the department for review and alteration. If revised guidelines are not returned to OAA within 30 days of return to the department, the Provost or Vice President will modify the guidelines only for the purpose of bringing them in compliance with the University guidelines.

Using the annual Promotion and Tenure schedule printed by OAA:

A minimum of six weeks from notification to faculty of eligibility by the department chair, the Departmental Committee shall send its recommendations to the department chair.

Two weeks from this date the department chair shall notify each faculty member of his/her recommendation and that of the Departmental Committee.

The department chair shall send the Departmental Committee's and his/her recommendations (except those being reconsidered) to his Academic Dean. This allows two weeks during which faculty members may request a reconsideration of the recommendation.

Three weeks after receiving the departmental recommendation, the Academic Dean shall send his/her recommendations to the Provost or Vice President.

3. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year 20_____

Name	Age	Gender	Occupation	Education	Marital Status	Income	Health Status	Smoking Status	Alcohol Consumption	Exercise Frequency	Dietary Habits	Stress Level	Sleep Pattern	Mental Health	Family Size	Work-Life Balance	Community Involvement	Life Satisfaction	Overall Well-being
John Doe	35	Male	Software Engineer	Bachelor's	Married	\$75,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Jane Smith	28	Female	Marketing Executive	Master's	Single	\$60,000	Excellent	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	9.0	9.5
Michael Johnson	45	Male	Teacher	Bachelor's	Married	\$50,000	Fair	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Irregular	Anxious	2	Fair	Active	7.5	8.0
Emily Davis	32	Female	Graphic Designer	Bachelor's	Single	\$45,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
David Wilson	50	Male	Business Owner	Master's	Married	\$90,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	4	Good	Active	9.0	9.5
Sarah Brown	25	Female	Student	Bachelor's	Single	\$20,000	Excellent	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Robert Taylor	40	Male	Doctor	PhD	Married	\$120,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	9.0	9.5
Lisa Anderson	30	Female	Writer	Master's	Single	\$35,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
James White	55	Male	Retired	Bachelor's	Married	\$40,000	Fair	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Irregular	Anxious	2	Fair	Active	7.0	7.5
Alice Green	22	Female	Intern	Bachelor's	Single	\$15,000	Excellent	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
Chris Black	48	Male	Engineer	Master's	Married	\$80,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Michelle Lee	38	Female	Manager	Bachelor's	Married	\$65,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	2	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Kevin Hall	52	Male	Analyst	Bachelor's	Married	\$55,000	Fair	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Irregular	Anxious	2	Fair	Active	7.5	8.0
Nancy King	27	Female	Researcher	PhD	Single	\$40,000	Excellent	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Paul Scott	42	Male	Consultant	Master's	Married	\$70,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Olivia Adams	33	Female	Designer	Bachelor's	Single	\$50,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
Benjamin Clark	58	Male	Retired	Bachelor's	Married	\$30,000	Fair	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Irregular	Anxious	2	Fair	Active	7.0	7.5
Victoria Evans	29	Female	Teacher	Bachelor's	Single	\$30,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
Gregory Hall	47	Male	Engineer	Master's	Married	\$60,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Isabella King	31	Female	Manager	Bachelor's	Married	\$55,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	2	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Samuel Lee	53	Male	Analyst	Bachelor's	Married	\$45,000	Fair	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Irregular	Anxious	2	Fair	Active	7.5	8.0
Madison Scott	26	Female	Student	Bachelor's	Single	\$18,000	Excellent	Non-smoker	Occasional	Regular	Vegetarian	Medium	Regular	Stable	1	Good	Active	8.0	8.5
Christopher Taylor	44	Male	Engineer	Master's	Married	\$65,000	Good	Smoker	Occasional	Regular	Non-vegetarian	High	Regular	Stable	3	Good	Active	8.5	9.0
Chloe White	34	Female	Designer	Bachelor's	Single	\$48,000	Good	Non-smoker	Occ										

Last

First

Middle

College or School Dept. _____

Date of First Appointment at PSU_____ Current Academic Professional Level_____

Date of Last Promotion

FACULTY MEMBER IS BEING REVIEWED FOR:

PROMOTION TO _____
(indicate academic professional level)

Each voting member of the Departmental Committee and each reviewing Administrator is required to sign and indicate their vote or recommendation.

(Please use **P** to indicate promotion or **D** to indicate deferral)

SIGNATURES	PROMOTION VOTE/REC	DATE
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:		
COMMITTEE MEMBERS*:		
COMMITTEE CHAIR:		
DEPARTMENT CHAIR:		
DEAN:		
PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT:		
PRESIDENT:		

*If more space is needed for committee membership, please attach an additional page.

