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Introduction

Welcome to the Faculty Handbook for the Department of Psychology at Portland State University. This document contains a description of the self-governance structures and their goals and responsibilities as well as the policies that organize the self-governance activities of the faculty in this department.

The goal of our self-governance activities is to continually recreate a department that provides a high quality context for the professional development of its members, namely, faculty, staff, instructors, graduate and undergraduate students, while at the same time making a positive contribution to the institution and community of which we are part. The changing historical, societal, and institutional context requires that self-governance be proactive and goal-directed and that the Department recognize and deal constructively with internal and external challenges and problems. The self-governance structure described in this handbook is designed to carry out this function. However, it is a work in progress, as is this handbook. As a living document, the Handbook is designed to be revised and replaced by something better as time goes on. The Handbook is eligible for annual revision by the respective committees and new policies are added at the same time that outdated policies are removed.

This Handbook could be used for several different purposes:

1. New faculty can read it as a whole to get a sense of how our Department is run and the nature of faculty roles and responsibilities. It pertains only to self-governance activities and so only describes a part of faculty life.

2. The chairs of Department committees can use their committees’ goal statements to remind them of their mission and goals.

3. Any faculty member can consult the Handbook to ascertain the exact policies and rules governing many aspects of faculty life. All departmental policies that pertain to faculty are supposed to be included in this Handbook, along with dates these policies were approved. In general the Handbook has the last word on questions of information as to extant policy.

4. Any faculty member who senses the departmental functioning needs a boost can consult the Handbook to see if committees and individuals are actually fulfilling their stated goals and responsibilities. Descriptions in the Handbook could also be used as a basis for revision of the self-governance structure itself. In this sense, despite its prior iterations, the Handbook remains only a beginning.
Who are faculty?

Unless otherwise specified, the term faculty in this Faculty Handbook will include all persons holding current appointments of .5 FTE (full-time equivalent) appointments in the Department of Psychology. Sometimes this handbook distinguishes between tenure-track faculty, Teaching, and adjunct faculty.

Tenure-track faculty hold tenure-related appointments, and have a profile of professional responsibilities that includes community-engaged applied research, undergraduate and graduate instruction, graduate mentoring and research supervision, community outreach, professional service, and departmental self-governance. Sometimes “senior” faculty, who have tenure, are distinguished from “junior” faculty who are not yet tenured. Tenure-line faculty ranks include Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. This appointment requires an advanced degree in the field of specialization and results from a national and international search process.

Teaching faculty hold full-time renewable appointments that are not tenure-related, and have a profile of responsibilities that focuses primarily on undergraduate instruction and development of the undergraduate program. Such appointments include undergraduate teaching, advising, mentoring, and involvement in design and development of courses, curriculum, and other facets of the undergraduate program. Teaching faculty ranks include Instructor, Senior Instructor I, and Senior Instructor II. This appointment requires an advanced degree in the field of specialization and results from a regional and national search process.

Adjunct faculty hold non-tenure-track appointments of .49 FTE or less, and can teach up to 5 courses annually for the department. Such appointments are exclusively focused on teaching specific courses, although adjuncts are allowed to (and do) offer advising, mentoring, and supervision to undergraduate Teaching Assistants; they also supervise their graduate Teaching Assistants. Adjunct faculty have their own handbook, which is located on the Psychology website at: LINK

Please note that a later section of this Handbook itself covers formal university ranks at length.
Self-Governance Committee Structure and Responsibilities

Department faculty hold the collective responsibility to set and implement policies and procedures that govern the Department. These policies guide the activities of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students and provide structure for the Department and the graduate and undergraduate program. To carry out this responsibility, the faculty have created Standing Committees and have delegated responsibilities and authority to each. Each committee is composed of faculty members, is entrusted to act in the best interests of the department, and answers to the faculty.

Overview of the Committee Structure

In general any Standing Committee has as its goal to initiate, communicate, facilitate, implement, monitor, and revise policies, procedures, and tracking/communication systems related to its domain of responsibility. To meet this goal each committee is charged with four general kinds of activities:

1. To oversee the routine activities of the Department in a given domain;
2. To facilitate setting new policies and procedures in that domain;
3. To set priorities for its committee activities; and
4. To identify, prioritize, and deal with unforeseen issues in that domain.

Currently there are three Standing Committees. These are:

1. The **Steering Committee**, which has as its domain the coordination of departmental activities to reach the short-term and long-term goals of the department.

2. The **Graduate Committee**, which has as its domain the quality of the graduate program and the experience and learning of graduate students;

3. The **Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) Committee**, which has as its domain the peer review of faculty progress toward promotion, retention, and/or tenure, and the periodic review of tenured faculty.

Recent History of the Standing Committees:

New faculty will occasionally hear colleagues refer to the “Big Three” committee structure. In a prior version of its structure the Department had, in addition to the Graduate Committee, a Faculty Committee (sometimes called Faculty Development Committee) and an Undergraduate Committee. The “Big Three” structure was approved in May, 2001. In Fall, 2009, the Department voted to accept a recommendation from the Steering Committee replacing that structure with a structure pictured in Figure 1. Functions of the Undergraduate Committee were largely absorbed by the Associate Chair. Functions of the Faculty Committee were largely absorbed by the Department Chair, Associate Chair, Department Manager, the just-prior Department Chair, and the PRT Chair.
Ad hoc Time-limited Committees

In addition to the three standing committees, faculty create a small number of temporary project-focused committees each year in order to make progress on specific departmental initiatives. These committees, which typically last for the academic year, are usually formed and populated at the fall faculty Retreat. Building on guidance from the Retreat, the first job of each committee is to determine its specific charge, agenda, and timeline for task completion. Depending on their charges, committees may also add members from the staff (e.g., the departmental advisor), graduate students, or undergraduate students. In making progress on their initiatives, these committees meet as frequently as they deem necessary and they can bring issues to the Steering Committee, request resources for their activities, ask for time at a Faculty Meeting, communicate directly with faculty via e-mail, and so on.

Committee Membership

All faculty are eligible to serve on all committees, unless the policies of a particular committee or subcommittee specify otherwise; for example, the PRT Committee includes all tenured faculty except the Department Chair and excludes untenured faculty. Faculty volunteer to serve on committees based on interest, expertise, and workload. A committee must have at least three faculty members, distributed as much as possible across substantive areas of the Department. The Chair of a committee typically volunteers; however, in cases of multiple volunteers, faculty elect a committee chair. Graduate student committee members are selected by graduate students.

1. The Steering Committee consists of 3 tenured faculty, including the Department Chair, Associate Chair, and Graduate Committee chair; one member of the Teaching faculty; the chairs of other standing committees; and additional tenured faculty as needed to make sure that all areas and interests of the department are represented.

2. The Graduate Committee consists of at least one tenure-track faculty from each area and methodology faculty as needed, as well as a graduate student representative. Teaching faculty are not expected to participate in the doctoral program, but they can request the option of becoming an Associate member of the graduate faculty, which would allow them to serve on Masters, comprehensive, and Doctoral committees, and to serve as co-advisors with tenure-track faculty, but not to serve as committee chairs or to admit doctoral students or work with them as the only direct supervisor. (Approved 6-10-2015)

3. The PRT Committee consists of all tenured faculty except the Chair, and can be divided into sub-committees to consider different kinds of cases. For example, the sub-committee to consider candidates for promotion to Full Professor consists of all the Full Professors; whereas the sub-committee to consider Teaching faculty for annual review and/or promotion consists of 3 tenured faculty and 1 Teaching faculty.

4. The members of Ad Hoc Time-limited committees are chosen based on the interest and expertise of the faculty.

Any faculty member may attend any meeting of the Steering Committee, the Graduate Committee, or any committees organized around departmental initiatives to discuss any
issue, but if a vote is taken (which happens rarely), only the members of the committee may vote.

Committee Responsibilities

One responsibility of committees is to solicit and consider departmental input, and to keep the department informed of committee activities. A responsibility of departmental members is to keep committees apprised of information and opinions relevant to the issues they are deliberating. Faculty can attend any meeting of any committee, unless specified otherwise (e.g., PRT meetings). Members of the department can submit agenda items to committees. The major issues being considered by a committee are communicated to faculty at Faculty Meetings, and to Standing Committee chairs and the Department and Associate Chair at Steering Committee meetings.

Committee Authority: Procedures for Developing, Revising, and Accepting Policies

Standing Committees have the responsibility to make recommendations for policies and procedures concerning activities in their domain. When these recommendations have been communicated to Faculty and discussed at a Faculty Meeting (and in all likelihood revised based on feedback), they are accepted as policy, unless a vote is called and the recommendations is vetoed by a majority vote of the faculty.

The general process for making policy recommendations includes:

1. Meeting and discussion by the Standing Committee, during which any faculty member may come and discuss. The Committee informs faculty about the agenda of meetings and about drafts of recommendations (e.g., by e-mail). The Committee makes an effort to contact and include departmental members who hold differing views on an issue.

2. The resulting recommendation or recommendation options are written up and distributed to faculty by e-mail prior to the Faculty Meeting at which the issues will be discussed. (This would usually be by Monday.) If the issue is controversial, the Committee may alert faculty by voice mail as well about the e-mail and the meeting.

3. The recommendation is discussed in a Faculty Meeting. If there are options, they can be voted on, and/or the recommendation can be revised based on discussion. The (revised) recommendation is accepted unless: (a) the Committee withdraws the recommendation for further consideration, or (b) faculty veto the recommendation. A recommendation is vetoed when a vote is called (any faculty member can call for a vote) and a majority of the voting faculty members who are present vote “no” on the recommendation.

4. All policies and procedures are communicated in writing to all faculty and to other departmental members who are affected. All policies and procedures are also included in the next revision of the respective Handbook.
Voting

Quorum. A quorum at a regularly scheduled meeting is 1/2 of the voting members of the department not on leave. Faculty shall receive 48 hours notice for meetings, and in summer, notice will include calling people at home.

Voting membership. Anyone who holds at least a .50 FTE appointment is a voting member of the department, except as further specified below. The department has the right to give voting membership to other individuals for one year, but doing so requires an absolute majority.

Voting procedures. Most matters are decided by voice votes or, if the voice vote leaves the outcome in doubt, by a show of hands. Absentee ballots are not permitted.

Voting for personnel, search, and hiring decisions. Decisions about how to allocate tenure-track and non-tenure-track teaching positions are made by tenure-track faculty. Search committees for tenure-track positions consist of tenure-track faculty; and only tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote in hiring decisions for tenure-track faculty. Search committees for Teaching positions consist of tenure-track and teaching faculty; and both tenure-track and teaching faculty are eligible to vote in hiring decisions for teaching faculty. (Approved 06-10-2015.)

Voting for promotion and tenure. To vote on promotion and tenure decisions, a person must have been present during all the deliberations on a particular case to vote on that case.

Voting for Faculty Hires (policy approved January 9, 2002). Faculty can participate in votes that involve a candidate, only if: (1) they have attended (or viewed a videotape of) that candidate’s colloquia from the beginning of the talk to the end of the question and answer session; and (2) they have participated in all the formal faculty discussions involving that candidate.

Exceptions to the eligibility rules. The group can accept votes from faculty who do not participate in all formal post-interview discussion, when: (a) Meetings are scheduled outside of normal days of operation (e.g., on Saturday or during break); (b) Faculty are called away unexpectedly (are sick or have an emergency); or (c) Faculty from the area of the hire are ineligible for good reasons. In controversial situations, faculty can vote about the exceptions.
Goals and Activities of the Steering Committee
Approved May 2001; amended to incorporate October, 2009 restructuring.

Goals: Maintain and improve the capacity of the department to accomplish its high priority objectives in all areas. To help formulate goals, coordinate activities, and monitor progress towards goals.

Responsibilities of the Steering Committee

Facilitate the formulation and implementation of the Strategic Plan.
1. Develop an agenda for Retreats.
2. Schedule and organize Retreats.
3. Update and revise the Strategic Plan, including departmental Progress Report.
4. Monitor the Strategic Plan and make sure priorities are met.
5. Facilitate decisions about which university or college initiatives to participate in as a department (and which not to).
6. Identify, communicate, and implement any additional new priorities.

Coordinate and facilitate the activities of the Standing Committees.
1. Identify issues that overlap multiple committees and make decisions about dividing up activities among committees.
2. Identify and formulate issues about goals arising from inside or outside the department. Bring back to Steering Committee.
3. Recommend the allocation of resources for committee work.

Coordinate Departmental Routines.
1. Set agenda for Faculty Meetings.
   a. Set dates for routine business (e.g., PRT, Admissions, post-tenure review, Graduate Student Evaluations, etc.).
   b. Schedule Faculty Meetings to discuss important topics or to review policy recommendations from Committees.
   c. Include agenda item “New Business” so faculty members can add brief items to the agenda during a meeting.
2. Schedule slots for Committee Meetings.
   a. Steering Committee Meetings are scheduled approximately once a month from September 16 through June 15.
   b. Schedule additional committee meetings as needed.
3. Set up system for communicating information outside of Faculty Meeting times.
Roles and Responsibilities of the Department Chair and Associate Chair

Eligibility, Selection, and Review of Chair and Associate Chair
(For more detail, see the PRT Guidelines.)

The Chair and Associate Chair are chosen from the ranks of the tenured faculty. The election of a new Chair is held spring term during the current Chair’s second year of each term of office. The Chair serves a three-year term and may serve a maximum of two terms in a row. The Associate Chair is selected by the Chair, with the general expectation that the Chair-elect will serve as the Associate Chair during the year before the Chair-elect assumes office. After the fourth quarter of the Chair’s appointment, the faculty review the performance of the Chair.

The Chair and Associate Chair coordinate their roles so that all the responsibilities listed below are jointly covered. The responsibilities that can be fulfilled only by the Chair include: (1) budgetary authority; (2) personnel matters; (3) hiring faculty, adjuncts, graduate students, and staff; (4) assigning teaching responsibilities to faculty; and (5) specific role in Promotion, Retention, and Tenure processes.

Responsibilities of the Chair

Provide leadership
1. Provide leadership, along with the Associate Chair, Department Manager, and Steering Committee:
   - To ensure smooth departmental functioning and progress toward improving the department as an organizational and social community that promotes high quality teaching, learning, and academic and professional development.
   - To help guide the department in making progress towards its overall mission and in identifying its current high priority goals.
   - To help anticipate, prevent, and deal effectively with problems, friction, and setbacks arising from both internal and external challenges.
2. Advocate for the Department, its Programs, Faculty, Students, and Staff to the Dean and the rest of the University.
3. Participate in All Chairs meetings convened by the Dean with the other Chairs and Directors from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as well as the Small Chairs meetings convened by the Associate Dean, and communicate university affairs and issues to faculty and staff.

Ensure fairness, transparency, and good communication
1. Ensure that all departmental functions, policies, and procedures are carried out in a manner that is transparent, fair, and in accord with the letter and spirit of university and faculty guidelines.

2. Make equitable and informed decisions about the department’s SCH goals, class sizes, and allocation of Teaching Assistants; if required, assign faculty teaching.

3. Ensure that faculty, graduate students, and staff are involved in and informed about departmental policy- and decision-making.

4. Ensure that departmental decisions and policies are informed by accurate internal data and by evidence and experience from relevant units inside and outside PSU.

**Manage fiscal resources in line with departmental goals**

1. Hire faculty, staff, graduate students, adjuncts, and student employees.

2. Manage the Budget in ways that are transparent and fair, and that promote the department’s high priority goals.

3. Oversee the distribution of faculty releases, travel funding, Summer Research Institute funding, and other departmental resources.

**Deal constructively with personnel issues**

1. Supervise the Department Manager and oversee supervision of Office Specialists.

2. Deal with all personnel matters involving faculty, graduate students, adjuncts, and staff.

3. Deal with graduate student concerns about assistantships; or instructor concerns about Teaching Assistants.

4. Provide support for instructors dealing with student threats and concerns.

5. Play specified roles in Steering Committee and PRT reviews.

**Goals and Activities of the Chair and Associate Chair, with regard to Faculty Development**

Approved May 2001 as Faculty Committee goals; revised here to incorporate October, 2009 structural change.

**Goals:** Maintain and improve the quality of the department as a context for professional development of faculty. Maintain and improve the quality of faculty teaching, research, community outreach, and self-governance activities.

**Responsibilities:** Initiate, communicate, facilitate, implement, monitor, and revise departmental policies, procedures, and tracking systems related to faculty activities and self-governance.

**Authority:** The Chair and Associate Chair share the responsibility to make recommendations for policies and procedures concerning faculty activities and self-governance. When these
recommendations have been communicated to and discussed at a Faculty Meeting, they are accepted as policy unless voted down by faculty. (For details, see the section above entitled “Procedures for Developing and Revising Policy”).

Responsibilities of the Chair and Associate Chair with regard to Faculty Development

Facilitate setting policies and procedures for faculty activities.
1. Identify issues that might need policies or procedures.
2. Discuss issues and formulate recommendations.
3. Review and update old policies and procedures.
4. Communicate policies and procedures to faculty (via Faculty Handbook, meetings, memos, and individual consultation).
5. Make sure that policies and procedures are followed.

Coordinate faculty routines.
1. Initiate and monitor self-governance activities (Chair and Associate Chair).
2. Organize orientation of new faculty (Chair, with PRT Chair).
3. Ensure that PRT guidelines and procedures are followed (Chair).

Facilitate setting priorities for faculty activities each year, in light of direction of department.
1. Prepare priority recommendations for faculty activities for discussion at Retreats.
2. Formulate priorities for faculty activities for Strategic Plan.
3. Organize activities to meet goals.
4. Request resources needed to reach goals.
5. Keep list of important goals for future.

Put out (and learn from) fires.
1. Be available to (cheerfully and accurately) answer questions about policies and procedures.
2. Make sure that faculty are included in decision-making.
3. Be available to hear faculty concerns, issues, and complaints.
4. Monitor, detect, and articulate faculty concerns and issues.
5. Bring issues to the Steering Committee for discussion and action.
6. Revise policies as necessary to minimize future problems.

Participate in the construction of departmental systems for tracking and communication of faculty activities.
1. Research: projects, research groups, publications, presentations, meetings.
2. Outreach activities and community participation.
Responsibilities of the Associate Chair

Adopted March 21, 2001; revised to incorporate departmental restructuring of October, 2009.

**Goals:** The faculty as a whole share responsibility for the quality of the undergraduate program and for coordination of the undergraduate experience. The Associate Chair is centrally involved in this arena, providing guidance and leadership to this work.

**Responsibilities:** Initiate, communicate, facilitate, implement, monitor, and revise departmental policies, procedures, tracking systems, and activities related to the Undergraduate Program.

**Authority:** The Associate Chair proposes items to the Steering Committee for discussion. The Steering Committee has the responsibility to make recommendations for policies and procedures concerning the Undergraduate Program. Such recommendations are brought to the faculty as a whole for discussion and consensus or vote.

**Responsibilities with Regard to the Undergraduate Program**

1. **Overview and planning of the undergraduate curriculum**
   a. Establish guidelines and review proposed changes for the requirements for the major.
   b. Identify issues in the scope and range of the undergraduate program, including course offerings.
   c. Establish criteria and guidelines for by-arrangement courses, for example, practica.
   d. Ensure articulation of undergraduate program with the graduate program.
   e. Assure a reasonable number of course offerings at a representative number of days and hours each term.

2. **Oversee undergraduate advising.**

3. **Support the teaching mission of the department.**
   a. Coordinate the Class Schedule, both undergraduate and graduate classes.
   b. Recruit, interview, and identify adjuncts for hire.
   c. Assign Graduate Students to classes as Instructors.
   d. Monitor teaching evaluations and provide feedback to faculty, adjunct, and graduate instructors as needed.
   e. Provide support for instructors dealing with student threats and concerns.
   f. Deal with student complaints about teaching.

