

Portland State University  
TOULAN SCHOOL PROCEDURES

I. Promotion, Tenure, and Approval Reviews

A. All faculty eligible for promotion, tenure and/or annual review shall be responsible for providing the Faculty Evaluation Committee with required information by performing the following actions:

1. preparing and maintaining a complete and current file of evidence of professional activities and achievements, including a current curriculum vitae in the format required by the University.

2. preparing a written, self-evaluation report according to the format developed by the faculty evaluation committee.

(for promotion and tenure)

3. providing the names and addresses of at least four persons outside of the University who can comment on the candidates' professional work and potential as a productive scholar (these persons may be contacted to provide information to the committee). 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.

(for promotion and tenure)

4. testifying before the committee in support of candidacy. If any of the preceding actions are not performed to the satisfaction of a majority of the committee, it may decide to defer action on a candidate's case because of insufficient information.

5. Faculty on annual tenure appointments must be reviewed after the completion of the first year of their appointment and each subsequent year. In order to assure that candidates have a timely assessment of their progress towards tenure or promotion so as to permit correction of deficiencies, there must be a more substantial review at the end of the third year. The review shall be in accordance with regular Toulon School and University procedures and should specifically evaluate the progress of the faculty member in meeting the standards for the award of tenure and/or promotion; however, reviews prior to the sixth year are normally only for evaluative purposes and do not have to include outside evaluation.

6. Faculty on fixed term appointments shall be reviewed in accordance with University procedures. Fixed term faculty with instructional responsibilities shall submit a current CV and their most recent syllabi and summaries of student course evaluations for each course taught since their last review. Fixed term faculty with research or service responsibilities shall submit a review of their work by their principal supervisor. Where no principal supervisor can be identified, the Director, or his/her designee, will select a

reviewer.

B. The committee shall provide timely public notice to all interested faculty and students so they may offer oral and/or written testimony regarding the performance of individual candidates. Materials submitted by the candidate will be open for review, but not those submitted by other individuals.

C. At least three additional external reviewers will be selected by the Director and the chair of the Evaluation committee in consultation. 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. The Director will send the list to the Dean for review and the Dean may add names to the list.

D. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will select evaluators from the combined list of outside reviewers. In cases when promotion or tenure decisions are deferred, external evaluations may be used in subsequent considerations for a period of three years. The committee may collect additional relevant information from sources, not limited to the candidate's list of referees, including an invitation to one or more recognized experts in the candidate's professional field to assist in the evaluation.

E. The committee shall make one of four possible promotion and/or tenure decisions (ineligible, deferred, positive recommendation, or negative recommendation) about each faculty member only after a complete review of all available documented information related to his or her individual performance.

F. The committee shall review the appointments of all adjunct and affiliated faculty bi-annually and make one of two retention decisions: positive recommendation, or negative recommendation. The criteria used to evaluate regular or joint-appointed faculty shall be applied appropriately to affiliated and adjunct faculty (see item I.C.3).

G. All decisions of the committee shall require a majority vote of all committee members; however, no committee member may vote on his/her case.

H. Any faculty member may have the committee reconsider its decision by submitting a written request to the committee chairperson and the Toulon School Director within two weeks of receipt of written notice of the committee's action.

I. When part of a faculty member's responsibilities, teaching, research, and community outreach must meet an acceptable standard of effectiveness. Each faculty member is also expected to contribute to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the University. For detailed criteria, see PSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (<http://oaa.pdx.edu/PromotionAndTenureGuidelines>).

1. Given the character of the programs in Urban Studies and Planning, within the area of scholarship, faculty will be evaluated for performance on a continuing program of

research and creative activities, teaching and curricular activities, and community outreach.

2. Faculty who teach almost exclusively in the MURP program may submit professional reports or planning documents to be considered as part of their research. Such items should represent innovative contributions with a high level of creativity, as judged by the committee with the aid of outside reviewers.
3. Fixed term faculty and faculty primarily in Research and Public Service Units should be evaluated relative to their appointments, as specified in their job descriptions and/or letter of appointment. When applicable, evaluations by the Director of the research or public service unit relative to that person's job description should be a significant part of any deliberations by the Evaluation Committee. The evaluation for promotion of fixed term faculty with teaching loads in significantly in excess of the norm for Toulon School tenure track faculty shall place emphasis on teaching quality and the dissemination of innovative and creative approaches to teaching, as judged by the committee with the aid of outside reviewers.
4. The Evaluation Committee should consider quality as well as quantity in all areas of evaluation. If committee members feel unqualified to judge quality in any area, then they should seek additional information or evaluation by others.
5. Criteria for evaluating teaching include formal student evaluations of all courses,  
student credit hours generated, student advising, supervision of exams and theses/dissertations for graduate students, course syllabi, innovations in teaching approaches and curriculum development, and integration of research and service activities into teaching.