I have been apprised of the recommendations indicated on this form and have been given the opportunity to review my file before its submittal to the Dean's Office.

Faculty Signature

Date


APPENDIX IV: ADDENDUM FOR OPTIONAL PROMOTIONAL PATHS FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY EMPLOYED AT PSU PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

All departments with non-tenure track faculty on fixed-term appointments (NTTF) must incorporate new ranks where appropriate by adding **job descriptions**, **promotion criteria**, and **evaluation procedures** into departmental promotion and tenure guidelines by May 15, 2014. Review of revised departmental promotion and tenure guidelines by the Dean or equivalent and the Provost must take place by June 15, 2014. Hiring into these ranks should begin on July 1, 2014.

Non-tenure track faculty members hired before September 16, 2014 who hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above shall retain those ranks, and shall retain the ability to promote to higher NTTF professorial ranks based upon the criteria for promotion to those ranks in their departmental P&T Guidelines.

To allow for promotion, all current NTTF appointed as Senior Instructors shall be re-ranked at the new rank of Senior Instructor I. However, in departments where new criteria for Senior Instructor II may overlap to a great degree with old criteria for Senior Instructor, the department has the discretion to affirm appointment of faculty hired prior to September 16, 2014 at the Senior Instructor II level, pending approval of new guidelines by the Dean or equivalent and Provost.

A. Promotional Options for Non-Tenure Track (NTTF, formerly Fixed-Term) INSTRUCTIONAL Faculty employed at PSU prior to September 16, 2014:



All Senior Instructors will be re-ranked to Senior Instructor I or Senior Instructor II, as appropriate under revised departmental P&T Guidelines.

Where applicable, a non-tenure track faculty member can be considered for Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice contingent on departmental approval as part of the process of revising departmental P&T Guidelines. The term Department refers to any instructional or research unit that has authority to hire and promote instructional and research faculty.

- Departments with NTTF instructional faculty hired before 9/16/14 are required to have clearly defined criteria in Departmental P&T Guidelines for promotion to Assistant Professor.
- Departmental Guidelines must state that a Senior Instructor I who has opted for promotion to Assistant Professor retains the right to be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor II (if they so request) if their application for promotion to Assistant Professor is unsuccessful. They should be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor II in the same cycle, with the same promotion packet, and by the same P&T committee. Should their application for Senior Instructor II be unsuccessful, they should retain the ability to apply for promotion to Assistant Professor and/or Senior Instructor II in future cycles.
- Departmental guidelines must state that for Instructional faculty members hired prior to September 16, 2014, the timelines for promotion at any point along the promotional path from Instructor through Professor shall not apply.
- Departmental Guidelines must state that Non-tenure track faculty members hired before September 16, 2014 who hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above shall retain those ranks, and shall retain the ability to promote to higher NTTF professorial ranks based upon the criteria for promotion to those ranks in their departmental P&T Guidelines.
- Departmental Guidelines must follow the standards set forth in this document and must be approved by the Dean and Provost.

B. Promotional Options for Non-Tenure Track (NTTF, formerly Fixed-Term) RESEARCH Faculty employed at PSU prior to September 16, 2014:

- Departments with NTTF research faculty are required to have P&T Guidelines for hiring and promotion to Senior Research Assistant I and II and to Senior Research Associate I and II.
- Departments with NTTF research faculty hired before 9/16/14 must define criteria for re-ranking of Senior Research Assistant(s) and Senior Research Associate(s).
- Departmental Guidelines must state that for faculty members hired prior to September 16, 2014, the timelines for promotion to Senior Research Associate I and Senior Research Associate II and Senior Research Assistant I and Senior Research Assistant II shall not apply.

- Departmental Guidelines must follow the standards outlined in this document and be approved by the Dean or equivalent and the Provost.

C. The following Motions approved by the PSU Faculty Senate in 2014 offer guidance on the adoption and implementation of new NTTF instructional and research ranks:

1. Motions on Faculty Ranks, as published in Appendix E-3, March 4, 2013 Senate Agenda:

Motion 1

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that fixed-term faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above who currently hold the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full to maintain their current academic ranks and titles in future employment contracts with the university that entail the same job duties they currently perform.

Motion 2

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that fixed-term faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above who entered into their current employment contracts with the expectation that, if rehired, they would be eligible for promotion to the ranks of Assistant, Associate, Full to extend their eligibility for such promotion in the creation of any future employment contracts with PSU.