4. **Develop, oversee, and prepare reports on the department’s Undergraduate Assessment.**
[UPDATE this with Julie et al.]

Responsibilities of Department Manager and Office Specialists

1. Provide support for the smooth functioning of all the routine activities of the department, including support for the Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate Chair, and PRT Chair as well as the faculty, adjunct, and graduate and undergraduate students.

2. Identify, prioritize, and deal with unforeseen issues as they arise.

Tracking and Information Systems

3. With Department, Associate, and Graduate chairs, facilitate the construction and maintenance of systems for tracking and communication of departmental activities.
   a. Faculty activities, including PRT.
   b. Graduate Program and graduate student activities, including applications of new students.
   c. Undergraduate Program and undergraduate activities.
   d. Revise and update departmental materials (e.g., web page and brochure).
   e. Maintain connection to past faculty and departmental history.

4. Provide departmental members with accurate and timely information to use in problem-solving and making budgetary, program, and activity-based decisions.
Goals and Activities of the Graduate Committee
Adopted March 21, 2001; revised to incorporated departmental restructuring of October, 2009

Goals: Maintain and improve the quality of the graduate program. Maintain and improve the quality of graduate student experience and learning.

Responsibilities: Initiate, communicate, facilitate, implement, monitor, and revise departmental policies, procedures, tracking systems, and activities related to the Graduate Program.

Authority: The Graduate Committee has the responsibility to make recommendations for policies and procedures concerning the Graduate Program. When these recommendations have been communicated to and discussed at a Faculty Meeting, they are accepted as policy unless voted down by faculty. (For details, see the section above entitled “Procedures for Developing and Revising Policy” which governs all committees).

Process: The great majority of work of the Graduate Committee is conducted by the Graduate Chair. For any topic on which the Chair decides full committee input is warranted, or for any topic on which committee members decide fully committee input is warranted, the full Committee mobilizes to address the concern.

Responsibilities of the Graduate Committee

Facilitate setting policies and procedures for the Graduate Program.
1. Formulate recommendations for new policies and procedures.
2. Review and update old policies and procedures.
3. Communicate policies and procedures to faculty and graduate students (via Handbooks, meetings, memos, and individual consultation).
4. Make sure that policies and procedures are followed.

Run Graduate Program routines.
1. Revise and update Graduate Handbook and section in Faculty Handbook on Graduate Committee.
2. Organize new student orientation.
3. Organize recruitment of new applications; update mailing lists and materials.
4. Organize Admissions.
5. Organize evaluation of graduate students.
6. Review and coordinate Graduate curriculum and course offerings.
7. Remind faculty to coordinate scheduling of graduate classes each quarter.

Set priorities for Graduate Committee for each year in light of direction of program.
1. Prepare discussions of direction of Graduate Program for the Retreat.
2. Prepare priority recommendations for faculty discussion at Fall Retreat.
3. Formulate priorities for Graduate Committee for Strategic plan.
4. Organize activities to meet goals.
5. Request resources needed to reach goals.
6. Keep list of important goals for future.

Put out (and learn from) fires.
1. Be available to (cheerfully and accurately) answer all questions of graduate students and faculty about policies and procedures.
2. Make sure that graduate students are included in decision-making as appropriate.
3. Be available to graduate students to hear concerns, issues, and complaints.
4. Detect, monitor, and articulate issues about Graduate Program.
5. Bring pertinent issues to the full Graduate Committee for consideration.
6. Revise policies as necessary to minimize future problems.

Participate in the construction of departmental systems for tracking and communication of graduate program.
1. Current and future curriculum offerings at the graduate level.
2. Current graduate student progress in the program.
3. Current and former graduate student accomplishments and participation in community settings.
4. Current and former graduate student activities and employment (community settings, other graduate schools, jobs).
## Overview of Timeline for Carrying Out Routine Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering</strong></td>
<td>Review Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Review Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Review Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Revise Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>Organize Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>Organize Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>Plan Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schedule for Fall</td>
<td>schedule for Winter</td>
<td>schedule for Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review committee membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT</strong></td>
<td>Organize faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select incoming PRT chair</td>
<td>Update PRT Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct PRT reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare lists for letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Post-Tenure reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solicit external letters for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>upcoming PRT reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Just-Prior</strong></td>
<td>In some years only: Notify Chair of review</td>
<td>In some years only: Conduct Chair Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Chair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate</strong></td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Complete admissions</td>
<td>Update Grad Student Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student evaluation</td>
<td>Update Graduate procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair and</strong></td>
<td>New faculty orientation</td>
<td>Teaching evaluations</td>
<td>Teaching evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair</strong></td>
<td>Assign graduate students to assistanship</td>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching evaluations</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT Reviews (Chair)</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-tenure reviews (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Select interviewees</td>
<td>Interview candidates</td>
<td>Select chair</td>
<td>Advertise position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meet with ODE</td>
<td>Schedule meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# OVERVIEW: DEPARTMENTAL PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEERING</td>
<td>Retreat Committee/ initiative membership Schedule faculty meetings</td>
<td>Conduct reviews</td>
<td>Conduct reviews</td>
<td>Applications due Dec 15</td>
<td>Review initiatives Schedule faculty meetings</td>
<td>Third year reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Organize faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>New student ORIENTATION</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Review applications Short lists</td>
<td>Visiting Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural OPE</td>
<td>BUDGET planning Course grid Budget request</td>
<td>Meet with Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE SCHEDULE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring due</td>
<td>Plan COURSES for next year</td>
<td>Plan Summer</td>
<td>Summer due</td>
<td>Fall due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW FACULTY ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>Schedule search and faculty meetings</td>
<td>Short list Select interviewees</td>
<td>Conduct interviews</td>
<td>Conduct interviews Make offers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEERING</td>
<td>Review initiatives Schedule faculty meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Chair’s Third Year Decide about promotion(s) to Full</td>
<td>Select incoming PRT Chair</td>
<td>Prepare lists for letters Send out packets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan RETREAT Revise Faculty Handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>Manage offers Complete admissions Plan SRI</td>
<td>Celebrate our successes Evaluations</td>
<td>Revise handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>Meet with Dean Budget finalized</td>
<td>Fifth year students Fixed-terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE SCHEDULE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINALIZE AD Select committee</td>
<td>Distribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit classes Conduct</td>
<td>Conduct Complete Analyze Write up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DARK = beginning of process
STEERING COMMITTEE:
Procedures for Carrying Out Routine Activities

1. Organizing the **Retreat**: Facilitating the formulation and implementation of **Strategic Initiatives**.
   - Example of an Agenda for Retreat.
   - Example of the Outcomes of a Retreat.
   - Example of a Strategic Plan.

2. Revising and updating the Steering Committee section of the **Faculty Handbook**.

3. Coordinating and facilitating the activities of the **Standing Committees**.

4. Coordinating **Departmental Routines**.

5. Organizing the **Election of the Chair**.

6. Organizing the **Review of Department Chair Performance**.

7. Principles for **Merit Raises**.
1. Organizing the Retreat: Facilitating the formulation and implementation of the Strategic Initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for: Organizing the Retreat to facilitate the formulation and implementation of the Strategic Initiatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughout year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is to see that the high priority activities of the department are identified and implemented. The routine activities of the Standing Committees are high priorities. In addition, departmental goals that reflect the desired future of the department are articulated, prioritized, and implemented. The primary vehicle for the description of future priorities are the Strategic Initiatives, which are identified at the Faculty Retreat. The Retreats in turn are based, among other things, on Committee Meetings in which the future directions of each of the program areas are discussed and articulated.

1. Organizing Faculty Retreats. The Steering Committee is responsible for organizing the faculty retreat. A retreat is scheduled in order to update, reconsider, or recommit to departmental priorities.

   The Steering Committee, in consultation with the other faculty, selects a date and time for the Retreat. Typically, a full day near the beginning of the Fall quarter is scheduled off campus. The Steering Committee develops the agenda for the Retreat, including the opportunity for each Committee to speak about its vision and for faculty to speak...
individually about their own visions for the Department. The Steering Committee also facilitates the Retreat and takes notes for the writing or updating of the Strategic Initiatives.

2. **Monitoring the Strategic Initiatives and making sure priorities are met.** Every year, the Steering Committee refers to the Strategic Initiatives in considering and integrating the goals and activities of the department, including the Chair and Associate Chair, the Steering Committee itself, the Standing Committees, any ad hoc committees or work groups, graduate students, and staff. If high priority activities cannot be taken care of by existing units (e.g., Committees or work groups), then the Steering Committee can form work groups or committees to work on these priorities. It is also important, however, for the Steering Committee to consider the overall workload of the department in deciding whether to take on activities that are not identified as high priorities by the Standing Committees.

3. **Fielding new initiatives.** The Steering Committee is responsible for facilitating decisions about which new activities (from university or college initiatives, professional opportunities, local activities, etc.) to take on as a department and which not to. Especially in cases in which Standing Committees decline to replace existing activities with new ones, the Steering Committee may introduce new departmental priorities. It is important to achieve active endorsement, even if not consensus, in the department that a new activity is important and feasible before committing to it.
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Example of an agenda for Retreat.

Retreat 2014: Focus on the Three R’s: Re-new, Re-visit, Re-align

OVERARCHING GOAL: Following a time of cuts and a focus on constraints from above, we take the opportunity of the expanding possibilities created by the new Interim Dean to:

- **Re-new** our commitment to our own departmental mission, values, and priorities.
- **Re-visit** our constraints and decide which ones to re-work to better serve our mission.
- Organize our initiatives so we can **re-align** those constraints over the coming year.

*Note:* The goal of the Retreat is to *select* issues for reconsideration over the coming year, not to actually re-work them at the Retreat.

AGENDA:

10:00-10:15 **Greetings and overview of the day:** Year(s) in review and perspective on the new possibilities ahead (Ellen). Questions. Setting intentions.

10:15-11:20 **Focus on our overarching Mission: Applied psychology** (Rob)
  - What issues do we want to reconsider over the coming year?
  - What message do we want to send to the larger community?
  ✓ Possible issues and messages up on white board.

11:30-12:25 **Focus on Doctoral program: High quality training** (Todd)
  - What issues do we want to reconsider over the coming year?
  - What message do we want to send to the larger community?
  ✓ Possible issues and messages up on white board.

**LUNCH:** Highlights of working with UGs, teaching, challenges. Small expression of big appreciation for Sherwin.

1:00-1:45 **Focus on UG program: High quality program** (Eric)
  - What issues do we want to reconsider over the coming year?
  - What message do we want to send to the larger community?
  ✓ Possible issues and messages up on white board.

1:45-2:20 **Focus on CLAS: Potential reorganization** (Sherwin)

Break.

2:30-3:35 **Focus on self-governance: What is the least amount we can manage?**
(Ellen)

- Select issues to reconsider over the coming year.
- Select messages to send to the larger community.

✓ Committee membership on white board.

3:45-4:00  **Review of day:** Intentions, experiences, and feedback.
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**Example of Retreat Outcomes**

**Staffing of Self-Governance and Initiatives**

**Psychology, Fall 2014 v.3**

**Chair**: Ellen  **Associate Chair**: Eric  **Graduate Chair**: Todd  **PRT Chair**: Thomas

**Human Subjects**: unstaffed

**Psi Chi adviser**: Keith Kaufman

**Hugo DuCoudray Scholarship**: Keith Kaufman

**Steering Committee**: Ellen, Eric, Todd, Andy, Donald

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Representation</th>
<th>AS&amp;C</th>
<th>I-O</th>
<th>Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Andy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad Committee</strong></td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External area rep</strong></td>
<td>Keith K.</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., grad questions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal area rep</strong></td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Andy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initiatives 2014**

**Grad committee**: (alternative comps and more): Todd (Chair), Greg, Joel, Kerth, Charlotte

1. **UG Pathways** (implement UG certificate(s) with advising office, departmental materials and website; finalize and implement undergraduate curricular pathways into advising materials; finalize departmental communication regarding supervision of honors students; submit new course proposals to UG curriculum committee; recommend to faculty distinction between 300 and 400 level courses): Thomas, Donald, Eric

2. **Cultural Diversity** (develop initiatives/forum to advance best practices leading to a culturally aware and skilled department faculty, graduates – including teaching, mentoring, training, hiring and research practices): Kim, Charlotte, Sherwin, Joel, Kerth

3. **Edith Sullivan Colloquium** (develop a series of Edith Sullivan colloquium speakers that is integrated thematically across areas; include a faculty proseminar on alternating weeks that includes works-in-progress talks to build intellectual community; reduce faculty meeting time to allow space for faculty to attend talks across areas; possible mechanisms for grad or UG credit to participate): Ellen, Liu-Qin, Eric, Rob
4. **Master’s program** (research and develop possible recommendation to faculty for a terminal master’s degree program and curriculum; program would be w/o funding, or tenure lines but would increase enrollments and enable more graduate courses to be taught and to generate additional streams of revenue for department): Donald, Sherwin
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Example of a Strategic Plan

Strategic Plan
Department of Psychology, Portland State University
Approved June 11, 2008

Galvanizing theme: Quality research, graduate training, and undergraduate education that is use-inspired, aiming to make a difference by strengthening the workplaces, schools, and communities where people live and work.

Preamble

The Department of Psychology undertook a year-long process in 2007-8 to develop a new strategic plan, in light of the changing environment both internal and external to the Department. Following several years of dedicated work and resource commitment to develop and implement our new Ph.D. program in Applied Psychology, we realized we needed to refocus our energy and clarify our direction. This effort to re-envision ourselves was aimed both at sharpening the ongoing work of the Department and at creating space to pause and reflect on new opportunities and challenges. The process included a series of meetings involving a range of formats and faculty, including a foundational faculty retreat (9-18-07), subcommittee meetings to extract themes (9-26-07, 10-3-07), and subsequent faculty meetings that brainstormed activities (10-10-07) and clarified values (12-12-07). At each step, results of the meetings were referred back to faculty for feedback and elaboration. Multiple Steering Committee meetings were used to synthesize and prioritize departmental vision and goals, and to compare them with college and university priorities. The involvement of all faculty at points throughout this process has led to a strategic plan that the Steering Committee hopes will unify the Department’s energy toward achieving the goals it articulates. As a complement to these dynamically prioritized goals, a new self-governance structure is being developed as a way to create needed resources and energy to tackle the goals.

Overview of the Psychology Department

As a department, we focus on Applied Psychology, which emphasizes the critical study of the role of individual and interpersonal processes in social issues and problems. We value programmatic research that yields rich information through intensive study in close collaboration with community partners. We advocate work with under-served populations. We encourage diverse methods of inquiry which account for the complexity of human action and thought, and how it is affected at multiple levels by different social settings.

We provide an undergraduate program for over 900 majors in which we aim to offer rigorous instruction, community-based learning, and opportunities to work closely with faculty on applied research. Our doctoral program in Applied Psychology currently serves more than 60 active graduate students who come from all over the
world. Our faculty have obtained several million dollars in external grant funding in the last five years to support research, graduate training, and undergraduate initiatives. We cooperate with other colleagues locally, especially from PSU's Business School, School of Social Work, and Graduate School of Education, and OHSU. Faculty have also established working relationships with institutions internationally, especially in China, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Viet Nam. We work collaboratively with dozens of community partners, including public institutions, private industry, schools, non-profit organizations, and loosely affiliated groups.

We accomplish these activities with 18 full-time faculty, 2.5 staff members, and a cadre of dedicated and talented part-time faculty. We operate on a modest budget, with most of us significantly underpaid relative to colleagues at comparable institutions. As an organization, the department seeks to create and sustain a vibrant intellectual community in which all members, including full and part-time faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, staff, and community partners, thrive. With high external pressures and scarce resources, it is a continual challenge to build a truly sustainable environment of our own in which our organizational practices are geared to achieving high priority goals while conserving human resources in a humane environment.

**Purpose and Context of Our Strategic Plan**

The creation of a Strategic Plan is an opportunity to, as a group, name and prioritize our commitments to the many constituencies we serve and to our own intellectual growth. It is also an opportunity to pause and imagine new ideas and new forms they can take in the future. Of necessity, we focus much of our effort on maintaining and improving the quality of our graduate and undergraduate programs and our own scholarship. However, we can undertake a few carefully chosen new initiatives. These initiatives may enfold new duties and responsibilities, but they should be selected because of their potential to support our central purpose—examining the role of human thought and action in solving social problems. Equally important is that the initiative enlivens, engages, and renews our community.

The environment within which we operate includes the following forces that seem most salient to us. These forces represent a combination of opportunities, demands, and threats:

- **Interdisciplinary focus.** PSU emphasizes community partnerships and student engagement, sustainability, and innovative scholarship contributing to solutions for regional, national, and international problems. These emphases move beyond disciplinary boundaries and foster interdisciplinary thinking. As a science of human mind and action, psychology is central and potentially mightily instrumental in all of
these emphases. At the same time, within psychology, sub-disciplinary specialties continue to drive student and faculty choices and work. Without Systems Science as a unifying theme, there is increasing tension between area specialties and the logic of interdisciplinary approaches to problems.

- **Growth and resources.** Expectations for growth in enrollment and in research dollars continue in an environment where both project resources and faculty salaries are inadequate. Relentless demands partnered with inadequate recognition and threats of budget cuts diminish both the capacity and the spirit of faculty. The support for new faculty hires, the hiring of a new grants support person, increased accounting support from the Dean’s office, and support of the Summer Research Institute do not offset the above, but they do increase research infrastructure and chances for smoother grant operations and greater grant-getting success.

- **National and international competition.** With the launching of an independent Ph.D., the department has entered a different arena of competition where resources to attract and retain both faculty and students are more critical. At the same time, the new doctoral program and faculty success in getting grants and playing national leadership roles bring visibility and recognition, increasing our competitiveness.

- **Space.** Space is a continuing university and departmental constraint. At the same time, there is considerable capital investment supported both by state dollars and private funds.

- **Assessment.** The expectations for formal assessment of student learning is growing nationally, translated through regional accrediting agencies into accreditation reviews contingent on formal evidence of student learning. While the university has tried to provide process support, dollars to do the work are not distributed to departments. At the same time, meaningful assessment of the psychology program can lead to improvement.

- **Technological advances.** PSU has a student body for whom technology is a way of life and who, on the whole, are as interested in efficiency in learning aimed at practical ends as faculty are interested in organizational efficiencies that enable their focus on research and teaching. Although not universal, the general acceptance of technology in the lives of students and a practical career orientation among many students provides chances for different learning formats and a break with the traditional quarter and classroom-bound format.

- **Faculty profiles.** We have a departmental faculty that, in addition to the achievements of its more senior members, has capable, active junior faculty with dynamic research programs and early success in grant-getting, a grasp of and commitment to community engagement, and considerable enthusiasm for teaching.
Careful consideration of the multiple roles for faculty and their varying developmental trajectories creates the opportunity to think creatively about the distribution of faculty leadership and service responsibilities.

**Overarching Priorities and Goals**

In preparing this Strategic Plan, we have decided to identify areas and strategies for further growth and improvement, with special attention to ideas that invigorate us. However, given our thin resources and fluctuating external conditions, we have decided to adopt a flexible plan of execution, in which each spring we select one initiative upon which we will concentrate our efforts in the coming year, remaining cognizant of our many important ongoing responsibilities and staying open to emerging opportunities. As depicted in Figure 1, this Strategic Plan (1) articulates the foundational priorities of the department, (2) identifies general directions and goals for improvement, and (3) lays out a strategy of self-governance that allows us to select and realize those goals. At the same time, we must continue to reflect on the effectiveness of our choices and strategies, and stage our (re)assessments over time so results can be considered and improvements made in priority areas. Supplementing the plan is a list of specific activities that are the results of brainstorming sessions for each goal. These would be scrutinized more closely and concretized at the time that we decide to implement a given goal.