J. During the sixth year of continuous service, fixed term faculty shall be reviewed for eligibility for multi-year appointments. The faculty member may choose to defer this review. The review for eligibility for multi-year appointments is a cumulative review, but is otherwise identical to the annual review. Regardless of the decision regarding eligibility for multi-year appointments, the review shall be developmental in nature.

The recommendations and reviews of the faculty evaluation committee shall be in writing, and shall indicate the extent to which faculty meet the above criteria, including a listing of documented evidence that is in the faculty member's file.

The recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are forwarded to the Director who shall make his/her own recommendation on each case. Both recommendations are forwarded to the Dean. The Dean may appoint an advisory committee as part of the decision making process at his level. Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendations, the Director's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation are then forwarded to

the Provost. The four recommendations (faculty evaluation, Director, Dean's advisory Committee, and the Dean) comprise the evidence that is submitted to the Provost. (NOTE: The Dean's Advisory Committee is not mandatory and serves at the pleasure of the Dean.)

These criteria for measuring faculty performance can be changed only by a majority vote of the faculty at a regularly scheduled, or special faculty meeting.

## II. Merit Salary Recommendations

A. The Faculty Evaluation Committee makes recommendations on merit salary increases to the Director on the basis of the same criteria used in judgments on promotion and tenure. The Director rather than the FEC evaluates eligible members of the FEC itself and determines appropriate merit increase recommendations.

B. Merit increases should be clearly based on the meritorious service. Meritorious service implies activities and achievements beyond regular and competent fulfillment of responsibilities. Consideration may be made for a person with consistently good performance who has not been granted merit increases; however, such awards should be based on merit and not on any rotation of awards.

C. Merit evaluations may take equity into consideration; however, such adjustments should be based on specific issues. Lack of merit increases in the past is not sufficient reason for an equity adjustment.

## III. Career Support-Peer Review Process

The purpose of the peer review process is to promote and sustain high standards of performance and professional development for faculty members holding tenured positions in SUSP.

A. The peer review process must be kept separate from the promotion and tenure process.

B. Faculty will be reviewed in order of seniority of tenure (not rank). Each individual will be reviewed every three years. Only those faculty members with regular or joint appointments in the Toulon School will be reviewed. In the case of peer review of joint appointments, there shall be consultation with other appropriate Schools or administrative units. Directors are not subject to this peer review process nor may a Director serve as a member of a peer review committee.

C. The committee for each person being reviewed shall consist of three members: one chosen by the reviewee; one by the Director; and one by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Should the reviewee fail to select a committee member, the Director shall appoint two members to the committee.

D. Committee members who are University faculty must hold the rank of Associate Professor or above, and must be tenured. The review committee may include persons from outside the Toulan School and/or qualified persons from outside the University provided they are able to attend committee meetings. One of the three members may be a non-academic professional person from outside the University. The committee shall select its own chairperson. The committee members should be identified and ready to begin the review process within thirty days after the beginning of Fall term.

E. The composition of the Peer Review Committee may be appealed by the reviewee to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Any appeal must be made within ten working days of the appointment of the committee, and should demonstrate a reasonable cause for a change in committee membership. If the Faculty Evaluation Committee determines that such reasonable cause exists, it shall recommend a list of three replacement candidates to the Director, who shall appoint replacements.

F. The reviewee shall furnish the committee with an up-to-date resume, a narrative review of past accomplishments (or the completed form developed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee), and his/her plan for the future. All materials should be in the possession of the committee one week prior to the first meeting of the committee, which will take place no later than six weeks after the beginning of Fall term. The initial meeting between the committee and the reviewee will be confidential and informal, as specified in the current collective bargaining agreement.