1. The criteria for promotion into the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full shall continue to be the same for tenure-related and fixed-term faculty, as outlined in the University and State Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.
2. Faculty with the rank of Senior Instructor I may choose to be considered for promotion to either Senior Instructor II or Assistant Professor, in accordance with their departmental and university guidelines.

Faculty hired within the same time period above who attain the rank of Senior Instructor II will be eligible to be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor and from there through the professorial ranks, again in accordance with previously established guidelines.

Motion 3

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that fixed-term faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above who currently hold the ranks of Senior Instructor, Senior Research Assistant, and Senior Research Associate to be mandatorily reclassified as, respectively, Senior Instructor I, Senior Research Assistant I, and Senior Research Associate I. This reclassification is to leave room for future promotion. *No faculty member shall receive a pay cut as a result of reclassification.*

2. Motion on Faculty Ranks approved at the April 1, 2013 Senate meeting:

Motion 4

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that PSU does not use the new Title/Rank of Librarian.

[Secretary's note: Motion 4 was introduced March 4 (Appendix E-3), and revised April 1, 2014.]

[Secretary's note: Motion 5 regarding the use of auxiliary titles "Visiting" and "Adjunct" was not approved.]

Motion 5 (as published in Appendix E-4, April 1, 2013 Senate Agenda)

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above, and whose current position meets the criteria in OAR 580-020-005, be given the option of holding Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor ranks (as defined in OAR 580-020-0005) when revised PSU and departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include these ranks. *No faculty member shall receive a pay cut as a result of reclassification.*

**Memorandum of Understanding between
Portland State University (University)
and the Portland State University Chapter
of the American Association of University Professors (Association)
May 2, 2017**

Subject: Revision of the University Post Tenure Review (PTR) Guidelines



Recital:

Article XI of the PTR guidelines call for an assessment of the PTR process. That assessment was conducted in Spring 2017 and minor revisions were made to the PTR guidelines. The PTR process is described in MOU #1 in the 2015-19 CBA.

Agreement:

The Parties agree that the PTR Guidelines shall be revised as attached, and shall replace the PTR Guidelines cited in MOU #1 of the 2015-19 CBA.

This MOU shall become an addendum to the CBA. The parties shall determine at the time of the next printing of the CBA how the PTR guidelines and the revisions will be included.

<u>For the University</u>	<u>For the Association</u>
 _____ Shelly Chabon, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel & Leadership Development	 _____ Jose Padin, President
<u>5/2/17</u> Date	<u>5/2/17</u> Date

**Memorandum of Understanding between
Portland State University (University) and
The Portland State Chapter of the
American Association of University Professors (Association)
August 20, 2015 (ratified by AAUP Membership 9/4/2015)**

**Revision to the Portland State University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines to incorporate the
Portland State University Post Tenure Review Guidelines**

Recital:

The Portland State University Faculty Senate adopted the Portland State University Post tenure Review Guidelines as part of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines on April 6, 2015.

Agreement

- I. In accordance with Article 14 Section 3 of the PSU/PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement between the parties, the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines shall be modified by the addition of language attached. The parties agree to collaborate on the proper placement of the Post Tenure Review Procedure in the document.
- II. Pursuant to Article III of the Post-Tenure Review Procedures, the base salary of each tenured faculty member in the first quintile whose post-tenure review finds he/she meets standards in AY 2015-2016 will be increased by \$ 4396.00 effective September 16, 2015. The base salary of tenured faculty members in the second quintile whose post-tenure review finds he/she meet standards in AY 2015-2016 will be increased by \$ 4396.00 effective September 16, 2016. Each tenured faculty member whose post-tenure review finds he/she meets standards in each of the subsequent three quintiles will be awarded a base salary increase equal to the increase provided in AY 2015-16 plus a CPI adjustment. The assignment to quintiles shall be based upon the faculty member's "PTR Date," in reverse order with the earliest PTR dates in the first quintile.

The faculty member's "PTR Date" shall be determined as the most recent of tenure or promotion dates, and the ordering of the "PTR Dates" shall be from earliest to latest. To determine distribution between quintiles, faculty members with the same "PTR Date" will be ordered by tenure date from earliest to latest, and if necessary, further ordered by rank from highest to lowest. In cases where there is a tie after the three sort criteria are applied, the group of faculty with the same criteria will be moved to the higher quintile in the construction of the first PTR list, and in subsequent years when the list is re-ordered as a result of retirements, terminations, and opting out.

- III. The parties further agree that the timelines for the commencement of the Post Tenure Review Process in 2015 shall adhere the following timeline in place of Section IV of the agreement. After AY 2015-2016 Article IV shall apply.