**Ongoing Foundational Priorities**

**Priority 1.** To improve our capacity to carry out research and outreach in applied psychology.
- Create and encourage forums to exchange ideas on key features of carrying out high quality research in community settings.
- Create opportunities for sharing and acquiring methodological expertise.
- Create structures that protect and promote our scholarship, such as a Center for Social and Community Action Research/Coalition for Applied Research in the Community.

**Priority 2.** To encourage and sustain learning communities that spontaneously coalesce around important topics of passionate interest to clusters of faculty and students, such as occupational health psychology, developmental science and education, and applied research methodologies.
- Create ongoing intellectual conversations in which these topics can bubble up.
- Foster collaborations among interested faculty and graduate and undergraduate students within and across areas.
- Support relationships with faculty outside of psychology and with community partners.
- Offer opportunities to learn about the activities, goals, and plans of these clusters.
Strategic Goals

**Goal 1.** To offer an undergraduate program well supported by an emphasis on improving student learning through skilled teaching and a strong advising system.
- Offer opportunities for full and part-time faculty, and graduate instructors to mentor and learn from each other about teaching.
- Create sequences and concentrations of courses for undergraduates that enable increasing comprehension of psychological specialties as well as career planning.
- Provide multiple opportunities for participation in research projects.
- Provide strong advising in multiple formats at appropriate turning points.

**Goal 2.** To work with graduate students in an apprenticeship model as junior colleagues.
- Create a developmentally-sequenced program that challenges students to learn how to do high quality applied research.
- Foster close collaboration with faculty, research teams, and community partners in research.
- Institutionalize opportunities for grad students to plot their own individual career trajectories.
- Support a strong peer community among graduate students across many generations.

**Goal 3.** To create closer ties to practitioners, community partners, and national and international colleagues and institutions.
- Promote undergraduate engagement in the community, e.g., by creating a faculty position to more systematically coordinate these activities.
- Foster cross-institutional and cross-cultural research collaborations.
- Promote the exchange of faculty and students.
- Create institutional partnerships.
Figure 1: 2008 Strategic Plan Priorities and Overarching Goals

Goal 1
To offer an undergraduate program well supported by an emphasis on improving student learning through skilled teaching and a strong advising system.

Goal 2
To work with graduate students in an apprenticeship model as junior colleagues.

Goal 3
To create closer ties to practitioners, community partners, and national and international colleagues and institutions.

Foundational Priority 1.
To improve our capacity to carry out research and outreach in applied psychology.

Foundational Priority 2.
To encourage and sustain learning communities that spontaneously coalesce around important topics of passionate interest to clusters of faculty.
2. Revising the Steering Committee section of the Faculty Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Revisions to the Faculty Handbook:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Steering Committee ensures that the Faculty Handbook is accurate and up-to-date. The Handbook should contain every policy governing Faculty that is currently in force. It is also important to correct any mistakes or discrepancies that are discovered in the Handbook.

Main Office staff revise the Faculty Handbook once a year, adding new policies and removing (or correcting the description of) old policies. Revisions take place during the summer, so that an updated version of the Handbook can be posted and available for new faculty in the Fall. Main Office staff notify faculty of the handbook’s location—either a link or on the Department’s shared computer drive.

1. **Making revisions.** The Steering Committee is in charge of reviewing the section in the Faculty Handbook about the Steering Committee and providing updates or revisions as needed.

2. **Providing feedback about revisions.** The Steering Committee may be asked to proof-read and edit any revisions to the sections of the Faculty Handbook on the Steering Committee.
3. Coordinating and Facilitating the Activities of the Standing Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>for: Coordinating and facilitating the activities of the Standing Committees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Revisit Strategic Initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request priorities from committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize Faculty Meeting on priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divide up responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Monitor progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer problem-solving and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field new priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Review progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Steering Committee is responsible for coordinating departmental activities as they are carried out by the Chair and Associate Chair, the Standing Committees including the Steering Committee itself, any ad hoc committees or work groups, graduate students, and staff.

1. **Identifying and articulating goals and activities.** Every Fall, the Steering Committee is responsible for requesting the Standing Committees to identify their planned goals and activities for the year. The Steering Committee is also responsible for identifying other units (e.g., work groups or faculty) who are undertaking activities on the department’s behalf. Each of these groups should have clearly articulated goals and activities.

2. **Coordinating activities.** The Steering Committee is responsible for making sure that the profile of departmental goals includes all high priority goals, is reasonable and feasible to accomplish, and has the right people and resources for each activity. It is especially important to reduce redundancy of work and to make sure that all units have access to any previous work or information relevant to their job. The Steering Committee needs to clearly establish who is responsible for what goals and activities and the timelines for those activities.

3. **Monitoring progress.** The Steering Committee is responsible for tracking the progress on high priority goals and offering problem-solving, resources, or help as needed.

4. **Ongoing “Steering”**. The Steering Committee is responsible for continuing with these jobs in an ongoing manner, as new priorities or work groups are started, as the scope of projects becomes clear, or as jobs are completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for: Coordinating Departmental Routines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of their responsibility to coordinate departmental activities, the Steering Committee sets the topics of the Faculty Meeting time slots every quarter (Wednesdays from 2 to 5:00). The Steering Committee also schedules Standing Committee meetings.

1. **Setting the agenda for Faculty Meetings.** The Steering Committee establishes dates for Faculty Meetings around the routine activities of the committees for that quarter (e.g., PRT, graduate admissions, post-tenure review, graduate student evaluations; see the overview at the beginning of this section). In addition, committees or work groups can request time at Faculty Meetings to discuss topics or to review policy recommendations from committees. Faculty Meetings should take place at least once a month (if possible) between September 16 and June 15.

2. **Scheduling Standing Committee Meetings.** In coordination with the Faculty Meeting times, the Steering and PRT meetings are scheduled. The Steering Committee does not typically schedule meetings of the Graduate Committee, in keeping with the Department restructuring of October, 2009.

3. **Scheduling Steering Committee Meetings.** The first Wednesday of the quarter (or the last Wednesday of the prior quarter) should be used for the Steering Committee Meeting that schedules Faculty Meeting slots. In addition, the Steering Committee should meet at least once or twice during the quarter. Usually, the Steering Committee meets from 2:00 to 2:50 on Wednesdays.

4. **Scheduling additional meetings.** During very busy quarters (e.g., Fall quarter when PRT is ongoing), additional time slots are needed for Faculty Meetings. For the most part, these are scheduled on Wednesdays between 2 and 3. So, for example, two meetings may be scheduled – one from 2 to 3:25 and one from 3:35 to 5. This decision will be made at the beginning of the quarter and communicated clearly to other faculty.
5. **Reserving the time slot.** Faculty should always reserve the time on Wednesdays from 2:00 to 5:00 for departmental meetings. No later than 36 hours prior to the Wednesday time slot in question, the Associate Chair sends notice to the faculty how much of this time slot will be needed for departmental meetings.

6. **Communicating the schedule.** The Associate Chair is responsible for distributing the schedule to all faculty and sending out reminders for that weeks’ meetings on Monday.

7. **Communicating about departmental issues outside of Faculty Meeting times.** The Steering Committee is responsible for setting up systems for communicating information outside of Faculty Meeting times.
5. Organizing the Election of the Department Chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Organizing the Election of Department Chair:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall of the current Chair's second year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter of the current Chair's second year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring of the current Chair's second year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year of current Chair's term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The just-prior Department Chair is responsible for organizing the election of the Chair. In addition and more generally the Steering Committee is responsible for making sure that the role and responsibilities of the Chair are clear and carried out by the Chair, and that the transition between Chairs is smooth.

The election of the Chair is described in the PRT Guidelines as follows:

“Department Chair

Eligibility of Chair and Associate Chair. The chair and associate chair are chosen from the ranks of the tenured faculty. The chair serves a three-year term and may serve a maximum of two terms in a row. After that he or she becomes eligible to run after being out of office as long as he or she was in during the last unbroken tenure. There are no other eligibility rules. The election of a new chair is held at the start of the Spring term during the current chair's third year of each term of office.

Selection of Chair and Associate Chair. Each eligible member of the department is asked whether he or she wants to run for chair. An election is held among those agreeing to be candidates. If no candidate receives a majority, the one with the fewest number of votes is eliminated, and a runoff election is held. This process is repeated until a candidate receives an absolute majority. These votes are held by written anonymous ballot. They are collected
over a one week period of time instead of being taken in a meeting. The chair chooses his or her own associate chair.”

1. During the Fall of the current Chair’s second year, the just-prior Department Chair reminds faculty that the Chair-elect will be elected in Spring.

2. In Fall and Winter of the current Chair’s second year, the just-prior Department Chair identifies candidates and encourages them to come forward.

3. If there are any questions about the Chair’s role and responsibilities, these are clarified.

4. Before the spring Faculty Meetings are scheduled, the just-prior Department Chair alerts the Steering Committee to get the election of the Chair-elect on the schedule.

5. The election is held by secret ballot and according to the rules in the PRT guidelines.

6. The Chair-elect becomes the Associate Chair for the current Chair’s third year. This role is explicitly designed to provide training and experience to the Chair-elect.

7. The first year of the new Chair’s term, the previous Chair serves as an advisor to the new Chair. If desired, this can be official, in that the previous Chair can serve as Associate Chair. Alternately, this may happen in an unofficial capacity.
6. Organizing the Review of Department Chair Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Organizing the Review of Department Chair Performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After meeting with Chair</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every two years, the just-prior Department Chair is responsible for organizing the review of the current Department Chair’s performance. If the current Department Chair requests, his or her performance will be reviewed more often.

The review process is intended to convey respect for the importance of the Chair’s role in the life of the Department. Goals of the Chair Review include improving communication between the Chair and the other faculty as a whole; creating opportunities for revisions of the Chair’s role; and providing constructive correctives for the relationships between the Chair, the Committees, and faculty as a whole. Suggestions which emerge from this review may come from the Chair and/or from other faculty. Suggestions may focus on the role of the Chair, the performance of the individual serving as Chair, the Committees, and/or the faculty as a whole.

The Chair Review is conducted as follows.

Fourteen calendar months into a Department Chair appointment, the just-prior Department Chair shall initiate the process of Chair Review. While the just-prior Chair initiates and guides the process, it is the PRT Committee which reviews the performance of the Chair.
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The Chair shall submit a self-assessment, summarizing his or her activities in the role of Chair to date. In addition, the statement should include a brief description of the Chair's vision for the department, and future priorities and plans for activities. The PRT Committee will review this material and review input from junior faculty. Optionally, the PRT Committee may solicit and review input from graduate students.

1. Late in Winter quarter, the just-prior Chair reminds the current Chair that this is a year of the review process.

2. In late Winter quarter, the just-prior Chair asks the Steering Committee to include two Chair Review meetings on the schedule of Spring faculty meetings. The middle of Spring quarter would be the typical timing and the meetings should be two weeks apart. The first meeting is for the PRT committee’s review. The second meeting is for the Chair to meet with the PRT committee after the report has been written.

3. The just-prior Chair informs the Chair that his or her statement is due on May 1. The statement describes the Chair’s accomplishments in that role and his or her self-identified areas for improvement. These can be focused on the Chair himself or herself, the role of the Chair, the Committees, and/or the faculty as a whole.

4. The just-prior Chair reminds the Chair to distribute his or her statement the week before the meeting.

5. As noted, it is the PRT committee which reviews the Chair’s performance.

6. The just-prior Department Chair reacquaints himself or herself with current professional literature on reviewing Department Chair performance.

7. The just-prior Department Chair runs the Chair Review meeting. In general, the meeting starts with a listing of the Chair’s identified strengths and accomplishments. A take home message is identified. Then each faculty member is given an opportunity to speak. The next phase of discussion is focused on surfacing a consensus view about one to three areas for growth, which can refer to any part of the department or university that is affecting the Chair’s functioning.

8. It is especially important for faculty to consider their roles in facilitating the Chair’s success. Reflecting on the consensus view, PRT committee members consider what they are prepared to commit to do to support the success of the Chair.

9. The just-prior Department Chair drafts an internal report to the Chair, which is distributed to faculty. These are each about 2 to 3 pages long. If necessary an additional meeting can be held to discuss how these reports should be revised.
10. The just-prior Chair and the Chair of the PRT Committee together meet briefly with the Chair to present the report personally, and to give the Chair an overview of the sentiment and issues they contain.

11. The Chair meets with the PRT Committee and provides his or her own review of the Department’s work with the Chair, as well as his or her thoughts on the report. This conversation stems from recognition that the role of Department Chair entails roles both of administrator and academic colleague. At the Chair’s option this meeting may be omitted but typically this meeting will be held so that the performance review is mutual.

12. At the next Steering Committee meeting, the Chair discusses his or her suggestions with the other Steering Committee members. Together they may plan changes based on these discussions.

13. After the meeting, the just-prior Chair collects information about how to improve the process for the next year. For example, what worked with this review which, if we do not note, we might forget next year? What mistakes did we make from which we want to learn? The just-prior Chair summarizes these in an e-mail or memo to the PRT committee.

14. The Chair Review process repeats every two years.

15. In any given year of Chair Review, specific tasks of the just-prior Chair may need to be differently delegated. For example, the just-prior Chair may be on sabbatical and another faculty member may need to take on these duties. In the case of a just-prior Chair being on leave from the campus, it is the responsibility of the PRT Committee Chair to ensure delegation and initiation of the Chair Review.
7. Principles for Merit Raises.

It is the responsibility of the Steering Committee to devise a system for distributing merit money that includes the following procedures and criteria:

1. Recommendations about how merit money should be distributed are made by the Department Chair according to procedures agreed upon by the entire department.

2. Recommendations are made in a manner as to consider the entire range of faculty activities (i.e., teaching, mentoring, advising, research, grants, outreach, community and university service, and self-governance activities).

3. Recommendations are formulated in a manner which considers the time period since the last merit increases.

4. Recommendations are made in a manner that compensates for (and does not amplify) inequities in salaries. For example, awards are made in absolute amounts or in higher percentages to faculty with lower salaries. Merit awards are not made across-the-board based on percentage of current salary.
CHAIR and ASSOCIATE CHAIR: Procedures for Carrying Out Routine Activities

1. Initiating and monitoring self-governance activities.
2. Revising the Faculty Handbook.
3. Orienting New Faculty.
5. Hiring, Scheduling, and Evaluating Adjunct Faculty and Graduate Student Instructors.
6. Conducting and monitoring teaching evaluations.
7. Undergraduate Psychology Advising Goals.
9. Guidelines for Working with Undergraduate Students as Teaching Assistants.
10. Resources for Dealing with Student Concerns.
11. Evaluating Requests for Tenured Faculty Service Leave.
12. Descriptors and Ranks: Part-time Faculty and Courtesy Appointments.
1. Initiating and monitoring self-governance activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Initiating and monitoring Self-governance activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty monitor and revise the self-governance activities of the department. This responsibility includes:

1. Making sure that all existing policies and procedures are available to faculty and that they are carried out in accordance with the spirit of the policies.
2. Identifying the need for and making recommendations about additional self-governance policies.
3. Making sure that the Committees are functioning well.
4. Facilitating communication and joint decision-making among all the members of the department (committees, chair and assistant chair, adjunct faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students).
2. Revising the Faculty Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Revisions to the Faculty Handbook:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Throughout previous year | Collect all new policies and procedures.  
|                          | Collect all mistakes or omissions.  
| Spring                  | Request revisions from faculty.  
| Summer                  | Revise Handbook.  
|                        | Identify policy or procedural issues.  
| 2-3 weeks before New Faculty Orientation | Give revisions to Departmental Office Specialist.  
| If revisions are substantial | See that web page is updated.  
| Throughout year | Bring issues for discussion and formulate policies as needed. |

The Department Chair ensures that the Faculty Handbook is accurate and up-to-date. The Handbook should contain every policy governing Faculty that is currently in force. It is also important to correct any mistakes or discrepancies that are discovered in the Handbook.

The Chair revises the Faculty Handbook once a year, adding new policies and removing (or correcting the description of) old policies. Revisions take place during the summer, so that an updated version of the Handbook can be distributed to new faculty at the fall orientation. Some years, when no new policies have been added and no mistakes detected, the Faculty Handbook from the previous year is distributed.

Making revisions. The general steps for a revision include:

1. During the academic year, every time a new policy is approved, it is written up as a memo and distributed to faculty. These memos are saved and the policies incorporated into the next revision.
2. Any errors, inconsistencies, or unclear sections brought to the Committee’s attention are collected, so revisions can resolve them. Sometimes discussion or further policies are needed to clarify past practices.
3. Any policies passed by the University are collected and added.
4. Faculty are requested to submit revisions to the Faculty Handbook.
5. At least one other faculty member should read over revisions to check for clarity and accuracy.
Informing faculty about changes in the Faculty Handbook. One goal of the Faculty Handbook is to help faculty keep up with changes or additions to policy. Therefore, the revisions should make it easy to detect differences to the previous Handbook.

1. The year of the revision appears prominently on the cover of the Faculty Handbook. If colors are used for covers, then a new color is used for each revision.

2. Major additional or revisions to policies are printed in bold face type. This is noted on the cover. Smaller word changes or clarifications do not appear in bold face type.

3. A memo accompanies the Faculty Handbook outlining the major changes from the previous Handbook.

Production of the Handbook. The Departmental Office Specialist is responsible for:

1. Entering the revisions of the Faculty Handbook and preparing the text for printing;
2. Formatting and posting the original;
3. Uploading the new copy to the network folder shared by Department faculty; and
4. Distributing the link.

Distributing the Faculty Handbook. The revised Faculty Handbook is made available to:

1. New faculty at the fall orientation.
2. All faculty; this includes the memo explaining the new policies.
3. The Departmental Office Specialist keeps extra copies of the Faculty Handbook available upon request.
3. Organizing the Orientation of New Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE for Organizing the Orientation of New Faculty:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughout previous year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring/ Summer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upon arrival</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-3 weeks after faculty has arrived.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughout year</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department Chair and PRT Chair organize the orientation of new faculty.

Every new faculty member in the PSU Psychology Department holding a full-time appointment will receive a general orientation to departmental and institutional systems, policies, procedures, and norms. This orientation is general in nature, rather than specific to the PRT process (PRT is addressed in a separate orientation). This general orientation should also include a realistic job preview of the challenges and rewards of the departmental and university-wide institutional climate, demands, and resources. It should begin as early as possible in the first quarter of the new faculty member’s employment; when feasible, starting it prior to the first quarter is ideal. If new faculty members receive an orientation in a timely fashion, it helps them perform well and, therefore, supports the functionality of the entire department. To ensure this, it is expected that a provisional date and time for a first orientation meeting will be decided as soon as possible after hiring negotiations are concluded. Given the volume of information and number of topics, more than one orientation session may be necessary.
The “Adjunct Faculty and Instructor Handbook,” which has been written with new adjunct faculty and instructors as its intended audience, may also benefit new faculty on tenure-related appointments.

List of Recommended Steps for Newly Arriving Faculty Members on Tenure-Related Appointments

These are the very first things that new faculty can do to ease their transition. We also believe you will find the orientation by the PRT Chair and the Department Chair quite worth your while.

Research:
1. If you will need IRB approvals moved over to Portland State as your new institution, visit the Portland State IRB webpage to see IRB application procedures and contact information.
2. If you are going to be supervising graduate students, you will be assigned lab space on the fifth floor. Part of getting yourself established will be finding and/or ordering furniture and equipment, such as desks, tables, and computers, for your lab space. Your area colleagues can help by showing you different ways that labs have been set up. The Department Manager will help you with finding and ordering furniture and equipment.