G. Further meetings will be held in accord with the procedures specified in the current collective bargaining agreement.

H. The Toulan School recognizes the unique contribution of faculty members, and the potentially diverse criteria upon which individuals might be reviewed. The criteria utilized to determine promotion, tenure, and merit pay increases by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as the unique strengths of each individual will be considered in reviewing past accomplishments and plans for future development. The committee may request additional information, and will consider the testimony of peers requested by either the committee or the reviewee.

**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**

**Motion Adopted by the PSU Faculty Senate  
June 12, 1996**

Move that the PSU Faculty Senate approve the revised *Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases* dated 5/17/96 to become effective September 1, 1996, and implemented according to the following timetable.

Proposed Timetable for Adoption and Implementation  
of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

September 1, 1996	New Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Become Effective. The new promotion and tenure guidelines will be effective for new faculty whose appointments begin after September 1, 1996 and for faculty whose promotions to Associate Professor are effective after September 1, 1996.
Fall 1996	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will develop multiple examples of<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– procedures that a department might adopt regarding scholarly agenda</li><li>– scholarly agenda themselves</li></ul></li><li>2. Development activities will be delivered on new Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Department Chairs</li><li>– New Faculty</li><li>– Department P&amp;T Committees</li></ul></li></ol>
1996-97	Departments Develop New Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures
Fall 1997	Begin implementing Scholarly Agenda in Formative Ways In 1997-98, after the development of departmental guidelines, faculty may elect to be considered for promotion and tenure under the new guidelines.
Fall 1999	Earliest possible time that a new faculty hired as of September 15, 1996 would be eligible for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor under the new guidelines. Exceptions which result in the consideration for the promotion immediately upon eligibility should occur only on the basis of extraordinary achievement.
Fall 2000	Earliest possible time that individuals promoted to Associate Professors as of September 15, 1996 would be eligible for promotion to Full Professor under the new guidelines. Promotion after 4 years will be made only in extraordinary cases.
Fall 2001	This will be the last year that faculty can go up for promotion and tenure under the <i>Portland State University Policies and Procedures For the Evaluation of Faculty Members for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases dated October 1990 (reformatted September 1991)</i> .
Fall 2002	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. In the normal course of events this would be the normal time when faculty hired as of September 15, 1996 would be eligible for consideration to Associate Professor under the new guidelines.

# **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 departments<sup>1</sup>.

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.

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 University.

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.

## **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 professorial ranks. Scholarly accomplishments, suggest 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Departments" includes departments, schools, and other similar administrative units.

All faculty members should keep abreast of developments in their fields<sup>2</sup> 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.

All faculty have a responsibility to conduct scholarly work in research, teaching, or community outreach in order to contribute to the body of knowledge in their field(s). Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Finally, each faculty member is expected to contribute to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the University.

## **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.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Faculty fields may be disciplinary or inter-disciplinary in nature.

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).<sup>3</sup>

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,

---

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

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. Quality and significance of scholarship are over-arching, 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:

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 scholars 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 enables 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 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 proposals 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 interinstitutional 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 chair<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> "Departmental 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.

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 interinstitutional 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. 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.<sup>5</sup>

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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

- 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.

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 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 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:** 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.

**Senior Instructor:** The rank of Senior Instructor is used in those cases where the nature of the assignment requires special skills or experience in the instructional program but does not warrant the rank of Assistant Professor and in those cases where the performance of the individual could warrant the award of tenure.

**Instructor:** Appointees to the rank of Instructor ordinarily hold an advanced degree associated with their fields of specialization or have comparable experience. An instructor at 0.50 or more is appointed for a period of one year, may be reappointed, and can only be awarded tenure with concurrent promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor or Assistant Professor. Normally persons appointed at the rank of Instructor are not eligible for consideration for promotion within the first year of their appointment.

**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.

**Professorial Research Appointments:** Professorial ranks will be available for faculty on Senior Research Appointments. Such appointments are for fixed-term faculty who are 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. The appointment status is "Other", and the title is "Research Associate-Senior Research." These faculty are identified as Assistant Professor-Senior Research, Associate Professor-Senior Research, and Professor-Senior Research.

**Research Associate and Senior Research Associate:** These ranks are appropriate for appointment of faculty whose primary responsibility is the conduct of independent research. Such appointees will normally hold the doctoral degree or the highest degree appropriate to the field.