2015

June 1: Procedures pass Faculty Senate and approved by AAUP and Provost.

- July 24:** The Provost's Office sends list of eligible faculty to deans and provides link to the approved guidelines: (<http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-and-tenure-information>).
- August 7:** Deans verify list of eligible faculty in all quintiles and return verified list to the Provost Office.
- August 18:** The Provost's Office assigns faculty to quintiles 1 & 2 per PTR MOU requirements and sends list to AAUP for final review.
- August 19:** The Provost's Office will notify eligible faculty in Q1 & Q2 via email and questionnaire.
- August 24:** Deadline for faculty to complete questionnaire provided by the Provost's office.
- August 26:** The Provost's Office will follow up with faculty who have not responded to questionnaire by phone call or certified mail.
- August 28:** Deans will be notified of the results of the questionnaire.
- August 31:** Faculty members submit their formal requests to defer or opt out to their dean's office.
- September 2:** Deans send notification to faculty with copy to the Provost's Office of decisions to accept/deny requests for deferrals or opt-outs.
- September 4:** The Provost's Office notifies deans of any eligible faculty added to the first two quintiles based on number of approved deferrals or opt-outs.
- September 8:** Deans verify list of added eligible faculty and return verified list to the Provost's Office.
- September 10:** Provost's Office will notify additional eligible faculty via e-mail and questionnaire.
- September 14:** Deadline for additional faculty to request deferral or opt-out on questionnaire provided by the Provost's Office.
- September 16:** Deans email notification to faculty and copy the Provost's Office of decisions to accept/deny requests for deferrals or opt outs from additional faculty.
- September 21:** Provost's Office compiles final list of eligible faculty and submits to HR with copy to deans.
- September 22:** Provost's Office and AAUP create training modules, FAQs and departmental PTR procedures template.
- September 23:** Provost's Office sends email reminders to eligible faculty and copies their supervisors.
- September 25:** OAA and AAUP hold joint information sessions.
- October 30:** Departments develop written procedures for PTR to be included in their P&T Guidelines.

November 16: Departments approve procedures per their departmental approval process and submit to deans.

December 7: Deans approve new department PTR procedures and submit to the Provost's Office.

2016

January 8: Provost's Office approves all departmental PTR procedures.

January 15: Department committees formed per guidelines.

January 15: Faculty dossiers due (1st and 2nd quintiles).

March 1: Committees complete reviews and submit report to the chairs.

March 15: Chair completes review and submits report to Dean.

March 30: Faculty member receives chair and committee reports (Assuming "meets standards" on both).

April 15: Dean completes review and submits report to chair, committee and faculty member (Assuming "meets standards").

- IV. This agreement is subject to ratification of the tenure related members of PSU-AAUP.
- V. This MOU will become an addendum to the parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- VI. The parties shall convene a PTR Data committee, to meet as needed, to address issues associated with the assignment of faculty to quintiles, and the assignment of PTR Dates.

For the University:

Shelly Chabon
Signature

Shelly Chabon
Print Name

8/21/15
Date

For the Association:

Leanne Serbulo
Signature

Leanne Serbulo
Print Name

8/21/15
Date

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

- I. Preamble**
- II. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Eligibility**
- III. Funding of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases**
- IV. Post Tenure Review Cycle and Timelines**
- V. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**
- VI. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review**
- VII. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Department Chairs/Unit Heads and Program Directors**
- VIII. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review**
- IX. Professional Development Plan**
- X. Assessment of the Post Tenure Review Process**

**Adopted by Faculty Senate Spring 2015
Ratified by PSU-AAUP September 4, 2015
Revised per PTR Article X Spring 2017**

I. Preamble

By awarding tenure, Portland State University recognizes its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty. The purpose of tenure is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution. Post-tenure review is founded on the principle that a strong and healthy university is one that supports, recognizes, and rewards faculty members throughout their careers for their contributions to the institution's mission. Post-tenure review acknowledges and values both the continuing scholarly work of the faculty directed towards research, teaching and outreach, and the many dimensions of service that are often a significant part of the career of tenured faculty members.

The faculty narrative is defined as a document that

- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, and service;
- describes an individual's accomplished and proposed contributions to the above areas;
- articulates the manner in which the individual's activities relate to the departmental needs, mission, and programmatic goals and changes in the department over time.

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their narratives will change to reflect varying proportions of time dedicated to research, teaching, advising, outreach, departmental, university, and professional service, administration, and academic leadership.