Teaching:
1. Order books (e.g., www.psubookstore.com) 6-8 weeks prior to the start of classes.
2. Check www.banweb.pdx.edu to be sure your courses are getting students, make sure the course sizes are appropriate for your classes, etc.
3. Check with the Department Manager regarding courses that are scheduled for you to teach in Winter & Spring (coordinate changes with Department Chair and your area colleagues).
4. If you expect to use an Internet component for any Fall courses, contact the Instructional Design team in the PSU Center for Academic Excellence. You will need to be set up as soon as possible on the Portland State intranet known as Desire2Learn (“D2L”).
5. If you expect to use the PSU Reserve Library for any Fall courses, send your requests to them at least a few weeks before the quarter starts:
   http://library.pdx.edu/putoncoursereserves.html
   http://library.pdx.edu/web_forms/course_reserves.php

Administrative items:
1. Secure a Portland State University ID card. This is also your access card to Cramer Hall (south doors) when Cramer Hall is locked.
2. Receive your staff ID# from Human Resources.
3. Get a Portland State University library sticker; get a Portland State bus pass or parking pass; set up your Portland State FlexCar account.


5. Arrange your Portland State e-mail address.

6. File HR paperwork for payroll checks and, if you so choose, for the 12-month distribution.

7. Inform yourself of health and insurance benefits through HR.

8. Put dates on your calendar for early Fall department Faculty Meetings, university convocation, and the Department’s Fall social gathering (assuming such a gathering will be held this year).

9. In making your holiday plans note the calendar on the Oregon University System (“OUS”) website.

The following issues will be included in New Faculty Orientation as conducted jointly by the Department Chair (and, as needed) the PRT Chair.

Processes and Practices

FACULTY

1. Which department colleagues you go to for what
   a. Area mentor & area colleagues
   b. Chair
   c. Department Manager

2. Retention and Tenure Processes
   a. CLAS guidelines
   b. Department guidelines
   c. Chart of expected review dates (earlier for 3rd year review and tenure review, than for annual reviews)

3. Faculty Roles and Expectations: Self-Governance
   a. Retreat
   b. Standing Committees: How you get on what
      • Steering Committee
      • Graduate Committee
      • Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee
      • Initiatives
   c. Faculty Meetings
      • When, where, norms
      • Hold 2pm-5pm Wednesdays
4. Department Organization
   a. Role of Chair & Associate Chair
   b. Role of Steering Committee
   c. Role of Main Office hub: Department Manager & Office specialists
   d. Faculty
      • Tenure-track faculty: Senior and Junior
      • Contributions and roles of teaching faculty
      • Contributions and roles of adjunct faculty
   e. Doctoral program: Applied Psychology
   f. Undergraduate program: Psychology
   g. Area-ness
      • How and whether the areas are organized
      • Faculty unaffiliated with areas
      • Methods track

5. Faculty Roles and Expectations: Teaching
   a. Teaching load
   b. Targeted Faculty Capacity Releases
   c. Buying off courses
      • Regular rates for external grants: 6.6% of salary
      • Flat rates for internal grants, e.g., Faculty enhancement Grants
   d. Office hours
      • 1 hr. per week per course
      • Office hours begin when contract begins
   e. Curriculum
      • Undergraduate “skeleton”
      • Graduate “matrix”
      • How are changes made

6. Roles within the wider University
   a. University/Departmental Awards/Grant Monies:
      • Research
      • Travel
   b. University Faculty Roles:
      • University committees
      • Collective bargaining unit, optional membership
      • Faculty Senate
      • Five-year academic calendar at Oregon University System website

DOCTORAL PROGRAM
1. Graduate Chair, Graduate Committee, Graduate Handbook
2. Apprenticeship model
   a. Admitted to work with specific faculty
b. Flexibility to move
  c. Vertical teams

3. Graduate application and selection
   a. When it takes place, where the materials are
   b. How decisions are made about how many students to take and who gets students.

4. Moving through the program
   a. Five-year program (four if entering with a completed Master’s thesis)
   b. Timely progress norms
   c. Departmental, grant funding
   d. Positions that our students take: Academic, Research, Organizations

5. Graduate curriculum
   a. Program requirements
   b. Area curriculum
   c. Comprehensive exams
   d. Practica & internships

6. Theses and dissertations:
   a. Who's invited
   b. What's expected of faculty not on committees
   c. Distribution of proposals and products

**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM**

1. Working with TAs:
   a. What the expectations are for grad TAs and the range of
   b. Ways in which faculty use TA time
   c. TA responsibilities agreement form
   d. Form for evaluating TA performance

2. Undergraduate advising:
   a. What do you know, how do you learn it
   b. When do you start it
   c. How much time are you expected to devote
   d. Departmental advisor

3. Student organizations:
   a. Who's in charge
   b. What organizations do
   c. Where it's appropriate/necessary to have student representation and involvement

**II. Operational Issues**

1. Keys:
   a. Define all keys needed at first
   b. Submaster key opens all Psychology 3rd floor offices
2. Faculty office locations:
Offices that open up are offered to faculty members in the order of their length of time as faculty in the Department

3. Who does what in the departmental office and whom it’s appropriate to ask to do what, and when:
   a. Copying
   b. Other tasks
   c. Role of work-study students; to whom they report
   d. Reasonable turnaround time for tasks and who decides?
   e. Mailing, both on campus and off (postage, packages, both receiving and sending)

4. Access and information via Psychology shared network drive

5. Departmental automated listserv

6. Supplies:
   a. Where they are
   b. How to order them
   c. When taking the last, notify the Department Office Specialist

7. Book ordering/Course materials preparation:
   a. Sources
   b. Timing
   c. Off campus packet preparation
   d. Copyright guidelines:
   e. Norms for student expense: Cost of texts?
   f. Additional materials fees
   g. Overheads
   h. Copying
      a. what should be in packets for which students pay?
      b. what materials is it reasonable for faculty to produce?
         • syllabus
         • tests
         • other handouts?
         • Roster preparation

8. Conference or meeting rooms:
   a. Where they are
   b. How to schedule them
   c. How to unschedule them

9. Classroom parameters and supplies:
   a. When to define them
   b. To whom you define them
c. Classroom characteristics
   • moveable seats
   • technological capacity
d. VCR and DVD procedures, location

10. Class scheduling:
   a. Class schedule structure – anticipate far ahead
   b. Issues in scheduling class times
      • overlap
      • student demand
      • maximizing enrollment
      • required/electives
      • coordinate actively with relevant other faculty (not only area defined, e.g., methods courses in a given quarter)
c. Summer is on a different budget
   • Many scheduling issues are similar, but operationalize differently for Summer Session

11. Graduate student operational matters:
   a. October meeting with each graduate student advisee
   b. Norms for photocopying and printing of thesis and course material (graduate students must use lab quotas for these)
c. Norms for fifth floor research focus
d. Graduate Office forms to monitor graduate progress
e. Departmental forms for working with TAs, RAs

12. Financial:
   a. How reimbursements happen
   b. Department credit card
      ✓ Where to use it
      ✓ How to use it
      ✓ Items acceptable to charge; amount limits

13. Phone/Fax:
   a. Long distance code
   b. How local system works, e.g., messages, group messages
   c. It is possible to forward phone messages to Thunderbird e-mail.

| TIMELINE for Search Committees and Initial Discussions Toward New Hires: |
|---|---|
| **Previous Spring** | Identify positions to be filled.  
Discuss nature of position.  
Identify search committee and chair.  
Consult Office of Diversity and Equity on ad and recruitment plans.  
Draft ad and circulate in department. |
| **Summer** | Prepare ads for circulation.  
Disseminate position widely.  
Post position on our website. |
| **Early Fall** | Set up schedule for search process and interviews.  
Continue recruitment efforts.  
Discuss criteria for selection of short list.  
Identify committee advisor from Office of Diversity and Equity. |
| **Late Fall** | Meet and create short list.  
Conduct phone interviews.  
Distribute short list.  
Discuss and decide whom to interview. |
| **Winter** | Schedule interviews.  
Hold interviews.  
Collect additional information.  
Make preliminary decisions about offers.  
Make final decisions about offers.  
Make offers. |
| **As needed** | Make decisions about more interviews. |
| **Late Winter** | Thank interviewees and inform about final decision.  
Send thank you/decline letters to all other candidates. |

The Department Chair is responsible for initiating discussion about new hires and for making sure that a search committee is formed in a timely manner. The Chair and Search Committee are jointly responsible for ensuring that search procedures are followed which are fair and transparent, especially with respect to decisions about whom to interview, to whom to make offers, and the terms of the new academic contracts.

1. In the Spring, any positions to be filled the next year should be identified. A portion of a Faculty Meeting is dedicated to discussing the nature of position. At this time the Search Committee Chair and, if possible, committee members are also identified. The committee decides whether and how to include graduate students in the search process.
2. The Search Committee drafts a position description (example descriptions are in Appendices to this section of the Handbook). The committee consults APA guidance on academic hiring, such as may be found at the APA website, and consults early with the university’s Office of Diversity and Equity regarding the position description and recruitment plans. The committee circulates the position description to other department faculty (and if needed, to relevant people outside the department whose opinions about how the position should best be described are valued).

3. After the position description is finalized, the Search Committee Chair prepares the ads for circulation. The position description is shared widely. It is posted on our departmental website. It is sent to relevant colleagues and departments via email and posted to relevant list serves.

4. Throughout the summer and fall, the committee and other faculty continue recruitment efforts. Committee members work closely with the committee advisor(s) from the Office of Diversity and Equity to actively recruit members of underrepresented groups.

5. In early Fall, the committee chair attends the first Steering Committee meeting to set up the schedule for the search process and interviews. Usually,
   a. a portion of a faculty Meeting is scheduled to discuss the criteria for selection of the short list.
   b. one meeting is scheduled for the discussion of the short list and decisions about whom to interview
   c. one meeting is scheduled as a backup if additional time is needed to make decisions.

6. The Search Committee includes an advisor from the Office of Diversity and Equity in its committee meetings. This means planning the meetings in advance so that the committee advisor’s schedule is included in committee plans.

7. The Department Office Specialist receives applications and organizes the files. The Department Office Specialist communicates with the applicants when their files are not complete.

8. The Search Committee meets to discuss the criteria for selecting applicants to interview. These criteria are distributed to faculty and discussed and approved during a Faculty Meeting.

9. The committee meets to discuss applicants and to create a short list of about 8 to 10 candidates.

10. The short list is distributed to faculty.
11. After getting approval from the Office of Diversity and Equity, the committee does preliminary telephone interviews. At that time candidates are told of the nature of the position and the salary range, and are asked a set of standard questions (an example set of questions is included as an Appendix to this section of the Handbook). This information is brought back to the faculty during discussions about whom to interview.

12. The telephone interview may be held using webcams and videoconferencing software if the Search Committee believe it is appropriate. However, (a) all interviewees must be alerted by e-mail well enough ahead of time that this is the plan, and, (b) if one interview is conducted this way all must be conducted this way.

13. At a Faculty Meeting, the Search Committee presents the candidates along with information from the telephone interviews. Faculty are reminded of the criteria previously approved. Faculty discuss and decide whom to interview. Votes are by secret ballot. A second Faculty Meeting may be needed to reach a good decision.

14. The Department Chair and/or Search Committee chair remind faculty of the eligibility criteria for voting on the eventual hiring decision. The Department Chair schedules the interviews according to candidates’ preferences, following our initial schedule as much as possible. In general, interviews take place during the last three weeks of January. After the interviews are scheduled, the meeting to make a decision about an offer is scheduled. A back-up meeting is also scheduled for this decision. This schedule is circulated to faculty.

15. The Department holds interviews. Details about this process TBA from Search Committee experts.

16. The Department Chair and/or Search Committee Chair sets up a system to track faculty attendance at colloquia and hence their eligibility to vote.

17. After each interview, the Search Committee collects questions that may have arisen about the candidate. As needed, the committee may call the candidate or his or her references to collect additional information.

18. At the scheduled Faculty Meeting, decisions are made about an offer. The Search Committee presents any additional information they have collected. Each faculty member has the opportunity to give his or her opinion about the candidates.

19. Faculty eligibility to vote is clarified using the Policies for Eligibility to Vote for Faculty Hires that were approved January 9, 2002. These are:

**Policy:** Faculty can participate in votes that involve a candidate, only if:
1. they have attended (or viewed a videotape of) that candidate’s colloquia from the beginning of the talk to the end of the question and answer session; and
2. They have participated in all the formal faculty discussions involving that candidate.

Exceptions to the eligibility rules. The group can accept votes from faculty who do not participate in all formal post-interview discussion, when:

a. Meetings are scheduled outside of normal days of operation (e.g., on Saturday or during break);

b. Faculty are called away unexpectedly (are sick or have an emergency); or

c. Faculty from the area of the hire are ineligible for good reasons.

In controversial situations, faculty can vote about the exceptions.

Additional supportive policies:

• Videotaping. When a candidate’s colloquium is videotaped, the colloquia for all candidates for that faculty position are also videotaped. All candidates are informed of the videotaping prior to their visit.

• Tracking. If any attendance criteria are used, a system should be put in place to keep track of which faculty members fulfill the criteria and so are eligible to vote. Either the Department Chair or the Search Committee chair presents the voting criteria again at the beginning of the Faculty Meeting before discussion begins.

• Target weeks (and days and times) for interviews should be identified in September and adhered to as much as possible.

20. Sometimes an additional Faculty Meeting is needed to decide to whom an offer should be made. If possible, the remaining candidates should be rank ordered, so that the Chair can make additional offers as needed.

21. The terms of the offer are discussed with faculty, especially if they differ from the standard offer (e.g., with rank or tenure or years toward them). Teaching plans are discussed with faculty from the area.

All letters of offer should include the following departmental values: that faculty research reflect a coherent program of study focused on applied problems, and examining community samples in real life settings.

22. The Department Chair meets with the Dean to get approval to make an offer. The Chair makes the offer. He or she notifies faculty when the offer is made, so that faculty can be in touch with the candidate as appropriate.

23. The Chair keeps faculty informed as events unfold. Additional meetings can be scheduled as needed to decide on additional offers, more interviews, etc.

24. The Chair calls all candidates who interviewed to thank them and let them know about the final decisions.
25. The Search Committee chair makes sure that all applicants receive a letter thanking them and letting them know about the final decision.
Appendix to Search

Example Questions for Telephone Interviews of Job Applicants.

Note: These questions are on the Department’s shared network drive in a format compatible with Microsoft Word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS&amp;C telephone interview questions – as of 11/15/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Kerth O'Brien, search committee chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. (Because you're applying for positions, we think you're probably giving some thought to the characteristics you find desirable in a department and a university.)
   If you could describe an “ideal department,” what would be some of the department’s most important characteristics?

2. [ IF THE APPLICANT HAS AN ACADEMIC POSITION NOW: ]
   Tell me a little bit about why you’re thinking of leaving your current department.

3. Tell me about a time that you had a problem doing research in the community, and how you handled it.
   (If they ask: Examples might be working with community partners, or gaining access to a community sample, but there could be a wide range of problems.)

4. Tell me about where you see your research going from this point.

5. Now about teaching. What are some of the most important issues you've dealt with in teaching graduate or undergraduate students? These could be specific situations, challenges in matching your teaching philosophy to your experience – or whatever you mean by “teaching issues.”

6. We'd like to tell you a little bit about the program and the university, and to see if you have any questions.
   A. The basic course load is 6 courses per year over 3 quarters.
   B. We have a new standalone PhD program in Applied Psychology.
   C. We accept roughly 1 to 2 new grad students per faculty member per year.
      We try to only take as many students as we can fund.
   D. Our three department focus areas are Applied Social & Community, Industrial/Organizational, and Applied Developmental. Within the AS&C area we have two tracks – Applied Social, and Community. For example we have different comps exam processes for the two tracks.
   E. Our time line is tentative but FYI, we hope the Department faculty will decide by mid-December whom to invite to campus; we will have the campus visits in the last half of January; and then we'll be finished by early February.

7. What further questions do you have at this point about us, the job, or the program?

8. Are you still interested in continuing in the process with us?

(Summary comments are in parentheses.)
"Direct quotes are in quotes.
[ Comments from the interviewer are in brackets. ]
RG = Repeated the question
AE = anything else?
5. Hiring, Scheduling, and Evaluating Adjunct Faculty and Graduate Student Instructors

1. Clarifying procedures for hiring and renewing titles and affiliations
   a. Standing ads.
   b. OS2 screens and prepares applications.
   c. Associate Chair identifies
      ✓ Degree and expertise in relevant area.
      ✓ Previously taught the course.
      ✓ Strong teaching evaluations or letters of reference.

2. Procedures for orienting new adjunct faculty.

An “Adjunct Faculty and Instructor Handbook” has been created to help with this. It is located at [LINK].
6. Conducting and monitoring teaching evaluations.

TIMELINE for: Conducting and Monitoring Teaching Evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general</th>
<th>Supervise teaching evaluations. Inform new faculty of evaluation policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every quarter</td>
<td>Distribute evaluation forms. Supervise data analysis. Prepare individual reports. Prepare quarterly departmental reports. Distribute individual reports. Meet with faculty, adjuncts, graduate instructors as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Post-tenure-reviews</td>
<td>Have individual and departmental reports available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For departmental reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout year</td>
<td>Update teaching evaluation forms and policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to see that evaluations of the teaching by all members of the department are conducted, analyzed, and distributed to teachers every quarter. In the recent past, this activity has been conducted by the Associate Chair.

1. Faculty members are required to evaluate all courses each term. Assuming they adhere to policy passed on May 22, 2001, tenured faculty may opt to conduct evaluations using their own format, for some courses, either instead of the general departmental evaluations or in addition to them. The May 22, 2001 policy is as follows:

   “Faculty members are required to evaluate all courses each term. In those courses where the departmental form is not used, faculty should generate their own evaluation process and procedure to get feedback from students. “The Psychology Department form is administered according to the following schedule:

   1. All tenured faculty: evaluate at least two classes annually, including one undergraduate class.
   2. All untenured faculty: evaluate all courses each term.
   3. Adjunct faculty: evaluate all courses first time taught, and then annually.
   4. Graduate students: evaluate all courses every year.”

2. Graduate student assistants are allowed to analyze data on faculty teaching evaluations and prepare quantitative reports. This information is confidential.
3. Evaluation information is available to all faculty. According to policies passed on November 20, 2002:

“Revision of Practices for How Teaching Evaluations are Processed

“a. Graduate students are allowed to analyze the quantitative portion of teaching evaluations and prepare reports. The information would be kept confidential by the graduate students.

“b. Quantitative evaluation information is available to all faculty. At this point, we do not suggest making evaluation information available to graduate or undergraduate students, or to the general public (e.g., on the web), but we will continue to consider this possibility.

“We are further considering how to best make use of the qualitative portion of the evaluations. We are guided by previous policies on this issue from the Teaching Committee.”

4. Course evaluations are to be completed in the last week of classes [4/4/2011: This has since changed to the last two weeks of classes]. The procedures for completing evaluations are explained in a memo, dated March 29, 2000. This memo, or one like it, is distributed to all instructors at least once a year. It is contained in the Handbook appendices.

“Identify a student to administer and collect the course evaluation forms. The student should be instructed to deliver the envelope containing the completed forms to the office administrative staff in the Psychology Department. The course CRN should be written on the blackboard to facilitate students completing that portion of the form. The instructor should leave the classroom while students are completing the course evaluation form.”

5. Forms for tracking teaching evaluations are included in the Handbook appendices.

6. At the end of each quarter, the main office collects the forms and forwards them to Computer Services for analyses. Analysis results contain:
   a. an overview of scores and distributions for the whole department for the specific quarter, and
   b. results separately for each evaluated class (i.e., 400 and 500 level classes are treated as separate classes).

7. The analysis of data from teaching evaluations has taken many different forms over the years. The minimum requirements for a report are described in the same memo cited above:

“Means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions will be obtained for each course. Evaluations for courses listed with more than one CRN (e.g., 500/600) will be combined for a single summary. (Please select one CRN to represent the class.) In addition, means and standard deviations for each item based on course evaluation data from the entire psychology department will be calculated for the academic year.