**Research Assistant and Senior Research Assistant:** These ranks are appropriate for appointment of faculty whose primary responsibility is the conduct of research under supervision. Such appointees will hold a degree appropriate to the research skills required.

Conversion of a Research Associate to Assistant Professor-Senior Research 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. Promotion to Associate Professor-Senior Research and Professor-Senior Research requires the customary University promotion review.

#### 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 580-20-005) separate academic ranks into two categories: graduate rank (Graduate Research Assistant, Graduate Teaching Assistant) and faculty rank (Fellow, Lecturer, Research Assistant, Research Associate, Instructor, Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor). The Board Rules further note that "academic rank is assigned to staff members in the unclassified academic service whether the type of service is teaching, research, extension, administration, or other service," without a requirement for assigning rank to all staff members.

##### 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 Professorial Ranks

1. As mandated by OAR 580-20-005(4), Deans, Vice Presidents and the President shall have the academic rank of Professor.
2. For faculty hired after September 16, 1990 the professorial ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) will be limited to
  - a. teaching related positions with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
  - b. librarians;
  - c. faculty on Senior Research appointments;
  - d. faculty meriting professorial-level appointments whose principal responsibilities are related to scholarly research.
3. Faculty in positions that do not have an associated expectation for scholarly accomplishment will be appointed with one of the four following designations:
  - a. with professional title but without rank;
  - b. at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor;
  - c. at professorial rank as mandated by state statute for those in administrative positions;
  - d. at the rank of Administrative Research Assistant, Administrative Senior Research Assistant, and Administrative Research Associate for faculty in research support or research training positions.

#### C. Definition, Use, and Conditions of Faculty Appointments

Faculty appointments are defined as fixed term, annual tenure, and indefinite tenure:

##### 1. Fixed Term Appointments

- a. 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 fixed term appointment and by January 1 of subsequent years. Such notices of intent may be based on the availability of funds. The immediate supervisor of faculty on fixed term appointments is required to provide an annual evaluation of performance after the first year. It should be understood that fixed term appointments are for specified times and no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

##### b. Use of Fixed Term Appointments

- i. Upon the adoption of these guidelines the use of fixed term appointments for continuing faculty who are .50 FTE or more on instructional accounts and who hold professorial rank shall be reduced as much as possible, consistent with stable funding and the special needs of academic units.
- ii. Fixed term positions should be used for:
  - a) faculty in professorial ranks who are less than .50 FTE;

- b) faculty whose appointments are primarily in academic support, student support and administrative support units and usually do not have academic rank;
  - 1) Professional titles offer an alternative to appointment at faculty rank for fixed term positions when, in the view of the unit administrator and provost or appropriate vice president, a professional position title most adequately describes the responsibilities of the position and qualifications of the individual holding those positions.
  - 2) These titles also provide alternative opportunities for promotion. A list of appropriate positions and titles must be defined and promotional opportunities in these positions be established and described and the appropriate criteria and procedures developed.
- c) appointments that are temporary, regardless of rank. Positions established with non-recurring funds are defined as temporary. Appointments associated with temporary assignments such as a visiting professor or a sabbatical leave replacement also are considered temporary.

c. *Conditions for Fixed Term Appointments*

- i. Initial appointments shall be for an appropriate fixed term period, but typically one or two years. Initial appointments of three years may be granted at the discretion of the provost or appropriate vice provost.
- ii. After six years of cumulative full time service, individuals who hold non-ranked appointments in academic support, administrative support, and student support units on multi-year, fixed term appointments shall be eligible to be considered for administrative leave for professional development. Such leave is at the discretion of the provost or appropriate vice president consistent with State System guidelines.

A fixed term 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 fixed term 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 (Annual) 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 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., 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**

### **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 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. If necessary, 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 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 II 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 II.

#### 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 with 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" (forms available in Academic Affairs) 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).

## 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. (or highest degree)	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

## 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 reviewers\*;
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 requested 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 (List Institutional Affiliation)	Relationship**	Date Letter Sent	Date Response Received
----	---	----------------	---------------------	---------------------------

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

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

[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 \_\_\_\_\_



**APPENDIX IIIB: ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET  
AND RECOMMENDATION FORM**

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year 19\_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Last First Middle

College or School/Department \_\_\_\_\_

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)

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

\*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*

## **ROUTING OF RECOMMENDATION**

A time table 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.