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his or her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution, the goals of post-tenure review are

- to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly within their units to ensure that unit contributions are shouldered equitably. A key aspect of this process is collaboration in aligning each faculty member's career path with unit missions while upholding academic freedom and a faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction;
- to be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development;
- to recognize and motivate faculty engagement.

Post-tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure.

The procedures for post-tenure review herein are a supplement to the PSU *Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases* 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014.

II. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Eligibility

Tenured faculty members shall undergo post-tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post-tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post-tenure review. In the event of an unsuccessful promotion review, there is no break in the timeline for post-tenure review.

All AAUP-represented tenured faculty members, tenured department chairs/unit heads, and program directors shall undergo post-tenure review. The reviews shall commence in the AY 2015-2016, as delineated herein.

In the event of changes in Article 30 Section 6b (Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases) of the University/AAUP CBA, the Faculty Senate shall reopen this document to make adjustments that maintain an appropriate balance between workload and incentives.

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for post-tenure review with regard to the year of the last review, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion.

A fifth of all eligible tenured faculty will be reviewed in each of the first five years, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion. Post-tenure reviews done prior to the approval of these guidelines will not be considered in judging eligibility.

Tenured faculty who provide a letter to the Dean, with a copy to HR stating they will retire within 2 years shall be allowed to opt out of post-tenure review. In these cases, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five-year cycle of reviews. If the faculty member subsequently rescinds their plan to retire, their post tenure review will occur with the next available quintile.

With written agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer post-tenure review if review for promotion occurs within the same year, or for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions. Faculty may not apply for post tenure review and promotion in the same academic year. As faculty in a quintile are deferred, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five year cycle of reviews.

III. Funding Of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases

The pool for Post-Tenure Review Salary increases (currently equal to 4% of salaries of reviewed faculty per Article 30, Section 6 of AAUP-PSU CBA 2013- 2015) shall be divided into equal increments, per the number of faculty under review in a year. A faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equal to this increment. The increase will be added permanently to the faculty member's base salary, effective at the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

Notwithstanding the above, the first two quintiles of tenured faculty shall be reviewed during the initial post tenure review period of 2015-16. The first cohort shall have their salary increase retroactive to September 16, 2015. The second cohort shall have their salary increase effective September 16, 2016.

IV. Post Tenure Review Cycle and Timelines (effective XXX)

Task	Due Date	
OAA creates list of eligible faculty and provides to Deans and Chairs	May 1	
Eligible faculty notified	No later than June 1 <u>May 15</u> prior to the year of eligibility	
Faculty requests deferment/ <u>opts out</u>	June 15 <u>1</u> prior to the year of eligibility	
Department Committee formed	Per Dept. P & T guidelines	
Faculty submits dossier		1st Friday in October
Committee completes review of eligible faculty and submits report		End of October
Chair completes reviews of eligible faculty and submits report	Within 10 business days from receipt of committee report	Mid November
Faculty member receives chair's letter and committee report	Within 10 business days of the transmittal of the committee's report	Mid November
Faculty member requests reconsideration	Within 10 <u>5</u> business days of receipt of recommendation	Late <u>Third week in</u> November
Faculty member submits supporting materials to committee and/or chair	Within 20 business days of request for reconsideration	Mid <u>Second week of</u> December
Committee and/or chair responds to reconsideration request and forward all materials to the Dean.		Second week of January
Dean completes reviews of eligible faculty and submits report	Within 10 business days of the receipt of the committee and chair reports	Fourth week of January
Department chair, chair of the committee or faculty member requests reconsideration conference	Within 10 <u>5</u> business days of receipt of Dean's letter	Mid <u>First week of</u> February
Faculty member submits supporting materials to committee and/or chair	Within 10 business days of request for reconsideration	Late <u>Third week of</u> February
Dean completes review, issues report and submits to provost.		Mid <u>First week of</u> March
Faculty member requests	Within 10 <u>5</u> business days of the	Early April <u>Second</u>

reconsideration conference with the Provost	receipt of the Provost letter	<u>week of March</u>
Faculty member submits supporting materials to the Provost Faculty member requests meeting with provost (optional)	Within business 20 days of receiving Provost letter	Early May <u>Second week of April</u>
Provost issues decision		Mid Fourth week of April
Post tenure review PDP developed and jointly agreed to by faculty member and chair	Within 30 business days after Provost's post tenure review decision is issued	Early June* <u>Fourth week of May</u>
If faculty member and chair cannot agree they will meet with the Dean	Within 14 business days	Second week of June *
Final PDP with Dean, Chair and faculty member developing PDP	June 15, year of review	<u>*June 15</u>
*May be extended if necessary and approval received.		

V. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

- A. The primary responsibility for assessing an individual faculty member's contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish procedures and criteria for post-tenure review that are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Procedures for Post-Tenure Review, which have priority. Guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.
- B. Approval of departmental/unit procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he or she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his or her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution. The final version must be returned by the Provost to the department/unit and ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit and approval by the Dean. If the procedures and criteria are not ratified by the tenure-line faculty the department/unit will return to the process in step A to develop modified procedures and criteria. Faculty members will not be eligible for review until procedures and criteria are in place.
- C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department/unit faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.
- D. In cases where a faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary research or teaching, ~~there shall be a written agreement~~ the faculty member and the department chairs shall agree in writing as to which department is responsible for post-tenure review and how the

other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed. The Department Chair of the department responsible for the review shall write the agreement.

- E. In schools that do not have departments or colleges that do not have schools, the faculty in the academic discipline will establish post-tenure-review guidelines that:
- 1) describe the procedures and criteria to be used, 2) are consistent with the procedures and criteria set forth in the University's post-tenure review guidelines, which have priority, and 3) provide procedures to choose review committee members from academic disciplines closely aligned with the faculty's member's career interests. The proposed unit guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the unit.

VI. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty Members

A. Notification

1. OAA shall notify each tenured faculty member eligible for post-tenure review by June 1 of the academic year prior to the year of eligibility. Requests for deferral shall be made by June 15 of the year a faculty member is notified.
2. OAA shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the Dean and chair/head of the appropriate academic unit.

B. Dossier

1. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes
 - i. Current curriculum vitae.
 - ii. Narrative of work done since the last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) in relation to the faculty member's career path. If the career path changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative. The narrative should succinctly describe the faculty member's activities that demonstrate continuing professional development and contributions to the life of the university and external communities which he or she has served during the review period. The narrative may also inform the review committee of the changes in work or life circumstances that occurred that have affected the faculty member's work during the review period. In addition, the narrative should speak to future plans.
 - iii. Any additional materials required by departmental/unit guidelines for post-tenure review. Documentation of teaching accomplishments in keeping with department/unit practice is expected.
 - iv. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he or she feels are relevant for the review.

C. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

1. Composition

- i. In order to clearly distinguish the P&T Process from the Post Tenure Review Procedure, departments/units shall create a Post tenure Review Committee for each faculty member under review.
 - ii. Departments/units shall specify in their guidelines that the committee shall be comprised of three people; one of whom will be selected from a list of three faculty members submitted by the faculty member under review; the other two will be selected as specified in department/unit guidelines, which shall be a clearly-articulated process for constituting committees that is collegial, equitable, and ~~formative~~ objective, and ensures that faculty under review have input into the selection process.
 - iii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory. Faculty members from other departments may be utilized as necessary to fill post tenure review committees.
2. Committee Review Procedures and Criteria
 - i. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member.
 - ii. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review, and any other criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines:
 - a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements (Research);
 - b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching);
 - c. Community Outreach (Outreach);
 - d. Service to the department/academic unit, school, university and profession/academic community (Service).
 - iii. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on research, teaching, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. The committee will find the faculty member to have met university standards for post-tenure review if:
 - a. the faculty member adequately demonstrates ongoing activity in each of the four areas (above), *or* the faculty member adequately demonstrates to the committee how his or her activities are consistent with departmental/unit needs and priorities, and
 - b. the effort expended totals the effort expected of a full time (1.0 full time equivalent) faculty member or prorated commensurate to the faculty member's FTE assignment for those parts of the review period when the faculty member's assignment was less than full time.
 - iv. Other factors from the faculty narrative to be considered when determining whether the faculty member has met the standards include

but are not limited to:

- a. the faculty member's teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation time required for new, different and/or non-lecture forms of instruction or delivery.
 - b. time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of research, teaching, outreach, or service.
 - c. increased departmental service, research, and/or instruction loads as a consequence of department staffing issues, such as the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty, increasing enrollments, absences of other faculty members due to sabbaticals, personal circumstances, or released time, unfilled vacancies, administrative appointments, changes in instructional support, increasing class sizes and/or changes in the physical workspace in the department.
 - d. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member's work that did not result in a deferral.
 - e. Increased advising or mentoring duties due to departmental changes or to the role the faculty member plays in the campus community
3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report to the chair. In its report, the committee shall explain its decision and provide evidence to support the decision. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions meet the standards set forth for post-tenure review, it shall document this in their report. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the report shall document the areas the committee finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.
 4. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority.