“The [Chair] will distribute summary reports as well as the original teaching evaluation forms to individual faculty members. The [Chair] will retain copies of the narrative comments. The qualitative information will be used to clarify the quantitative information. The [Chair] will review
the narrative responses when the numerical summary indicates that there may be student concerns about the quality of instruction.”

8. The memo distributed to faculty with the faculty evaluation information (dated June 3, 2003) described the information as follows:

“As part of our new evaluation system, each faculty member, adjunct or lecturer will receive both a general summary report for undergraduate courses across comparable classes (i.e., providing 200, 300, and 400 level mean ratings). You will also receive individualized feedback providing mean ratings (and standard deviations) for the specific courses you taught this quarter. For convenience sake, the individualized feedback also offers overall means, department means at the specific level of your course, and difference scores from the overall mean. We also have the original evaluation forms so that you can review written comments. It will be your responsibility to maintain these in your files for at least 1 year prior to destroying them.”

An example of a report prepared according to these guidelines is included in the appendices.

9. A report describing teaching evaluations for an entire academic year have typically been prepared by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. An example of such a report from academic year 2001-2002 is provided in the appendices. Such reports are useful in conducting annual reviews of faculty.

10. Previous reports have included additional information to aid in interpreting evaluation ratings. These vary, but may include the following.

   a. To account for intra-individual variability, it has been useful to compare each teacher’s “best evaluated” and “worst evaluated” classes.
   
   b. To lessen the impact of extreme scores at either end of the distribution, it may be helpful to report median scores instead of, or in addition to, arithmetic means.
   
   c. Enrollment numbers for each class can be obtained from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Because larger classes are likely to receive less favorable ratings (at least according to within-teacher comparisons), this information can be used to weigh individual teachers’ evaluation results in the report. (The number of evaluation forms received is not a good estimate of class enrollment.) Note that enrollment numbers can also be instructive in evaluating an individual teacher’s contribution to the departmental teaching load as well as evaluating the role of full-time faculty in the department’s teaching (compared to fixed term and graduate instructors).
   
   d. Student evaluation forms sometimes contain an item about the student’s expected grade. Because classes in which many students receive A’s are typically evaluated more favorably, this information has also been found useful in weighing individual ratings.

11. For PRT reviews, each faculty member is responsible for providing his or her own evaluation results. However, the Chair is responsible for maintaining back-up individual records as well as departmental reports. A format for teaching evaluation results is provided in an Appendix to this section of the Handbook.
7. Undergraduate Psychology Advising Goals.

PSYCHOLOGY ADVISING GOALS:
Sherwin Davidson   date: May 13, 2011

1. Through efficient, accurate, positive and intentional advising, enable student progress through the Psychology major (and university experience), and support student success for students at all stages of the program and all levels of academic achievement. This includes positive orientation of students and related supporters to the program’s possibilities;

2. Develop a model for large departments in relation to implementation of mandatory advising;

3. Develop advising in a meaningful way in relation to our major and the university at large including:
   a. Develop student knowledge of career options in psychology (as a major);
   b. Develop student knowledge of psychology requirements including course sequencing and the rationale for it;
   c. In keeping with departmental academic standards, provide straightforward, accurate, and timely resolution of problems, exceptions, and special circumstances;
   d. Attract students, both existing majors and potential majors to the department based on wide range of advising activities, e.g., utilizing the Web in imaginative ways, utilizing the Reder Student Success web-based program, career seminars, practicum orientations and provision of practicum resources;
   e. On the basis of advising experience, assist department with student retention;
   f. Develop student knowledge of general education, total credit and other general graduation requirements; and
   g. Develop student knowledge of other academic and student life campus resources.

ADVISING ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF GOALS:

1. Development and Delivery and Evaluation of overall advising plan consistent with university mandatory advising;

Summary of Status:

a. Development of a peer advising program, including recruitment of 14 new peer advisers, formal training through weekly 2 hour training sessions and shadowing and observation of existing peer and professional advisers (7); This extensive training program is new, well-thought through and promising both in terms of improved capability of the peer advisers and meaningful psychology-related experience for the advisers themselves.

Also in development relative to the training program:

1) Peer advising performance evaluations
2) Peer advising e-portfolios
3) Peer advising teams for various functions such as Communication, Community building within the department, Outreach (within PSU and the greater Portland Community) and Marketing;

b. Development of new approach for mandatory advising that includes group advising and individual sessions for those who can’t make group times. We are also exploring (developing a mandatory advising approach that utilizes Learner Web or D2L.

c. With the assistance of one of the peer advisers, development of a data base for tracking services delivered.

d. Delivery of Advising services: Review of our paper appointment records show the following since February 2011 (Casey Campbell began in January).

Of the students subject to mandatory advising, 70 of 107 have been served;

General advising: 455 students have been seen in individual and group appointments (may include some duplicate counting).

2. Development and Maintenance, and Coordination of communication with Psychology Front Office and Department Chair;

Summary of Status:

a. Clarification of roles with Psychology staff;

b. Development of referral and appointment procedures;

c. Ongoing negotiation and assignment of space for advising activities.

3. Supervision of Graduate Students Advising Program including training and evaluation:

Summary of Status:

a. The supervisory role previously provided by a faculty member who had release time to supervise and oversee group advising has now been assumed by Casey;

b. Development, with graduate students of models for delivering service that both advance the graduate student development and serve students well;

c. Oversight of psyadvis@pdx.edu, an e-mail resource for answers to advising-related matters, a response format handled by graduate students.

4. Provision of services related to recurring topics/students, e.g., high achieving students, DWFI courses, study abroad students, registration challenges, academic support.

Summary of Status:

a. Referral to adviser for short-turnaround response to the idiosyncratic and often gnarly issues associated with registration, grading, etc.

5. Liaison to faculty and translator/facilitator of students’ connection to faculty;

Summary of Status

a. Development of strategies to support and encourage faculty advising through clarification of roles (e.g., career, graduate school consultation that faculty can provide)
6. Development of Introduction to Applied Psychology course that will incorporate career assessment, career information, advising resources, and introduction to psychology as a multi-faceted profession:

   **Summary of Status:**
   a. Participation of Chair and Full-Time Adviser in CAE seminar on Teaching Large Courses;
   b. Consultation with Career Center personnel on selected elements of course which the Career Center might support

7. Continued delivery, in conjunction with Psi Chi Psychology Honorary, of Brown-Bag-type sessions on topics such as Grad School Considerations, How to Develop a Practicum Experience.

   **Summary Status:**
   a. Development of standards for practica;
   b. Development of standards of behavior for students in practica;
   c. Development with faculty of clarity of roles for practicum supervision.
Overview
Two undergraduate assessment activities were undertaken in 2009-2010, as part of Psychology’s continuing efforts to assess program quality and student learning. First, building on assessment surveys completed in 2005, 2007, and 2009, we conducted a survey of students attending Psychology undergraduate courses that focused on student satisfaction, achievement of learning goals, and acquisition of knowledge about research methods. Second, and initiated for the first time, we conducted a focus group with 15 high achieving seniors graduating in Psychology.

These efforts converged on the conclusion that students find the Psychology undergraduate program satisfactory and focused on target learning goals, and that students who have taken core Psychology courses know more about research methods. At the same time, assessments suggested areas for continued improvement, including career advising, the creation of smaller more challenging classes and certificate programs for advanced students, more opportunities for students to participate in practica and faculty research, and increased preparation for graduate school and teaching careers.

Undergraduate Experience Survey
In Spring 2010, all students who were attending undergraduate Psychology classes were invited to participate in the Undergraduate Experience Survey, which asked students to evaluate: (1) overall elements of the Psychology program; (2) quality of instruction in Psychology classes; (3) curricular and extra-curricular offerings; (4) interest in extra-curricular activities; (5) advising; and (6) achievement of learning goals. In addition, the survey requested information about students’ demographics and included a 16-item multiple-choice exam on research methods. The results are summarized below for all students who took the survey, and by Psychology majors and minors.
Assessment Method

Recruitment. All undergraduate instructors agreed to provide a small amount of extra-credit to students who completed the survey; alternative activities were also provided. During week 4, all 45 classes were visited by the Associate Chair who explained the importance of the survey; instructors reminded students periodically throughout the rest of the quarter. The survey was posted electronically and students could access it until the last week of classes.

Sample. Of the 3000 students registered for Psychology classes in Spring, 1446 completed the survey, including 523 Psychology majors and 175 Psychology minors. Because students could take more than one Psychology class, but could only complete the survey once, it is not clear exactly what percentage of potential participants this represents. However, these participation rates are a substantial improvement over previous years. For example, in 2009, using volunteer responses to targeted e-mails, 289 students (of whom 171 were Psych majors) completed the survey.

Survey. The survey included multiple blocks of questions, covering (1) overall elements of the program; (2) quality of instruction; (3) curricular and extra-curricular offerings; (4) interest in extra-curricular activities; (5) advising; (6) learning goals; (7) knowledge of research methods; and (8) demographic information. All ratings were answered on a scale of 1 to 5 (or answered on a scale of 1 to 4 and converted to a 1 to 5 scale). After each block, students were invited to provide open-ended comments on the topic of the block.

Results. Summaries of results for each block are presented below. Issues for Psychology to consider further are also identified. The accompanying document “Psych Undergraduate Assessment Sp2010” contains the complete results of the survey by item and block, for the entire
sample and broken down by Psychology majors and minors. Students also provided more than 3000 open-ended comments. These are available upon request.

(1) Overall Program Quality
Students were relatively satisfied with the Psychology undergraduate program overall ($M = 3.88$ on a scale of 1 to 5), with little difference between majors, minors, and the whole sample. Rated most highly were quality of instruction provided by faculty ($M = 4.05$) and graduate instructors ($M = 3.95$), variety of course offerings ($M = 3.96$), and attitude and help from the main office ($M = 3.94$).

Issues to consider. The lowest rating was for class sizes ($M = 3.68$), suggesting that we could consider strategies for creating smaller courses, for example, a set of smaller upper division courses, capstones, or specialty seminars.

(2) Quality of Psychology Instructors
Instructors were rated very highly ($M = 4.21$), with the highest ratings for “are well-informed about the topics they teach” ($M = 4.47$), “enjoy teaching” ($M = 4.40$), and “treat students with respect” ($M = 4.37$); and the lowest rating for “provide feedback to students about their performance” ($M = 3.85$).

Issues to consider. Psychology faculty are to be congratulated on their teaching. In addition, our current systems for carefully screening and selecting our adjunct faculty and for mentoring our graduate instructors seem to be working well.

(3) Curricular and Extra-curricular Offerings
Students were relatively satisfied with curricular and extra-curricular offerings ($M = 3.49$). However, they were more satisfied with the curricular offerings (e.g., relevant, interesting, enjoyable, and engaging courses) than the extra-curricular offerings. Rated lowest were “know how to arrange a practicum” ($M = 2.54$) and “how to get involved in faculty research” ($M = 2.61$). Majors also gave low ratings to “provide enough career-related information about my field” ($M = 2.85$). These 3 items received the lowest ratings on the survey; and were the only ratings of satisfaction whose averages were below the mid-point of the scale.

Issues to consider. We should consider strategies for providing more information about careers in Psychology, and developing capacity to inform and supervise students in practica and research activities. The rate-limiting factor is faculty capacity.

(4) Interest in Extra-curricular Activities
Our majors expressed the most interest in earning a certificate in an area of Psychology ($M = 4.21$), and in participating in practica ($M = 4.19$) or research with faculty ($M = 4.00$). Least interest was in an undergraduate thesis or honors program ($M = 3.45$).

Issues to consider. We should consider developing certificates in areas of psychology. As mentioned above, we can also consider strategies for developing capacity to supervise students in practica and research activities. We could consider re-submitting our request for a faculty position with major responsibilities in locating and coordinating student practica.
(5) **Advising**

Our majors are marginally satisfied with our current advising system, with the Psychology majors less satisfied ($M = 3.28$) than the minors ($M = 3.60$). Highest ratings were for the quality of advising by faculty ($M = 3.46$), peers ($M = 3.44$), and group orientation ($M = 3.36$). The lowest ratings were for access to faculty advising ($M = 3.10$) and advising for professional careers ($M = 3.03$).

**Issues to consider.** We are pleased with improvements in the ratings of our newly re-vamped advising system, but need additional advising capacity. We should also continue developing the PSY207/307 course on vocational development and pathways to careers in psychology and related fields.

(6) **Achievement of Learning Goals**

Students reported that Psychology classes contribute to their learning in key areas we identified as important ($M = 3.61$). Rated highest were learning about “psychological theories and concepts” ($M = 4.21$), “understanding how gender, class, ethnicity, and culture influence human behavior” ($M = 4.11$), and “understanding my values and beliefs, and personal bias or prejudice” ($M = 4.04$). Rated lowest were conducting data analysis using statistical software ($M = 2.49$) and intermediate computer skills ($M = 2.70$).

**Issues to consider.** Perhaps we could consider a course focused on data analysis and presentation. The lowest rating not connected to computing was “figuring out my professional goals” ($M = 3.25$), which suggests that a greater focus on career advising would be useful to students.

(7) **Knowledge of Research Methods**

The Psychology Research Methods exam consisted of 16 multiple-choice items, 4 each covering knowledge of design, measurement, statistics, and ethics. The exam was challenging: No one achieved 100%. Two items were correctly answered by fewer than 12% of the students (hypothesis falsification and goals of observational methods). Four items were answered correctly by 75% or more students (definitions of standard deviation and hypothesis, purpose of surveys, and lab vs. field). The highest score was 88%.

The entire sample’s scores averaged 52%, while Psychology majors averaged 66%, and minors 52%. Of most interest was whether students achieved higher scores when they had completed more of the core courses in Psychology (PSY200 Psychology as a Natural Science, PSY204 Psychology as a Social Science, and PSY321 Research Methods). When students were divided into groups based on whether they had completed none, one, two, or all three of the core courses, we found that students who had completed none or one of the core courses scored 47%, whereas students who had completed two scored 53%, and students who had completed all three of the courses scored 62%. Pairwise comparisons of students’ scores from these four groups revealed that, although students who had completed none or one course did not differ in their performance, students who completed two courses scored significantly higher than students with one or none, and students who had completed all three courses scored significantly higher on the exam than any other group.
(8) Demographic, Profile, and Performance Information

Although the majors in Psychology who completed the survey ranged in age from 18 to 66 years old, the average age was 26; the majority were female (72%) and Caucasian, with 12% Asian/Pacific Islander, 10% Latino, 10% Multi-racial, 5% African-American, and 5% Native American. For 48% of our Majors, neither parent had completed a bachelor’s degree; for 28% one parent had and for 23% both parents had completed an undergraduate degree.

The majority of our majors are transfer students (69%). 45% are paying for school themselves, 67% have student loans, 42% grants, 19% scholarships, and for 37%, families are helping. Most of our majors work part-time (47%) or full-time (17%) but few have childcare responsibilities (11%). Students typically settled on Psychology as their major as sophomores (30%), but some decided before starting college (24%) or as Freshmen (17%), while some waited until their junior year (21%). The average GPA reported by majors was 3.49.

Most of the Psychology majors who took the survey had junior (38%) or senior (38%) standing, with 117 of them (23%) planning on graduating in 2010. 39% were taking longer to graduate than expected, and reported a variety of reasons for the delay, including financial (86%), academic (74%), work (70%), and family (54%). In terms of next steps, a majority of Psychology majors were planning on graduate school in Psychology (40%) or related fields (24%), whereas 15% planned on going into teaching, 12% academic or nonprofit research, and 12% law or medical school.

Issues to consider. The career goals of Psychology majors, in which the majority are focusing on graduate school, should encourage us to carefully reconsider how our undergraduate program (curricular and extra-curricular) can better prepare students. In addition, since many of our students are headed for careers in teaching, perhaps we should re-visit our preparatory courses and practica opportunities. The demographic composition of our majors suggests that our program pay special attention to transfer students, first generation college students, students from African-American, Native American, and Latino backgrounds, and men.

Survey adapted and conducted, and summary prepared by Ellen Skinner and Una Chi
Psychology 2009-2010
9. Guidelines for Working with Undergraduate Students as Teaching Assistants.

Guidelines for Working with Undergraduate Students as Teaching Assistants
September 17, 2012

Overview. By working with undergraduate TAs in their classes, Instructors have the potential to gain additional support for their teaching, enrich and enhance their classes, and provide learning experiences for the TAs themselves. However, such arrangements can be complicated, because they involve TAs who are peers of the students in the class, and there is no formal structure for arranging how the TA’s work will be conducted or how it will be coordinated with the work of graduate TAs. To help instructors create the best possible experience for themselves, the undergraduate (and graduate) TAs, and the students in their classes, the following guidelines have been developed, which highlight some of the most important issues and recommendations for practice.

1. Selection. Undergraduates who are selected as TAs should be upper-division (juniors or seniors), and they should be selected on the basis of their exceptional performance. They must have taken the class themselves previously and received a very high grade. They should have demonstrated the skills needed to work with our undergraduate students: subject content competence, dependability, conscientiousness, maturity, good judgment, flexibility, kindness, respect, thoughtfulness, and exceptional communication skills.

2. Structure. The student must be in a By Arrangement with the Instructor because that provides a structure and formalizes the relationship, giving the Instructor evaluative authority. The student signs up for Psy405, using the By Arrangement Request available in the office.

   a. The Instructor decides on an appropriate number of credit hours, based on the expectation that a student generally will complete 30 hours of work for each credit hour. The Instructor determines whether it will be Pass/No pass or graded. If graded, then criteria must be set for performance.

   b. The Instructor signs the by-arrangement form, or if it is a graduate instructor, the Chair (or Associate Chair) signs the form. In either case, the Chair (or Associate Chair) signs the form and must be aware of the arrangement. (Please be sure the signature is legible so that the instructor can be identified).

   c. The student should understand that one PSY405 (for up to 4 hours) can be counted toward a major in Psychology, but any additional courses (PSY399-409) are counted as general elective credits.

3. Letters of recommendation. Undergrad TAs often request a letter of recommendation following their work as a TA. This issue should be spelled out before the class starts.

4. Assistance to instructor. In general, the focus of the undergraduate TA should be primarily to assist the Instructor rather than the students. In assigning responsibilities, it's important to
think through the authority assigned to the undergraduate TA with those who are essentially his or her peers. The value of the undergraduate TA is as an informal resource, but there is potential for confusion with peers if the undergraduate TA is assigned the role of content expert.

5. Expectations and responsibilities. We strongly recommend that the Instructor develop a written agreement about tasks and expectations associated with them and whether the TA is to be graded or Pass/No pass. It is the responsibility of the instructor to determine that all undergraduate TA tasks are appropriate for FERPA (The Family Rights and Educational Privacy Act), as well as fully respectful of every student involved.

a. Undergraduate TAs can help with class preparation, such as finding materials for the Instructor, preparing PowerPoint slides, and designing activities that could be meaningful to the class.

b. They can also help with activities during class, such as taking attendance, collecting homework, or assisting in the organization of small group activities.

c. Generally, undergraduates would not perform grading and would not have access to students' performance or grade information. An excerpt from FERPA, included below, provides information about what is meant by educational records and what is protected under the guidelines:

“What are student education records? Most student records at the university are considered education records that are protected by FERPA.

“Examples of education records include:

- Admissions information for students who are accepted and enrolled;
- Biographical information including date and place of birth, gender, nationality, information about race and ethnicity, and identification photographs;
- Grades, test scores, evaluations, courses taken, and official communications regarding a student's status;
- Course work including papers and exams, class schedules, as well as written, email or recorded communications;
- Disciplinary records;
- Students' financial and financial aid records;
- Internship program records.
- Employment records related to a student's employment in a position for which only students are eligible.

