

**Conducting Post-Continuous Appointment Reviews for  
Non-tenure Track Instructional Faculty**  
Updated August 2020

<b>TIMELINE for Conducting the Post-tenure Reviews:</b>	
Spring	<p><b>Dean's office</b> notifies Chair and faculty who are eligible for review in the upcoming year by <b>May 1</b>.</p> <p><b>Eligible faculty</b>, if desired, request deferment from Dean (e.g., based on sabbatical) by <b>June 1</b>.</p>
Late Fall	<p><b>Office Specialist</b> reminds faculty who are to be considered that materials are due <b>January 15</b>.</p> <p><b>PRT Chair</b> solicits faculty nominations for specific committee members. Faculty make requests, if desired, by first week of term.</p> <p><b>PRT Chair</b> assigns subcommittees and set up a schedule for review.</p> <p><b>Faculty</b> submit materials to Office Specialist by <b>January 15</b>.</p>
Winter	<p><b>Subcommittees</b> conduct reviews and write reports.</p> <p><b>Subcommittee</b> submits evaluation and recommendation to <b>Chair</b> by <b>late February</b></p> <p><b>Subcommittees</b> meet with faculty to review reports.</p> <p><b>Chair</b> writes memos to Dean to accompany faculty reports by the <b>end of March</b>.</p> <p>If no reconsideration is requested, <b>Office Specialist</b> sends reports and memos to the Dean, copies faculty.</p>
Spring	<p><b>Faculty</b> can request reconsideration to Committee, Chair, Dean, and/or Provost.</p> <p>If <b>faculty</b> request reconsideration, procedures detailed below are followed.</p> <p>If final decision is negative, <b>faculty</b> member and Chair develop a personal development plan by <b>April 15</b></p> <p>If <b>faculty</b> wishes to appeal remediation plan to <b>CLAS Dean</b>, must do so by <b>April 30</b>.</p> <p>Upon receipt of notification from OAA, the <b>Chair</b> or reviewed <b>faculty member</b> notify the designated <b>Office Specialist</b> who places final memos in faculty folders.</p>

The Chair and PRT Committee Chair are responsible for ensuring that Non-Tenure Track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment (CA) receive post-CA reviews (PCA) after three years of continuous appointment and then after every three years following the last evaluation or promotion.

The goal of these reviews is to provide opportunities for the professional development of senior faculty and to align each faculty member's career path with the departmental mission. Post-tenure reviews are neither a merit review nor a re-evaluation of promotion. Post-Continuous Appointment reviews are carried out by subcommittees.

The Post-Continuous Appointment Review Process is conducted as follows:

1. Late in Spring quarter, no later than May 1, OAA notifies (via the **Dean**) the Chair and faculty who are eligible for review the next year. By June 1, **faculty** may request a deferment (based, for example, on an upcoming sabbatical or leave).
  - Promotions in rank are considered reviews, and reset the countdown for PPR.
  - NTTF instructional faculty who provide a letter stating they will retire within 2 years can also opt out of post- promotion review.
2. The **Chair** informs the PRT Chair and the Office Specialist who is eligible for PPR next year, and the **Office Specialist** notifies them that their materials are due by October 15.
3. At the beginning of fall quarter the **Office Specialist** obtains the dates that reviews are due to CLAS and again reminds faculty that their materials are due by January 15.
4. The faculty member creates a dossier that includes:
  - 1) A cumulative self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and highlights activities and achievement
    - a. key accomplishments in the previous three years, including
      - undergraduate teaching, advising, and mentoring activities, and
      - self-governance and service activities;
    - b. a personal self-evaluation of progress made in the previous year including
      - a description of professional goals, professional development activities intended to advance job performance, and progress toward professional goals,
      - a description of teaching philosophy, instructional goals, and pedagogical methods, and
      - a self-evaluation of both classroom and individual instructional processes; and
    - c. a description of contributions to the undergraduate program, including documentation of projects undertaken/completed;
  - 2) Current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU P&T format approved by the Provost;
  - 3) Appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range) or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review, summarized and presented graphically;
  - 4) Representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

Materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation following continuous appointment may include, but are not limited to:

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

5. The **PRT Chair** coordinates the work of the PPR subcommittees. A subcommittee, consisting of 3 people, is organized for each faculty member up for review.
  - a. Committee members can include tenured or emeritus faculty of Portland State University whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory.
  - b. The PRT Chair informs faculty that, by a certain date, they can nominate 2 faculty to serve on their review committee. The faculty member may also request exceptions for consideration and such exceptions shall be considered at the discretion of the department.
  - c. If these names are received by the deadline, the PRT Chair accommodates these names as fully as possible. If nominations are not submitted by the deadline, the PRT Chair appoints the entire committee.
6. When the **subcommittee** is constituted, its members select a chair who writes the committee's report, addressed to the Department Chair. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. Other factors to be considered include but are not limited to:
  - a. the faculty member's teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation time required for new, different and/or non-lecture forms of instruction or delivery;
  - b. time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of teaching, outreach, or service;
  - c. increased departmental service, and/or instruction loads as a consequence of department staffing issues, such as the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty, increasing enrollments, absences of other faculty members due to sabbaticals, personal circumstances, or released time, unfilled vacancies, administrative appointments, changes in instructional support, increasing class sizes and/or changes in the physical workspace in the department;
  - d. personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member's work that did not result in a deferral; and
  - e. increased advising or mentoring duties due to departmental changes or to the role the faculty member plays in the campus community
7. The **subcommittee** will find the faculty member's contributions to have met university standards for post-continuous appointment review if:
  - a. the faculty member adequately demonstrates ongoing activity in each of the areas above, or the faculty member adequately demonstrates to the committee how his or her activities are consistent with departmental/unit needs and priorities, and
  - b. the effort expended totals the effort expected of a full time (1.0 full time equivalent) faculty member or prorated commensurate to the faculty member's FTE assignment for those parts of the review period when the faculty member's assignment was less than full time.
8. The **subcommittee** tries to reach consensus before writing its report. In its report, the committee shall explain its decision and provide evidence to support its decision. If the committee finds the

faculty member's contributions to meet the standards set forth for review, they shall document this in their report. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the report shall document the areas the committee finds do not meet standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority. **Subcommittee** submits evaluation and recommendation to **Chair** by **end of February**.

9. The **Department Chair** confirms that the faculty member's PPR Committee has followed departmental and university review guidelines, has considered the faculty member's dossier, and that the committee's report is complete and uses the proper forms.

**By the end of March**, the **Department Chair** writes a memo affirming or challenging the committee's decision and recommendation based on departmental criteria and explaining his/her reasons. If the Chair finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the Chair's letter documents the areas he/ she finds do not meet the standards and provides evidence so that these areas can be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

10. The **Department Chair** sends their letter and the committee report to the faculty member within 10 working days of receiving the committee's report. The **faculty member** reviews the entire file before it is forwarded to the Dean/Provost, and indicates this by signing the appropriate form.

### Requesting Reconsideration

11. If the **faculty member** disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may request reconsideration. The Department Chair discusses with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the review committee and the Department Chair. **Faculty** can request reconsideration to the Committee, Chair, Dean, and/or Provost (see timeline below).
12. In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the **faculty member** and **Department Chair** or chair equivalent will meet to discuss the deficiencies identified in the review. Following the meeting, the Chair will develop a remediation plan to address the deficiencies by **April 15**.
13. If the **faculty member** disagrees with the remediation plan, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean or the Dean's designee by the **end of April**, who shall review the plan and make the final decision regarding the contents of the plan. The remediation plan is to be developed before the end of the academic year in which the unsatisfactory evaluation occurred. If the Chair and faculty member identify resources that would assist with the remediation plan, a request for access to such resources will be made to and considered by the Dean. Resource unavailability could result in modification or extension of the remediation plan.
14. Progress on the remediation plan is to be assessed and communicated on a regular basis during the subsequent academic year. At a minimum, the Chair and the faculty member will meet near the beginning of the fall term to review the remediation plan and near the end of the fall term to review the faculty member's progress on the remediation plan. Prior to the end of fall term, the Chair is to provide the faculty member with a written assessment of progress on the remediation plan, including identification of any issues that have not yet been successfully remediated.

15. At any point in the process, the Chair can determine that the remediation plan has been successfully completed, at which time the Chair shall notify the faculty member and conclude the remediation process.
16. Around the end of the winter term of the academic year following the unsatisfactory evaluation, the Chair is to notify the faculty member whether the remediation plan has been successfully completed. If the plan has not been successfully completed, the Chair may either extend the plan for an additional academic term or provide the faculty member with notice of termination. A remediation plan may be extended by the Chair for up to three academic terms. A notice of termination provided under this section shall be provided to the member, Dean, Provost, and the Association and shall be effective no sooner than the end of the subsequent academic term.
17. The **Department Chair** provides to the Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed, and the **Office Specialist** submits to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
  - A completed recommendation form signed by members of the review committee and Chair;
  - The review committee's report and the Department Chair's letter;
  - If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member's request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the Chair and/or committee.
18. Upon receipt of notification from OAA, the **Chair** or reviewed **faculty** notify the designated **Office Specialist** who places final memos in faculty folders on the I-drive and in the faculty member's personnel file in the Chair's office.

Updated by Ellen Skinner & Zoe Erickson, August 26, 2020.