D. Role of the Department Chair/designee

1. The department chair/designee must assure that the faculty member's post-tenure review committee has followed department/academic unit and university post-tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member's dossier, and that the committee's report is complete and uses the proper forms. In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities shall be fulfilled by a person or persons specified in unit guidelines; potential *chair designees* may include program directors, area directors, or the faculty member's supervisor, ~~or post-tenure review committee chair.~~
2. The department chair/designee shall write a letter affirming or challenging

the committee's decision and recommendation based on the criteria in departmental post-tenure review guidelines, and explain his or her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the chair's letter shall document the areas he or she finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

3. The department chair's letter and the committee report must be sent to the faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee's report.
4. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the post-tenure committee report(s) and the department chair's letter, before it is forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member should indicate he or she has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he or she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E.
5. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the post-tenure review committee and the department chair.
6. The department chair must provide to the Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
 - i. A completed recommendation form (Appendix PT-1) signed by members of the post-tenure review committee and the department chair or chair designee;
 - ii. The post-tenure review committee's report and the department chair's letter;
 - iii. If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member's request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the chair and/or committee.

E. Procedures for Reconsideration of Recommendations by the Post-Tenure Committee and Department Chair

1. If a faculty member questions the post-tenure review committee's recommendation and/or the department chair's recommendation, he or she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendations within 10 working days of receiving them.
2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supporting materials must be submitted to the post-tenure review committee and/or the department chair as appropriate within 20 working days of the request for reconsideration.
3. If the reconsideration is requested for the committee's decision, the committee chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee's reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then

- be forwarded to the department chair for his or her review.
4. If reconsideration is requested of the chair's decision, the chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of his or her reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her consideration.
 5. Should the committee and/or the department chair reverse their original decisions and find the faculty member's contributions to meet standards, they shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member's submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.

VII. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Department Chairs/Unit Heads, and Program Directors

The procedure of evaluating department chairs/unit heads, and program directors will be the same as those for tenured faculty except that the role of the department chair shall be filled by the immediate supervisor of the individual under review provided the immediate supervisor is not the Dean. If the immediate supervisor of the individual under review is the Dean, the Dean must designate a person to fulfill the role of the immediate supervisor (e.g. an Associate Dean).

VIII. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review

A. Role of Dean or Equivalent Administrator

1. The Dean shall provide to the Provost a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed.
2. The Dean shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the report of the post-tenure review committee and the chair or chair designee with regard to the dossier submitted by the faculty member in order to write a letter affirming or challenging the recommendation of the committee and the chair.
3. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post-tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain his or her decision and document which criteria in the department's post-tenure guidelines were not being met and provide evidence to support the decision.
4. The Dean's letter shall be delivered within 10 working days to the department chair, the post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member.
5. If the Dean finds that the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the department chair, chair of the committee, and/or the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean's letter. The conference must be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. After notifying the Dean that the faculty

member requests reconsideration, the faculty member has 10 working days to provide additional materials to the Dean in support of the reconsideration.

6. If upon reconsideration, the Dean reverses his or her original decision and finds the faculty member's contributions meet standards, the Dean shall so report in writing and provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. The Dean shall send the original letter and all materials to the Provost.
7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member has met standards when the post-tenure review committee's and the department chair's finding disagree, the Dean shall provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. The Dean's letter to the Provost shall give his or her reasons.
8. The Dean's original recommendation, and Dean's recommendation after reconsideration, shall be included in the dossier. The Post Tenure Review dossier will be housed in the Dean's office.

B. Role of the Provost

1. The Provost shall review the materials only in those cases when a faculty member is found not to have met standards and requests reconsideration.
2. The Provost will review the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and post-tenure review committee to ensure that they comply with university guidelines. If the Provost finds that the review does not comply with university guidelines, then he or she must give reasons for his or her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.
3. The Provost will review the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and post-tenure review committee to determine if the faculty member meets or does not meet standards. If the Provost finds that the faculty member does not meet standards, then he or she must give reasons for his or her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.
4. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her final decision.
5. The faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Provost within 10 business days of the receipt of the Provost's letter and may add additional evidence to the file within 20 business days of receiving the Provost's letter. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.
6. The Provost's decision after reconsideration shall be forwarded to the faculty member, the chair, and the Dean. The Provost's decisions shall be included in the PTR dossier housed in the Dean's office.
7. After receipt of the Provost's final decision, a step 3 grievance may be filed

by or on behalf of the faculty member, as provided in the PSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement, or through the non-contractual grievance process, as applicable, if the faculty member believes that there has been a violation, misinterpretation or improper application of these guidelines._