Education Records include any information or data recorded in any medium that is directly related to a student and maintained by the University or by a person acting for the University. Record mediums include, but are not limited to, electronic databases and files, handwriting, print, tapes, film, e-mail, microfilm, and microfiche.”
We strongly encourage your review of the FERPA Tutorial, available at the following site:

http://pdx.edu/registration/ferpa-student-records-privacy-tutorial

d. In general, undergraduates would not hold office hours. Putting the undergraduate in this position assigns the student an authority that is potentially confusing to his or her peers. It also blurs the responsibilities of the graduate TA if there is one for the same class.

e. If the class also has a graduate TA, it is important to establish the unique role and responsibilities of the graduate TA. Unless there are sufficient distinct tasks, an undergraduate TA should not be assigned when there is also a graduate TA. If there are exceptional reasons that warrant doing so, then the relationship between the two positions should be made clear so that each can articulate the difference.
10. Resources for dealing with student concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources for Supporting Students and Constructively Dealing with Student Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Dishonesty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disruptive Classroom Behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distressed Students: Students who may be at-risk for harming themselves or others</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts for Information and Assistance at Any Time

- **Chair**, Associate Chair, Department Manager of the Psychology Department
- **Dean of Student Life Office (DOSL)** (503) 725-4422  askdoslife@pdx.edu
- **Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO)** (503) 725-4407  cpso@pdx.edu (24 hours a day)

As an instructor, you are empowered to manage your course and your classroom in ways that allow all members of the learning community (including instructors, teaching assistants, and students) to feel safe, to teach, and to learn. In fact, you have a responsibility as an instructor to create and maintain a welcoming and respectful teaching and learning environment surrounding your courses. Most students cooperate fully in this endeavor. However, on occasion, a student interferes with this overarching goal-- by obstructing your ability to teach, by disrupting other students' ability to learn, or by behaving in ways that appear to be dishonest, threatening, intimidating, or dangerous to themselves or others. In such cases, it is your job to address these issues in a way that, while respecting the individual rights of the student, ensures the safety of our community and restores an atmosphere in your classroom that is conducive to good teaching and learning. It is the responsibility of the department and university to provide you with the resources you need to accomplish this task.

From an instructor’s perspective, incidents in which student behaviors appear to be dishonest, disruptive, or threatening are some of the most challenging and stressful situations you will encounter, and they are likely to provoke distressing emotions in the instructor, teaching assistants, and other students (e.g., frustration, worry, resentment, fear) as well as feelings of helplessness or confusion about how to handle these issues in ways that are safe, effective, honorable, and caring. In order to navigate these situations constructively, you will often need access to support and strategies. Resources are available to you through several interconnected channels. Most important is the knowledge that it is the responsibility of the department and the university to provide all instructors with support, resources, and strategies for dealing with student issues and concerns. Such incidents, because they are rare, may be new to you, but they are familiar to us. Although each situation is treated as unique based on its own constellation of factors, the university is part of a nation-wide network that has developed best practices and protocols for thinking through such incidents and strategizing about how best to approach and deal with them.

If you have any questions or concerns about any aspect of student behavior, you are encouraged to call or e-mail people from any of these offices. Your **Department Chair** is a good first point of contact, but you should feel free to contact any office at any time. The **Dean of Student Life Office (DOSL)** has teams in place to deal with student conduct (e.g., disruptive or dishonest behavior) and with student care (e.g., students who may be at-risk for harming themselves or others). The **Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO)** is available 24/7. Whoever you reach will immediately make sure that you are directed to the people who are best positioned to help you with your particular set of issues. The offices of the DOSL and CPSO are well connected to one another and frequently call on other campus resources such as Student Health and Counseling for consultation and support. We recommend that if you seek support from the DOSL or CPSO you also alert your
Department Chair, as the Department Chair is ultimately responsible for making sure that your needs as an instructor are met.

| Resources for instructors, including brief video tutorials on dishonesty, disruptive classroom behavior, and distressed students, can be found at http://www.pdx.edu/dos/facultystaff-resources. |
11. Evaluating Requests for Tenured Faculty Service Leave.

Tenured Faculty Service Leave Policy
6/6/07, with minor edits (see endnote).

Overview. Tenured faculty service leave entails a release from departmental service for one quarter, once between sabbaticals. The service release may be combined with teaching releases (which must be supported by other provisions outside the tenured faculty leave, such as internal or external grants and/or chunking of courses--i.e., teaching extra courses in the term prior to or after the leave). The purpose of the leave is to afford tenured faculty an opportunity, once between sabbaticals, to pursue an exceptional career opportunity or to engage in a major mid-career adjustment in scholarly interests. There should be extenuating circumstances associated with the leave, such that the activities to be supported would fall outside the normal range of expected faculty responsibilities and could not be accomplished without the leave. The Department Chair and Associate Department Chair set a relatively high hurdle in evaluating applications for tenured faculty leave, because we recognize it creates significant work for other faculty members. Faculty members awarded a tenured faculty leave will be required to write up the results of their leave for the Department Chair and Associate Chair, who will in turn distribute the write-up to department faculty.

Eligibility. Tenured faculty may apply once between sabbaticals. Tenured faculty service leaves are awarded on a first come, first serve basis, with a maximum of one faculty member per (Winter or Spring) term. Faculty cannot be released from Fall term service because of the heavy PRT responsibilities. Further, chairs of PRT or the Graduate Committee cannot take leave during the year they serve.

Application and Review Process. Leaves are awarded on a first come, first serve basis. Consequently, we suggest that interested faculty members apply one full calendar year in advance of the term in question. Applications are submitted to the Department Chair and Associate Department Chair for their joint review. The application should entail a 1-2 page description of the proposed activities during the leave. If the faculty member is including course releases as part of the leave, they must spell out the sources (and certainty) of funding for those course releases, as well as feasibility of the proposed teaching schedule. Note that any course releases or stacking must be coordinated with area/track colleagues, as well as with the Department Chair and/or Associate Chair. Applicants would be advised to review course release/stacking plans with their area/track colleagues’ plans prior to applying.

The Steering Committee will determine eligibility of the candidate(s). In the case of multiple proposals, the Steering Committee will weigh the relative merits of each proposal in terms of feasibility and exceptionality of the opportunity. If necessary and appropriate, the Steering Committee will endeavor to seek alternative possibilities for one or more of the candidates. Within 8 weeks of receipt of a proposal, the Steering Committee will render the
final decision about the leave. Other faculty will be available to the Steering Committee to provide input if requested in the decision-making process.

**Report.** Faculty who receive a tenured faculty service leave are required to submit a report detailing the results and accomplishments of the leave to the Steering Committee within 4 weeks of the end of the leave term. The report will subsequently be forwarded to department faculty at large.

**Summary Reflection.** This resource is offered in the spirit of our collective integrity with the expectation that the goals associated with each faculty member's leave will be fulfilled.

This document provides a basic framework and exceptions in all areas will be dealt with on a case by case basis.

---

**NOTE.** The policy on Tenured Faculty Service Leave was adopted by department faculty on June 13, 2007. To bring language into keeping with October, 2009 changes in departmental structure, the policy has since been reworded to move responsibility for this process to the Steering Committee.
11. Descriptors and Ranks: Part-time Faculty and Courtesy Appointments.

Prepared by Sherwin Davidson 12/1/09

On the ranks of Senior Instructor and Instructor, PSU’s P & T Guidelines read:

I. Instructor ranks.

“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.

II. Lecturer rank

On the rank of Lecturer: PSU addresses the rank of Lecturer only in “The ABC’s of PSU”

“Academic Ranks

Professorial ranks PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SENIOR INSTRUCTOR, INSTRUCTOR, EMERITUS, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE and SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, RESEARCH ASSISTANT and SENIOR RESEARCH ASSISTANT, and LECTURER are reserved for faculty whose responsibilities and positions carry the expectation of scholarly accomplishment. Reference: PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES.”
(http://oaa.pdx.edu/ABCHandbookSectionL#Lecturer)

Following the link to Lecturer in the section above from the ABC’s of PSU” (http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/abcs-portland-state-university) takes you to another section of the ABC document showing the following definition:

“Lecturer

Lecturer is a rank that may be used for faculty who are hired at less than .50 “annualized fte, and who have limited formal academic preparation, but whose professional achievement and scholarship warrant an academic rank.”

Since the reference cited for the complete section above on Professorial Ranks is the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, I searched the P & T Guidelines. The only two references in the P&T document (based on a computer search of the document) are in Section IV on Academic Appointments. Neither of these references contains a definition.

So, the conclusion about the rank of Lecturer is that it derives from the Oregon OAR definition which follows:
“(e) "Lecturer" may be used for appointments of faculty members for part-time service who have limited formal academic preparation but whose professional achievements are such that expected salary would equal that paid to persons with professorial rank.” (From OAR http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_580/580_020.html This is in the section on Academic Rank 580-020-0005 in Division 20 on Academic Rank and Classification.)

Finally, I referenced the AFT contract. In the contract, relevant sections in which Lecturer is referenced follow:

1) in the definitions, which cite the OAR definition, noted just above in this document.

2) “Lecturers, upon obtaining a terminal degree, will be appointed to regular adjunct academic ranks within the bargaining unit at the time of the next appointment or reappointment.” (p. 7, 2007-2009 AFT Contract)

In our department then, Lecturer is the term we use for all the part-time people who teach for us who have only a masters degree. Upon completing a Ph.D., such a person would become an Adjunct Assistant.

III. Adjunct—not a rank, but a status joined to a rank; and Visiting—type of temporary appointment.

The Oregon Administrative Rules state the following:

“(3) The adjectives "adjunct" or "visiting" may be joined to academic ranks in those cases in which the institution wishes to draw upon the skills of certain persons in the community or in other educational, industrial or governmental institutions for help in carrying forward teaching, research or service commitments (e.g., doctors, dentists, lawyers, psychiatrists, professors or administrators at other academic or governmental institutions, public school teachers or administrators).” (http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_580/580_020.html)

On the term, “adjunct” or “visiting”, there is no reference in the “ABCs of PSU.”

On the terms adjunct or visiting, after searching the P& T Guidelines, I found the following:

1) no reference to the term adjunct.

2) the following reference to the term visiting: 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. (p. 15 in Section IV, on Fixed Term Appointments and how they should be used.)

In the department, we use “Adjunct Assistant Professor” for all the part-timers who teach for us who have a Ph.D. They achieve that status by virtue of our hiring them and providing a time limited period of appointment. Their adjunct status is named in their letter of offer.

Adjunct, the term joined to a rank for a variety of purposes defined in the OARs above—teaching, research, or service commitments—is also a status that is acceptable for service on committees. To gain the adjunct status for reasons other than teaching (described immediately
above), the faculty member must have a courtesy letter of appointment. In our department, this would require review of vitae and a vote of the faculty.

IV. Affiliate:
After conversations with Courtney Hanson in Graduate Studies, I’ve determined the following:

1) Affiliate is a status used by us and other departments to describe someone who, with this designation, becomes akin to being a member of the department. He or she is authorized to chair and serve as a departmental member of a thesis or dissertation committee. The department must approve someone for this status, and then provide formal notice of that approval to Graduate Studies.

A person with Affiliate Status cannot serve as a GO Rep on a committee because their status is considered to be similar to a Psychology Department faculty member.

V. Graduate Research Committee Service:
Graduate Studies says the following with regard to Masters and Doctoral Committee Service

1. Masters thesis procedures:

“Adviser submits the Appointment of Final Oral Examination Committee form (GO-16M) two weeks before the end of the term preceding the term of defense (earlier in summer term). The chair of the examination committee must be regular, full-time PSU faculty, tenured or tenure-track, assistant professor or higher in rank; the other committee members may include adjunct faculty. If it is necessary to go off-campus for one committee member with specific expertise not available among PSU faculty, a CV for the proposed member must be submitted with the GO-16M. All committee members must have master’s degrees or higher. No defense shall be valid without a thesis committee approved by the Office of Graduate Studies.”

http://www.gsr.pdx.edu/ogs_general_masters.php

My comments: GO Rep is no longer required for masters’ committees. Masters committee must have a minimum of 3 members and no more than 5. The Chair must be tenure-track; the regular committee members may be tenure-track, fixed-term, or adjunct, or affiliate. An outside person (e.g., from the community) with a minimum of a masters may serve on a committee as the 4th (or 5th person), upon the submission of a CV and subsequent approval by Graduate Studies.

2. Doctoral dissertation procedures:

After passing the comprehensive examination and identifying a dissertation topic, a dissertation committee is appointed and the student must pass a proposal defense. The dissertation committee must be approved by OGS using the Appointment of Doctoral Dissertation Committee form (GO-16D). The dissertation committee must consist of five to seven PSU faculty members: the dissertation adviser, a minimum of three and a maximum of five regular members, and the Graduate Office Representative. The chair of the dissertation committee and
the Graduate Office Representative must be regular, full-time PSU instructional faculty, tenured or tenure-track, assistant professor or higher in rank; the other three to five committee members may include adjunct or fixed-term faculty and/or one member of the OHSU faculty. If it is necessary to go off-campus for one committee member with specific expertise not available among PSU faculty, a curriculum vitae (CV) for that proposed member must be presented with the GO-16D form. This off-campus member may substitute for one of the three to five regular committee members. All committee members must have doctoral degrees. No proposal defense shall be valid without a dissertation committee approved by OGS.

My comments: Graduate committees have a minimum of 5, maximum of 7 persons. Of the 5 minimum, one will be the GO Rep who must be a tenure-track faculty at assistant rank or higher. This GO Rep, someone from outside the department, cannot hold Affiliate status in the department. Unlike masters committees, for the doctoral level committee, an off-campus person (who must have a doctorate and whose CV must be submitted to Graduate Studies), CAN serve as one of the 5 minimum committee members. An Affiliate can serve in this status as well.

VI. Conclusions at this point:

1. We use two main terms in describing the persons who actually teach for us: lecturer, and adjunct + appropriate rank of professor. “Adjunct” is an adjective that can be joined with any rank. Each of these terms is addressed in greater detail below, along with other statuses that provide options for a relationship to the Department of Psychology.

2. A Courtesy Appointment is one we typically use for someone who wants a connection to our department or to the university for a specific and generally time-limited reason. For example, it could be someone on sabbatical spending time in Portland who would really appreciate having library access. Or it could be someone from another university who is working on a research project with one of our faculty and will be in town for awhile to conduct that research. Generally these are called Visiting Assistants, Associates or Full Professors.

   Within our department, practice for a Visiting Courtesy Appointment is to circulate a CV, provide a rationale, and ask for a vote. If the vote is positive, a letter describing the arrangement is prepared and filed with HR.

   Occasionally, a lecturer or adjunct who regularly teaches for us needs access to the library during a time when he or she isn’t teaching. In that case, the chair can simply prepare a Courtesy Letter specific to his or her library research purposes.

3. An individual can be appointed as an adjunct plus rank—that is adjunct plus assistant, associate or full--when we wish him or her to perform duties that can include teaching, research or service, e.g., committee service.

   The adjunct status is most commonly used by us when someone with a Ph.D. teaches for us part-time. Generally, this person would be at the Assistant level unless coming from another academic institution.
The adjunct plus rank status is also one that Graduate Studies accepts for service as a regular member of committees when the appointment is made official through a Courtesy Appointment Letter filed with personnel. This is explained in further detail below.

Since within our department, practice for a Visiting Courtesy Appointment is to circulate a CV, provide a rationale, and ask for a vote, the same procedure is followed for an Adjunct plus rank appointment when we want to appoint someone to adjunct status for purposes other than teaching. If the person is from another university, then the rank would be the same as at the other university. If the person is not from another university, then the rank would be at the level of Assistant unless a request from the individual and exceptional qualifications warrant further examination and consideration of a higher rank.

The length of appointment specified in the letter determines the duration of the status.

4. “Lecturer” is a rank according to the “OARs,” used for persons with limited formal academic preparation. In our departmental practices, this is generally a masters level person. He or she would gain the rank of “Adjunct Assistant Professor” once the Ph.D. is completed. In general, in our department, lecturer is a status assigned to someone with a masters degree who teaches for us.

5. Affiliated faculty is a status recognized by Graduate Studies and assigned to PSU faculty outside the department. To gain affiliate status, someone in the department would propose the status for a specific person, and the department would vote. Once recognized by the department as having the affiliate status, such persons, if they are eligible to chair and serve as regular committees in their home department, are eligible to do the same in Psychology. If the person were to be a Fixed Term person for another department, and gain affiliate status with us, he or she could not chair a committee. The Fixed Term person can only serve as a regular committee member. Once a faculty member from another department gets assigned the Affiliate Status in our department, he or she cannot serve as GO Rep in our department.

Once Graduate Studies is notified (an e-mail notice is acceptable) of the department’s approval of someone as an affiliate, the status is retained until formally withdrawn by the department.

6. For purposes of masters or doctoral committee service, a resource person from the community can be appointed if he or she meets the specified degree level (masters for thesis; Ph.D. for doctoral) and has a CV submitted to Graduate Studies as part of the committee appointment process. Such a person carries no special title.

See “V” in the above documentation for further explanation of who can serve on masters and doctoral level committees.
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1. Undergraduate Practicum Guidelines.

The Department of Psychology shares the mission of the University to “let knowledge serve the city.” The practicum program in the Department of Psychology supports this mission by offering a range of opportunities for students to apply and test academic knowledge in real-world settings. Students interested in pursuing graduate studies are particularly encouraged to gain experience in applied settings, either through field research or practicum work. Although practicum sites vary considerably, those appropriate for psychology credit include some formal integration of psychological principles. Although the terms “practicum” and “internship” are sometimes used interchangeably, the academic field of psychology generally makes a distinction between the two terms. Internship refers to field placements where doctoral level students carry advanced professional responsibilities, often working for pay and for an academic year. The practicum refers to undergraduate and masters level graduate experiences in field settings, generally with lesser degrees of responsibility and for a shorter duration of time (one or two terms, although this is variable.)

In selecting the practicum site, students are encouraged to carefully consider their career goals and to work in consultation with their academic advisor, as well as the faculty member who is sponsoring the practicum. Students should make use of the following guidelines in completing practicum work for academic credit. Students are also encouraged to make use of the Practicum Resource Book in identifying potential sites. A copy is available in the Department of Psychology, along with lists of faculty interests and sub-specialty areas. Students also may want to refer to the Department of Psychology website.

**Goals and Objectives:** Although specific learning objectives vary, depending on the student’s interests and the setting, the goals of the practicum program are: 1) to apply psychological principles to real-world human problems; 2) to gain exposure to potential career paths; 3) to gain an understanding of ethical and social dimensions that arise in social service organizations. Undergraduate students enter the organizations at the apprentice level and thus are not expected to develop professional skills during the course of the practicum. Students may want to specify learning objectives, however, e.g., interviewing skills, group facilitation, introductory assessment skills.

**Pre-requisites:** Students must be at the junior level (minimum of 90 credits) to register for practicum credits. In addition, students must have completed at least 8 credits of upper division psychology coursework in areas of study related to the practicum, i.e., in the subspecialty of psychology most directly related to the practicum. (For examples of coursework related to subspecialties of psychology, see the Advising Guidelines Handbook.)

**Selecting a Site:** After identifying a general area of interest (e.g. mental health, youth programs, social change organizations), the student meets with the faculty member who will be sponsoring the practicum to discuss potential sites. The practicum must include learning experiences that are predominately psychological in that they should include some
systematic application of psychological theory or research to human problems. (This
determination is made in consultation with the faculty sponsor.)

The practicum setting should be capable of providing a structured learning experience for
students, including weekly supervision (30 minutes or more.) If weekly staff meetings are
included as part of the supervision, the meetings should provide the opportunity for the
student to receive feedback and to address concerns that arise in carrying out duties in the
practicum setting. It is the responsibility of the student to schedule interviews at potential
sites and to negotiate roles and responsibilities with the field supervisor in the course of
selecting a site. The field supervisor should have a formal supervisory position in the
organization or agency and recognized expertise in the setting.

**Arranging credit:** After selecting the site, the student formalizes the agreement with the
field supervisor and the faculty sponsor. The faculty sponsor should have some familiarity
with the field setting or with a subspecialty of psychology directly relevant to the practicum
setting. The sponsor also provides the *Practicum Proposal* form that is completed with the
student and serves as a contract. The form includes contact information, scope of duties of
the practicum student, and the product to be submitted at the completion of the term. The
form also includes information on the expertise of the field supervisor related to the
practicum learning experience. In addition to the faculty sponsor and student, the field
supervisor also signs the proposal.

The student may register for from one to five credit hours, with each credit commensurate
to approximately 30 hours of fieldwork per term. (For a four-credit practicum, for example,
120 hours of field experience is required per term.) Library research, staff meetings,
orientation sessions and outside activities related to the practicum may be included in the
total hours. In addition, a by-arrangement form is completed for credit (PSY 409), with the
pass/no pass grade option.

**Criteria for field supervisor’s evaluation of student:** General criteria for evaluation of
practicum include demonstrated: 1) responsibility to the agency and to clients in carrying out
agreed upon duties; 2) openness to learning and applying principles and feedback gained in
supervision; and 3) completing the required number of hours, as well as any agreed upon
product. In addition, the field supervisor may evaluate the student according to specific
learning objectives.

**Basis for the final grade:** The faculty sponsor solicits the final letter from the field
supervisor and submits the final grade. The student must create a *practicum log*, including
the scheduled hours completed each week. In addition to the log, the student maintains a
*practicum journal*, with weekly entries focused on key issues that arise in the application of
psychological principles in the field setting. The student may identify a key conflict or
concern that arose during the week, for example, and how psychological principles
(including ethical principles) might be applied in conceptualizing the conflict or concern. In
addition to describing the dilemma, the journal entry may include personal reflections, for example how cultural background might influence responses to the dilemma.

After the initial meeting with the faculty sponsor to negotiate the practicum contract and credit, the student should meet with the sponsor once midway through the term and again the week prior to finals week. The journal (including weekly entries) should be submitted to the faculty advisor at least a week prior so that the student is able to receive feedback during these meetings.
2. Policy on Class Sizes and Canceling Classes.

Passed by the faculty on June 11, 2003.

"We recommend that the department monitor and enforce a policy that requires a departmental average of 7 graduate students (including audits) in 500/600 level graduate classes over the course of an academic year."

Passed by the faculty on October 6, 2003.

“We have created a set of internal procedures for dealing with any classes taught by regular faculty that could be cancelled due to class size. Since classes that faculty agree to teach are basically commitments to the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, decisions about canceling a class (based on low enrollments) will involve a meeting between the faculty member, the Chair, and the respective committee.”

Research Space Guidelines
Department of Psychology

Approved 3/19/2008

I. Overview

A. Characterizing Use

Fundamental to the work of PSU’s faculty in Applied Psychology are the following:

- research with participants in a wide variety of settings;
- development of graduate students’ research skills as well inclusion of students in the multiple research projects which faculty are conducting at any one time;
- a research team model, engaging undergraduate and graduate students with one another in the course of faculty research as well as student research. Teams meet regularly to generate questions, review designs, consider methodology, and determine the division of labor that will lead to successful and timely execution of projects.

As demonstrated by these fundamental features, research in a department of applied psychology with a Ph.D. program is not a solitary task.

The research in which PSU faculty members are involved most often involves the collection and analysis of data from human participants. Data collected at any one time (e.g., grant-supported data collection) remain viable for continuing use as part of faculty scholarly inquiry as well as student theses and dissertation projects.

For all these reasons, research space is a precious resource, central to the success of our mission as a department. It is considered a bedrock requirement for support of faculty in their conduct of an active program of community-based research that involves community partners, colleagues, staff, post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, and undergraduate students.

B. Defining What Research Space Is

For the purposes of this policy, research space is defined as that space used in the conduct of research and is considered to include all space used by personnel involved in the research, including faculty researchers, undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral students, research assistants and associates, and technical and managerial staff. Neither faculty office space, nor classroom and laboratory space used predominantly for instruction is considered to be research space. While instruction does occur in most research laboratories, instruction alone is not sufficient to justify the occupancy of research space. Office space is considered distinct from research/laboratory space.

Specific research space needs include:
• Working with sensitive data;
• Training graduate students completing empirical masters and dissertation projects;
• Developing effective research groups, including graduate and undergraduate students;
• Carrying out research studies;
• Interviewing participants, sometimes about highly sensitive issues (e.g., substance abuse, HIV status);
• Working collaboratively with colleagues;
• Carrying out grants and contracts, which often requires certain space needs.

C. Characterizing Importance

The importance of research space is reflected in:

• Our mission statement, as a department in which the faculty conduct community-based research on applied problems of significance to society, and the expectations associated with our doctoral program in Applied Psychology;
• Grant applications, all of which include a description of available research space, including secure data space;
• Expectations for research central to departmental promotion and tenure guidelines;
• Faculty letters of offer, which include research space.

Graduate students are paid to perform research assignments, including handling of sensitive research data on site. Faculty productivity depends on access to these data and regular access to students for collaboration and supervision. Highly sensitive data, often attached to individuals and/or community-based agencies and private-sector organizations, require storage in confidential conditions.

D. Characterizing the Reality and Fundamental Expectations

We come together as psychology faculty to achieve these goals collectively. At the same time we have individual responsibility for our own research and the timely progress of the students who work with us. As the university has expanded and the research profile of the department has increased, research space, which has always been at a premium, is insufficient. Furthermore, the limitation of the space in terms of appropriate occupancy to assure air balance and quality is a factor that has to be taken into consideration. Therefore, there is an inevitable pressure on the space we presently have available. That insufficiency translates easily to internal pressures for space between and among us. Examination of departmental policies from departments in the U.S. and Canada reveals that our situation is not unusual, and also that other departments of psychology, as well as other disciplines, have guidelines to address distribution and use of space.

The following guidelines provide both a framework and some procedures which are intended to generally describe the realities, and provide a way for members of the department to more systematically address space concerns. Naturally, there is a personal dimension to space that makes discussions and negotiations difficult. Therefore, the guidelines are intended to provide
values and general criteria against which decisions about space can be made so as to lessen the pressures on individual faculty members. Fundamental to the guidelines is the assumption of our collective interests.

In this context of the space demand, members of the department must cooperate and share space in order to make the maximum possible use of our physical facilities. Members must recognize that the physical space we individually occupy belongs to the department and, even when assigned to an individual, is not to be considered the 'property' of the member to whom it is assigned. Members must also recognize that the uncertain/changing circumstances of the department and university may sometimes require alterations to agreements and arrangements previously agreed to. No office or research space is assigned on a permanent basis to any faculty member.

Past practice has included shifts and changes, and expressed willingness by some members of the faculty to yield their space, to make moves as needed, and to share space if necessary. It is important to recognize that spirit and to create a framework that means some of the responsibility for making changes as needed does not rest only on individuals who volunteer, but is supported by an agreement on operating principles to govern distribution and use of space. That said, it is the responsibility of each member of the department to efficiently use his or her assigned space and to notify the department Chair when any previously assigned space is no longer being used efficiently and to surrender this space for other uses.

Priorities for space allocations should be seen as general guidelines. The department, seeing the futility of a rigorous algorithm for space allocation, allocates space through regular dialogues among the Chair, Steering Committee, and faculty.

By agreeing to the foregoing general principles and to the following guidelines and procedures, the members of the department assert their intention to make optimal use of our allotted space.

II. Considerations for Space Use

Whether psychology faculty are active in research cannot be determined by the application of a simplistic rule such as counting publications or grant submissions. Faculty research and scholarly activity in terms of articles, book chapters, and books is difficult to assess. Research in psychology does not proceed at a steady pace and so faculty productivity can be variable over several years. Publications can represent a great range of effort--a single article can be a report of a series of empirical studies extending over several years or a brief book review or commentary. Publications can be single-authored or co-authored and it can be difficult to assess whose contribution is primary. In addition, the quality of the research that is reported and of the ideas that are advanced is certainly more significant than the raw number of publications. Given these realities, it is extremely important that decisions made about space not be interpreted as a statement about the differential value of the work.

Furthermore, faculty research and scholarly activity must be considered in the context of other faculty commitments, for example, preparing grant proposals, administering research grants, seeking grant renewals, training undergraduate and graduate students in research techniques, working with community partners, and supervising undergraduate and graduate student research.
Indicators of an active research program also include funded research grants, proposals submitted for external funding, ongoing research protocols still under approval with the University’s Human Subjects Committee, research collaboration with community partners, colleagues, staff, post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, and/or undergraduate students, ongoing data collections, active ongoing commitments to partners involved with a project and research presentations including those that are under review.

III. Process

The process that follows is suggested against the reality of university-wide pressures on space, and more particularly, pressures within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). A clear departmental process is particularly essential so that we can be collectively clear about our values and systematic about our internal decision processes. At the same time, the ideal set forth in guidelines and outlined processes will at times be subject to external realities which require exceptions most often delegated to the Chair based on time and circumstances.

With that in mind, one of the functions of the Steering Committee will be to act as a space allocation committee with ultimate decision-making responsibility resting with the Chair. The Steering Committee will periodically review the research space needs of the faculty, ideally annually.

Whatever the precipitating factor, when significant space changes are necessary, the faculty as a whole will be made aware of the need, either by e-mail or in a Faculty Meeting, depending on timing. Concurrently, as much of the following will take place as is feasible:

1) Meeting of the Steering Committee;
2) Notice to and exploration with potentially affected faculty members, using the criteria within this document as a basis for the conversation;
3) External resources as necessary; and
4) Facilitation of contact between and among faculty in hopes that faculty are able to effectively share space. Decisions such as this must account for data-protection stipulations.

Faculty who anticipate requiring additional research space in the event of funding of external research proposals are expected to discuss this with the chair in advance of submitting the proposal. Consideration of whether research space is being fully and effectively utilized is an ongoing process. Reallocation of research space from less research-active to more research-active faculty can occur at any time, but reallocation of research space typically occurs on the occasion of departures or hiring of faculty.

IV. Distribution and Factors for Consideration

Distribution and priorities must be considered in light of space available. When particular demands create a space crunch, the department will first turn to resources external to the department who both need to be aware of the issues and may assist in addressing departmental needs. Among those resources are:
1) the Vice Provost for Research and Sponsored Projects (particularly as the space challenge relates to data collection, protection issues, and terms of grants),

2) the Dean,

3) the Vice Provost for Academic Planning,

4) Facilities, and

5) other university personnel with whom informal contacts may prove fruitful.

The amount of research space for each project is often directly proportional to the needs of the specific research activities. For example, a project that involves on-site data collection (e.g., focus groups) or data coding (e.g., observational coding) or a large number of graduate and undergraduate research assistants may need more space than a project in which data collection is subcontracted out or which involves few people. Hence, faculty may exchange research spaces (or share or relinquish their space temporarily) as the needs of different projects expand and contract.

Hence, the criteria for deciding on space: Ideally, tenure-track and tenured faculty on regular appointments will be assigned a minimum research/laboratory space. We aspire also to have space for all graduate students, and the number of graduate students supervised by each faculty member may be a factor in their research space assignment.

However, when space is limited, faculty who are not currently conducting an active program of primarily community-based research and who are not supervising graduate or undergraduate student research are not provided with research space; however, if such faculty resume such activities, they will be provided with research space. To comply with the commitments made to funding agencies and community partners, additional laboratory facilities will be assigned for funded faculty research which can’t be conducted within the assigned minimum laboratory space. Therefore, “active” includes between grants, and would include such factors as a consideration of active grant getting and continuing use of grant-based data.

At times, some faculty may need to have priority for scheduling in order to conduct their research effectively. Even in the case of a designated research space, another faculty member may request occasional or temporary use of space, as need arises. In addition to the factors noted above, the following criteria are weighed as part of the designation of space:

1. The physical layout of the space – in some instances specific spaces may have the physical features necessary to enable the research that faculty conduct. For example, only certain rooms have one-way mirrors. If this feature is needed, then a faculty member may need scheduling priority for a room.

2. Identification to the community outside of PSU – in some cases, researchers need specific space to maintain a cohesive presence for contact with members of the community. For example, research participants may be recruited from the outside community (e.g., infants or elderly participants). In these cases, researchers should be given priority in scheduling and usage of a space to maintain these contacts.

3. Consistent intensive usage – in some cases, faculty use spaces each and every term to support their research. Consistent access to research materials and/or equipment is
required. Space to accommodate the size of the research team will also be considered. These faculty members should be considered for priority scheduling and usage of research space to facilitate the continuity of these research endeavors.

4. **Scheduling factors** – in some cases, researchers have fixed data collection days and times. This factor should also be carefully considered when determining who has priority in scheduling and usage of a research space.

5. **Untenured tenure-track faculty**– because untenured faculty must quickly build a research program, it is particularly important that they have access to adequate space.

6. **Sharing spaces**– Especially with regard to bigger spaces, arrangements will be facilitated in which the spaces are shared by multiple faculty. In a crisis, bigger spaces will be divided among more faculty.

7. The nature of the activity itself may also affect the nature of the space required (e.g., coding of data may need to occur at the same time phone interviews for data collection are taking place). This concurrent activities may require separate space.

**Sources**

Department of Psychology Space Subcommittee, Spring, 2006. (Kaufman, James, Skinner, Sinclair).

[www://sci.odu.edu/sci/about/policies/research_apace.shtml](http://www.sci.odu.edu/sci/about/policies/research_apace.shtml) Old Dominion

[http://psychweb.uoregon.edu/otresources/PsychDSP21.pdf](http://psychweb.uoregon.edu/otresources/PsychDSP21.pdf) University of Oregon

[http://wings.buffalo.edu/psychology/resources/space.html](http://wings.buffalo.edu/psychology/resources/space.html) Dept of Psychology, University at Buffalo

[http://louisville.edu/a-s/general/docs/space_policy04.pdf](http://louisville.edu/a-s/general/docs/space_policy04.pdf) University of Louisville


[http://www.tcnj.edu/~leynes/space/Space_policy.pdf](http://www.tcnj.edu/~leynes/space/Space_policy.pdf) College of New Jersey Department of Psychology

[http://www.plattsburgh.edu/academics/psychology/departments/policies/governance](http://www.plattsburgh.edu/academics/psychology/departments/policies/governance) State University of New York at Plattsburgh

**Policy%20on%20Allocation%20of%20Research%20Space.doc** University unknown.

[http://www.usask.ca/psychology/department/policies/spacepolicies.php](http://www.usask.ca/psychology/department/policies/spacepolicies.php) University of Saskatchewan Psychology Department

[http://research.phhp.ufl.edu/research-space-gathering-information.htm](http://research.phhp.ufl.edu/research-space-gathering-information.htm) University of Florida Space Allocation Report

Website missing at the moment: Psychology Department, College of New Jersey. Policy Guiding Allocation of Research Space in the College of Health Professions—university unknown.
4. Proposed Practices for Graduate Student Funding and Teaching.

Proposed Practices for Graduate Student Funding and Teaching
Version 4. 10-26-2010

As stated in the Graduate Handbook:
“Efforts will be made to provide continuous funding throughout a student's graduate program providing that the student remains in good standing and makes timely progress toward the degree. Two-years of support will be attempted for Master's students, four-years for Doctoral students. These may be graduate teaching assistantships, part-time instructorships (extra wage sections), or research assistantships, and often will include a combination of research and teaching responsibilities” (p. 33). Students receive funding as a graduate assistant, that is, funding that includes a graduate stipend and tuition remission. Funding from all sources, for example, from the department, a grant, or a fellowship, are included in tracking the number of years of support a student has received.

1. The opportunity to TA for and teach undergraduate courses is considered part of graduate training in our program. Graduate students are eligible to teach for the department as an Instructor only after they have completed a Master’s degree. Students who enter the program with a Master’s degree are eligible to teach as an Instructor starting their second year in the program. In general, GAs will be considered to be regularly available to teach as Instructors when they have completed their comprehensive exams. In general, GAs would teach a maximum of three courses after their comps. Faculty advisors or students may notify the Chair or Associate Chair if the student would like to teach sooner, or if a student’s professional goals do not include teaching undergraduate classes.

2. At the end of four years of funding for Doctoral students (or two years of funding for Masters students), it is possible that students may be supported for one final year as graduate assistants. Such support is contingent on the availability of funding, and is only possible if students are in good standing and making timely progress. These decisions will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the Graduate Chair and the student’s advisor.

3. If a student has not successfully defended their dissertation after 27 dissertation credits, they are no longer considered to be making timely progress. Therefore, they will no longer be eligible for funding as a graduate assistant. Note that after 27 dissertation credits, no more dissertation credits can be counted toward graduation, so the kinds of tuition remissions (full-time or 9 credits) associated with funding as a graduate assistant are no longer needed. However, students will still need to be enrolled in 1 credit per term until they complete their dissertation.

4. In general, students should not expect funding from the department after they are no longer eligible to receive funding as a graduate assistant. However, under certain conditions, graduate students may be eligible to be hired by the department as an instructor, that is, paid on a per course basis as an adjunct. This is possible if:
   a. the student has successfully proposed their dissertation,
   b. the advisor agrees that the student is on track to complete the dissertation within one year,
   c. the student has demonstrated a high level of teaching proficiency (as shown through teaching evaluations), and
d. the department needs to staff courses the student is qualified to teach.

5. Funding as an instructor is never guaranteed. When making decisions about hiring graduate students as instructors, the department uses the same range of criteria as hiring regular adjuncts, including:
   a. who is the most qualified instructor for a particular class,
   b. seniority of instructors (graduate student are integrated into the seniority queue based on the first quarter they taught as an instructor for the department), and
   c. obligations to employ adjunct faculty based on their history of teaching for the department.

6. Under this arrangement, graduate students can only teach one course per quarter and may be hired as an adjunct for a maximum of three quarters, during the year directly following the last quarter they received departmental funding as a graduate assistant.

7. Graduate students may also apply to be approved to teach one course per quarter for Psychology as part of the Extended Campus Program.

8. Rare exceptions may be made to this policy based on departmental needs, such as emergency staffing needs, or based on individual graduate student situations, such as health issues, as determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Graduate Chair and the student’s advisor.

**FYI: Recommendations for Timely Progress Norms:**
**Grad Progress Committee 3-9-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Early On Time*</th>
<th>End of On Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propose Master's thesis</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.5 years</td>
<td>Winter of Year 2</td>
<td>Winter of year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Master's thesis</td>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>Spring of Year 2</td>
<td>Spring of Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comps</td>
<td>2.5 to 3.5 years</td>
<td>Fall of year 3</td>
<td>Fall of Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>2.5 to 3.5 years</td>
<td>Winter of year 3</td>
<td>Winter of year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose Dissertation</td>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>Spring of Year 3</td>
<td>Spring of Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend Dissertation</td>
<td>4 to 5 years</td>
<td>Spring of Year 4</td>
<td>Spring of Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>EARLY ON TIME Propose Master's thesis</td>
<td>EARLY ON TIME Finish Master's thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>EARLY ON TIME Comps</td>
<td>EARLY ON TIME Internship</td>
<td>EARLY ON TIME Propose Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Propose Master’s thesis</td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Finish Master’s thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Comps</td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Defend Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>END OF ON TIME Propose Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

* Few students are on the shorter ranges (we could think of only two), and those who were had been grant funded all 4 years.
- Includes expectation that students will teach for us.
- Includes expectation that no student will be funded for more than 27 dissertation credits.

**Entering with a Master’s**

Timely progress markers depend on
- Whether they have already completed an empirical Masters, and
- How much coursework they can waive

Average seems to be about 3 years,
- Including some waived coursework and not doing a Masters
- 4 quarters of coursework, comps, internship, and 27 dissertation credits

**Master Classes: Goals, Context, and Responsibilities**  
Approved May 2, 2012

**Goals:**
1. Identify a set of courses that our grad students will regularly teach:
   - ones that we have multiple sections
   - ones that fit with the teaching profile we want our students to have
   - ones that they will be qualified to teach
2. Help grad students who are teaching for the first time be more prepared to do a good job teaching (i.e., “You can’t be a Master teacher the first time you teach a class, but you can teach a Master class”).