8. Should a faculty member be deemed not to meet the standards of the post-tenure review, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

IX. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)

A. Purpose and Objective

1. A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) with input from the department chair or chair designee. As per Article 16, Section 3 of the PSU-AAUP CBA, an unsatisfactory review shall not be the basis for just cause sanctions pursuant to Article 27, or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.
2. The PDP can be up to three years in duration; a fourth year will be approved in exceptional circumstances. Upon request to the chair the PDP will be extended due to sabbatical or other approved leave.
3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member's career. The PDP shall only contain tasks that are substantially within the faculty member's control (e.g. the PDP could specify that the faculty member write a book but not that the book be published).

B. Role of the Department Chair, or Chair Designee, in Developing the PDP

1. Using the information provided in the post-tenure review committee's report and the department chair's letter, the faculty member and his or her chair shall jointly agree on the PDP no later than 30 business days after the post-tenure review. The chair will forward the PDP to the Dean.
2. If the faculty member and the department chair cannot agree, or want modifications to the PDP, they will meet with the Dean within 14 business days to discuss modifications to the PDP. If no agreement can be reached, the faculty member and the chair shall write a letter identifying the modifications they recommend for the PDP and the reasons for the modifications. The faculty member's PDP and the department chair's letter are submitted to the Dean for resolution.

C. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the

- chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix PT-1).
2. Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the chair and the faculty member.
 3. If the faculty member and the chair agree on the modifications requested by the dean, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the chair, whereupon the University shall make available the appropriate resources to implement the PDP.
 4. The Provost will make the final determination if the faculty member, the department chair, and Dean do not agree on the modifications requested by the Dean. Items 1-4 of this section (C) will be completed no later than June 15 the year of the review.

D. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair, or chair designee in schools where there are no department chairs, shall meet with the faculty member every 6 months for the duration of the PDP to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the department chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member's request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member's request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who shall reply within 15 working days. If the department chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination within 15 working days.
3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.
4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member's report to the Dean.
5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member. Additional funding may be required.
6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the

department chair within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair's letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.

7. If the department chair reverses his or her decision, he or she shall write a revised letter to the Dean. The Dean will wait to make a decision until receiving the reconsideration letter from the department chair.
8. Should a faculty member refuse to create and/or follow the PDP (except due to circumstances that are substantially outside the faculty member's control), he or she shall be notified and subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA.
9. If the department chair and Dean agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will be eligible for the post-tenure review increase that is currently in force effective at the start of the following academic year.
10. The PDP, with information on how it was fulfilled, must be signed within 20 working days of completion by the faculty member, the department chair/unit head, and dean and filed with the Provost Office.

E. Funding of PDP

Any faculty member whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional development funds for each year of the PDP, in an annual amount not to exceed the annual salary increase that would have been provided to the faculty member had s/he met standards to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the PDP.

Recognizing that some PDPs will not require the, full dollar amount described above, any unexpended funds in the pool established for post-tenure review salary increases shall be transferred to the Faculty Development Fund.

F. Training for developing and administering PDPs

OAA shall design and implement training for Deans, Chairs, and Directors and tenured faculty for developing and administering PDPs.

X. Assessment of the Post Tenure Review Process

Faculty Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee including members from OAA and AAUP-PSU to assess the post tenure review process after the 2nd year of the review process and to make a report to Senate, OAA and AAUP-PSU that calls, if needed, for changes in the post tenure review process.

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year 20____

Last

First

Middle

Department/School/College: _____

Date of First Appointment at PSU: _____ Current Rank: _____

Date of Tenure, Promotion, or most recent Post-Tenure Review: _____

Each voting member of the Departmental Committee and each reviewing Administrator must sign and indicate his or her recommendation. YES indicates “meets standards” and NO indicates “does not meet” standards. Faculty members not meeting standards will create a Professional Development Plan in collaboration with their chair or director.

Was this review a reconsideration decision: Y or N

(Reconsideration decisions should be reflected on a new signature page attached to dossier)

NAME	SIGNATURE	Meets standards YES or NO	DATE
COMMITTEE MEMBERS:			
COMMITTEE CHAIR:			
DEPARTMENT CHAIR:			
DEAN:			

I have been apprised of the recommendations indicated on this form and have been given the opportunity to review my file before it is submitted to the Dean's Office.

Faculty Member Signature

Date _____

When Provost Review is required as described in Section VIIIB.

PROVOST	SIGNATURE	Meets standards YES or NO	DATE

Completed forms must be filed with Provost by June 15 the year of review.