**Context:**
1. We would like the Master classes to be seen as part of preparing our grad students to teach, and so they would include the workshop from CAE, the online workshop and teaching sessions, and other departmental efforts to support teaching.
2. To the extent possible, grad students should be assigned to TA the classes they will eventually teach.
3. To the extent possible, for their first time out, grad students should teach in summer or in classes of 50 or smaller.
4. To the extent possible, graduate instructors should not be supervising graduate TAs.
5. To the extent possible, grad student teaching should routinely incorporate mid-course evaluations (e.g., as done through CAE).
6. To the extent possible, grad student teaching should be supported by faculty in-class observations and feedback.

**Primary Master Classes (Master teachers)**
- PSY 204 Psychology as a Social Science:  Keith Kaufman
- PSY 200 Psychology as a Natural Science: TBA
- PSY 311 Human Development:  Ellen Skinner
- PSY 321 Research Methods:  Todd Bodner, Joel Steele, Greg Townley
- PSY 399 Computing in Psychology:  Todd Bodner, Joel Steele
- PSY 399 Motivation in Education:  Robert Roeser
- PSY 471 Health Psychology:  Cynthia Mohr

**Secondary Master Classes:**
- PSY 343 Social Relationships and Groups
- PSY 345 Motivation
Also possible:  
   - Employee Development  
   - Work Motivation  
   - Psychology of Addictive Behaviors

**What does it mean to create a “Master class”?**
1. Create the course materials that a new graduate student would need to be able to teach
the class well. This would includes any of the following elements that you use in your class:

- selecting the book
- identifying any supplemental readings
- example of a syllabus (for whatever pattern you are teaching: TR, MWF, evening)
- powerpoints or overheads and notes, and supplementary materials (e.g., videos)
- descriptions of assignments and rubrics for grading
- exams
- in-class activities, videos

2. Teach the class at least once a year (probably fall)
   - Possibly teach a larger section (e.g., 150) so you could have two TAs.
   - Mentor the TAs so they would have an experience that would be preparing them to teach the class.

3. It would also probably mean that you could have the "right-of-way" whenever you wanted to offer it other quarters, whereas the non-Master class teachers might not be able to offer it as often, since we might need to populate it with grad instructors.

4. Creating a Master class is enough work that it could be counted as a significant contribution to the UG program and used as a basis for a targeted capacity release.

**What are the Master teacher’s responsibilities to the TA (Teaching Apprentice)?**

1. Help apprentices understand that they will be tailoring the course materials, and the course materials are a living changing set of plans.

2. Scaffold apprentices’ teaching in the class (at least 4 hours of direct class contact)
   - Have the TA start small: leading a class discussion
   - Have them move up to a review session
   - Have them facilitate an in-class activity
   - Have them prepare and deliver a small section of a lecture (e.g., 30 minutes)
   - Have them prepare and deliver at least two 1 hour sessions

3. Provide feedback to the TA about their work in class, perhaps using a TA form developed by Keith.

4. Arrange for TA to receive direct feedback from students in the class about their work, perhaps by adding to course evals or index cards.

5. In order to show apprentices how classes grown and change, have them help revise at least one aspect of the course (e.g., improve exam questions, rework in-class activity, revise rubric or instructions).

6. **Process for Attending to Concerns about Faculty Advising of Graduate Students.**
Overview. Faculty have a collective responsibility to assure that all of our graduate students receive high quality advising during their time in the program. For the vast majority of students, this is the case. However, we have had no regular process for identifying and addressing situations in which there are questions about the quality of faculty advising.

Addressing such concerns is inherently challenging. The processes of graduate student advising are complex, dynamic, largely private and dyadic; the causes of problems in these relationships are difficult to discern even from the inside, let alone from the outside; they always involve the capacities and actions of both participants; and both participants naturally focus most on the role the other person is playing in creating problems. Faculty-graduate student relationships are professionally very close; both parties have big investments in the relationship and loyalties to each other; and the costs of problems or of dissolution of these relationships, especially to graduate students, can be very high.

It is inherently challenging to detect potential problems, and difficult to figure out exactly what is going on when visible problems are detected. Because of what is at stake for graduate students, there is probably a high threshold before students talk to outside parties about difficulties in advising they may be experiencing. Information about concerns with the way specific faculty are advising collects in many different locations, including the Chair and Grad Chair who receive complaints from students, faculty on students’ committees, senior faculty in an area, the whole faculty during grad evaluations, and comments from the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) and their grad representatives. Possible markers of concern are also visible in students’ performance, for example, their lack of timely progress, or when they leave the program or move to other advisors. Typically faculty only receive snippets of this information (e.g., because grad students who complain do not want anyone to bring the information back to faculty) and so may not have the full picture of concerns about their advising. As a result, the recipients of complaints about faculty often do not have the opportunity to hear “the other side of the story,” which makes all the information about the situation inherently incomplete.

Goal. As a department, we have the responsibility to identify and address any concerns about the quality of advising our grad students are receiving. We have in place a forum and process for discussing and evaluating the part that graduate students play in impeding their success and progress in the program, namely, the yearly Graduate Student Evaluations, and we have several benchmarks and processes in place for stopping academically unsuccessful graduate students from continuing in the program.

Process. The process described in the remainder of this document is designed to address concerns with the other partner in the transaction, namely, faculty about whom concerns arise. We need a fair and humane process for receiving concerns, for bringing this information to the faculty member for their reflection and discussion, for taking action, and, if the faculty desire, for gathering accurate information about any issues in their advising and working with them to improve their advising.
1. **Markers of Concern Regarding Faculty Advising:** Issues with faculty advising rise to the level of concern when they reflect a pattern of multiple markers, that is, concerns are raised by multiple sources about multiple students. These should signal issues that are above and beyond the normal give-and-take and ups-and-downs of a faculty-student mentorship relationship.

No one marker is a definitive indicator of problematic advising. Many of our students are behind in their timely progress through the program, for a variety of reasons. Students rarely, but sometimes, switch mentors for reasons of match and interest, unrelated to concerns about advising. Students leave the program for a variety of reasons, sometimes abruptly. We routinely conduct exit interviews with students who leave before finishing the program, and this may shed light on their reasons, and whether or not they were connected to faculty advising.

Moreover, no faculty are perfect in their advising of graduate students. All faculty have made mistakes on occasion, in failing to provide structured guidance and timely feedback, in sometimes being neglectful or abrasive in their interactions, in losing track of a student’s progress, or giving poor advice. By and large, we think that graduate students understand such occasional mistakes and students believe that, on the whole, what they receive in their relationships with their mentors far outweighs their mentors’ idiosyncrasies and lapses.

Hence, it is very unusual for students to complain about faculty advising. The Chair, Grad Chair, and Associate Chair might receive 1-2 such complaints a year. Therefore, such complaints usually have high signal value. It is also very unusual for senior colleagues in an area to express concern about another faculty member’s advising, and it is very rare for OGS or the grad representative to contact the department. Therefore, these markers also have high signal value.

The following markers of concern rise to the level of potentially actionable information, when they appear to converge on a pattern, involving multiple students over multiple occasions, especially students whom faculty judge to be capable. The first group of indicators are not usually definitive by themselves (although they may suggest to us that we should reflect on our selection and advising practices), but the second set are considered more serious.

**Potential Markers of Concern**
- a. Students not making timely progress.
- b. Students moving or actively seeking to move to another advisor.
- c. Students leaving the program (especially suddenly or after first year).

**Markers of Concern**
- d. Student complaints to Chair or Grad Chair.
- e. Concern expressed by faculty on students’ committees or in area.
- f. Concern expressed by faculty at grad evaluation meeting.
- g. Concern expressed by graduate representative or OGS.

2. **Responding to graduate student (or any other) complaints about faculty advising.**
- a. Students can express their concerns about faculty advising to the Chair, the Associate Chair, the Grad Chair, or to other faculty. Faculty can also express their concerns about faculty advising to the Chair, the Associate Chair, or the Grad Chair.
- b. Sometimes student “concerns” are really questions about norms and time tables (e.g., Does the mentor have to provide feedback on thesis drafts over summer?). When these can be dealt with through the provision of information (e.g., for faculty who are not on contract over the
summer, such participation is at their discretion), they do not really rise to the level of “complaints.”

c. We have a history of general practices for addressing concerns constructively: by trying to ascertain the “facts” as the student knows them, by reflecting with the student on their own role in the situation, by advising the student to address their concerns directly with the faculty member, and by providing suggestions and strategies for working constructively with the faculty member.

d. If possible, faculty should be informed about any concerns that the Chair, Associate Chair, Grad Chair, or senior faculty identify, as the information becomes available. The best way for this to happen is for the students themselves to raise them with their faculty mentor. By the time they come to the Chair, Associate Chair, or Grad Chair, students have typically tried this already, but it is an important step to think this through with the student. The process of bringing information back to the faculty member is delicate since grad students often do not want their concerns to be brought back to the faculty member, and students are concerned about the negative repercussions (both in the program and professionally) of their complaints.

3. Identifying and responding to cumulative information about concerns.
   a. It is the job of the Chair and Grad Chair to identify, monitor, and cumulate markers of concern.
   b. Chair, Grad Chair, and faculty should keep each other abreast of these conversations, as long as they are not confidential personnel matters.
   c. A threshold is reached that requires concerns to be addressed cumulatively when there are multiple markers for multiple students and a history of concern. In deciding when a threshold has been reached, the profile of strengths and performances of the graduate students involved should always be considered as a contributing factor.

4. Additional information seeking and discussion.
   a. When a judgment about the level of concern has been reached, the Chair and Grad Chair (along with senior faculty in the area if appropriate) meet with the faculty member to review and discuss the concerns. Such a meeting can also be initiated by the faculty themselves or by senior faculty in an area.
   b. This conversation (or multiple conversations if needed) should explore the markers of concern, with genuine openness to the information brought by the faculty member.

5. Possible actions.
   Based on the new information and discussion(s), the Chair (in consultation with the Grad Chair, Associate Chair, and senior area faculty) decides whether or not to place a “hold” on the faculty member’s ability to take on new advisees, either by admission of new students to the program or through taking over advising of a student currently in the program.

6. To remedy this “hold”, the faculty member may request a review of their advising of graduate students. This process includes gathering additional information about the faculty’s advising practices, creating and implementing an action plan, and deciding on a timeline and set of behavioral indicators for review of progress.
7. **Gathering additional information from former and current graduate advisees, other faculty, and other graduate students with whom the faculty member has worked.**
   a. Gathering accurate information about quality of advising from current and former graduate advisees:
      1) In order to gather accurate information about advising, the faculty member and the Chair request Janelle Voegele (or other similar university professional development staff) to gather information from current and former advisees, through a focus group or e-mail, inviting all students supervised by that faculty.
      2) Students are told that the faculty member is requesting information about their strengths and about how to improve their advising.
      3) Students provide info about strengths and concerns anonymously and as a group.
      4) Janelle compiles information, focusing on common themes.
   b. Gathering accurate information from other faculty. The Chair requests information from other faculty who are familiar with the faculty’s advising, for example, who have served on thesis, comprehensive exam, or dissertation committees with them.
   c. Gathering accurate information from other graduate students. Additional information may be gathered from current or former graduate students, who are not advisees of the faculty member, but who have worked with them in other capacities, for example, on thesis, comprehensive exam, or dissertation committees.

8. **Plan of action.** The process of working to improve advising involves the creation and implementation of a plan of action:
   a. Faculty selects a senior mentor with whom to review the information.
   b. Faculty and mentor make plan of improvement and work on improvement together.
   c. Faculty let students know about what he/she heard and plan of changes.
   d. Behavioral indictors of performance improvement are identified and a plan to collect information is developed.

9. **Review of progress.** After a sufficient amount of time, the Chair and Graduate Chair review the improvement of the faculty’s advising, using behavioral indicators of performance improvement, including:
   a. Review students’ progress.
   b. Check back in with all students.
   c. Check in with faculty on student committees.

10. **Possible next steps.**
    a. Based on progress, the Chair and Graduate Chair (in consultation with the Associate Chair and senior faculty in an area) make a decision about whether the hold may be lifted or additional action is needed. If the hold is lifted, careful attention is paid to how the advising process proceeds.
    b. If the concerns are merited or if additional concerns arise, other responses may be appropriate as well. For example, if the situation is urgent, it may merit removing responsibility not only for advising future graduate students, but for advising current
graduate students as well. In these rare cases, the Chair and Graduate Chair would work with individual students, for example, in:
1) informing students of the possible adequacy and/or appropriateness of the faculty member’s advising,
2) assigning co-advisors for a student, or
3) reassigning the student(s) to a different advisor.

11. Concerns about the Chair’s graduate advising. If concerns are raised about the graduate advising of the Chair, these same steps and processes are carried out by the Graduate Chair and the Associate Chair, in consultation with the senior faculty in the Chair’s area.

From Faculty Meeting notes and updates:

To divide reduced funds for summer teaching fairly among faculty, we will use:

**Variable flat rate**: The rate for each course would depend upon the number of faculty who are interested in teaching summer courses and the funding available after adjuncts are paid. These funds would be divided equally among tenure-related faculty, for the first summer course that each faculty member teaches. For 2nd and 3rd summer courses, faculty would be paid at the adjunct rate.

**Explanation (not voted on)**: We decided on a variable flat rate-- a common rate that could differ from year to year. So any year, all faculty who want to teach have the opportunity to teach one course at this variable rate. And we would take the money that remained after we paid everyone the adjunct rate ($3640) and divide it up among all the faculty who wanted to teach. So, for example, if faculty want to teach 9 classes, then each would be paid about $5000, but if only 5 want to teach, it would be $6000, and so on.
8. Targeted Faculty Capacity (TFC) Release.

Targeted Faculty Capacity (TFC) Release for
Advancing Faculty Research and Scholarship (TFC-R) or
Advancing Departmental Objectives (TFC-D)
(approved 11 April 2012 and updated 11 February 2015)

Goal. The goals of this initiative are to create additional faculty capacity so that faculty can (1) devote attention to significant research activities that advance their scholarship; and (2) contribute to or lead significant projects for the department beyond the usual committee assignments. In addition, this initiative attempts to bring some portion of graduate supervision in load.

Eligibility. Faculty who meet eligibility criteria can apply for either kind of TFC. No faculty will receive more than one TFC per year. Faculty who are already receiving a departmental release (e.g., a Third Year release) are not eligible to apply during that year.

Decisions. TFC requests will be reviewed by a committee of at least 3 faculty members, including either the Chair or Associate Chair. A maximum of 5-6 faculty will be granted TFCs in a given year, depending on funds and other considerations (e.g., availability of qualified replacement instructors). All faculty who are eligible and whose proposed projects meet criteria will be rank ordered based on when they last received releases.

Conditions. If as the year progresses, problems arise with the expected project, the chair of the TFC committee must be notified and changes agreed to. The committee chair may convene the committee if it seems necessary to review the extent of the changes.

Completion. Documentation includes the completed project, to be submitted by end of the academic year for which the release was granted (September 14th). It is the responsibility of each faculty member to voluntarily forward the project by this date. If the project is not completed and submitted, the faculty member is not eligible to receive TFCs for at least two years. After that time, faculty are only eligible if they complete and submit documentation from the previous project.

Note these contingencies and named tensions: (1) the availability of slots is contingent on availability of funding to replace the UG course; (2) ranking faculty will be a judgment call based on multiple criteria; (3) the goal is for resources to be distributed fairly and used wisely.

Targeted Faculty Capacity Release for Advancing Faculty Research (TFC-R)

Goal. The goal for the TFC-R is to create faculty capacity so that faculty can devote more time to concentrate on research activities. The scope of each project must be above and beyond a faculty member's generally expected research activity and the faculty member must continue with all expected departmental service.

Projects. Typical projects include writing a new grant proposal to a major funding agency or foundation; and, completing a major research product such as editing or authoring a scholarly book.
from a reputable publisher, editing an issue of a peer reviewed journal, or chairing a major research conference.

**Coordination and timelines.** A timeline for completion of the research project should be included as part of a proposal. If the project is not completed as originally agreed to, or as revised in agreement with the Chair, the faculty member's future eligibility for project releases will be affected as described above.

**Request for a Targeted Faculty Capacity Release-R**

Faculty name________________________________________________

1. Please provide a paragraph describing your recent research activity (include recent publications):

2. Describe your supervision of graduate students:
   Please list graduate students, years, and their progress:

3. Describe your fair share of self-governance activities
   Please list departmental self-governance activities:

4. Add additional considerations, if any:

5. Identify quarter/calendar year of requested course release:
   Name of course:
   (must be graduate course, unless only 1 or no graduate courses left)

6. Please indicate how the capacity will be used by describing the proposed project and its timeline for completion and the deliverables for the project:
   For example:
   a. Writing a new grant proposal (specify funding agency and approximate amount to be requested)
   b. Major research task (e.g., editing or authoring a book or journal issue, chairing a major conference, etc)

7. Conditions: please check to show you have accepted this condition:
   [ ] I understand that if I do not complete the activity and provide documentation by the deadline, I will not be eligible to receive another TFC for at least 2 years. Moreover, if as the year progresses, problems arise with the expected project, I will notify the chair of the TFC committee and we will agree upon changes (if necessary with the consultation of the rest of the committee).

**Targeted Faculty Capacity Release for Advancing Department Objectives (TFC-D)**

**Goal.** The goal for the TFC-D is to advance specific departmental objectives such as the following: (1) improving undergraduate learning (e.g., curricular improvements); (2) a unique and major departmental project (e.g., revision of the faculty handbook); (3) assessment of graduate or undergraduate student learning; or (4) fundraising. The scope of each project must be above and beyond a faculty member's generally expected departmental service and the faculty member must
continue with all expected departmental service. Faculty who are not supervising graduate students may also be eligible. Eligibility will also include evidence of a continuing scholarly agenda.

Projects. Special projects to advance departmental objectives may be based on an initiative proposed by a particular faculty member, and/or identified by the faculty as a whole, and/or by the Steering Committee, and/or designated by the Chair. Unless already identified by the faculty as a whole (e.g., at the Retreat), projects proposed by a faculty member or by the Chair will be reviewed and approved by the department's Steering Committee. The Chair will have the latitude to solicit a faculty member for the project based on the Chair's specific knowledge of a faculty member's experience, fit, and feasibility.

Coordination and timelines. A timeline for completion of departmental projects will be included as part of a proposal, and/or generated by the Chair and the faculty member. Because the project is intended to benefit the department, the timeline will include periodic discussions with the Chair in order to review project status. The Chair will bring to the Steering Committee significant shifts in the timeline or revision to the project's aims and the Steering Committee will determine the disposition of the project. As with Targeted Faculty Capacity-R releases, if the project is not completed as originally agreed to, or as revised in agreement with the Steering Committee, the faculty member's future eligibility for project releases will be affected in ways equivalent to Targeted Faculty Capacity-R releases.

Request for a Targeted Faculty Capacity Release-D

Faculty name__________________________________________________________

1. Please provide a paragraph describing the scholarly agenda and research activities underway:

2. Describe departmental self-governance activities:

3. Add additional considerations, if any:

4. Identify quarter/calendar year of requested course release:
   Name of course:
   (must be graduate course, unless only 1 or no graduate courses left)

5. Describe proposed project and an initial timeline:

6. Conditions: please check to show you have accepted this condition:
   [ ] I understand that if I do not complete the activity and provide documentation by the deadline, I will not be eligible to receive another TFC for at least 2 years. Moreover, if as the year progresses, problems arise with the expected project, I will notify the chair of the TFC committee and we will agree upon changes (if necessary with the consultation of the rest of the committee).