DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Guidelines for Faculty Development and Evaluation
Retention, Promotion, Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Merit Review
of Tenure-Track Faculty

Approved October 22, 1997.
Updated February 11, 2005.
Merit guidelines added May 30, 2012.
Updated June 10, 2014.
Guidelines for non-tenure-track instructional faculty added June 10, 2015.
Guidelines for post-tenure and post-promotion review added June 10, 2015.
Guidelines for non-tenure-track instructional faculty updated May 2, 2017
Approved by OAA May 9, 2017.
Approved by Psychology faculty May 22, 2017.
NTTF guidelines moved to separate document by OAA October 23, 2019

The department's P&T Guidelines are an interpretation of and subordinate to the University P&T Guidelines. These department P&T Guidelines are not effective unless and until approved by the Dean and OAA. Changes to the department's P&T guidelines shall not be effective unless and until approved by OAA. These guidelines must be distributed in writing to all members of the department faculty. Department chairs must distribute these guidelines to new tenure-track and non-tenure-track instructional faculty with their appointment letters.

Guidelines for Faculty Development and Evaluation
Retention, Promotion, Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Merit Review

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission as a Department of Psychology will be considered in evaluating each faculty member's contributions to research, teaching, outreach, and service.

Applied psychology creates understanding and solutions to enhance lives and address societal problems. In our research, we use science to generate knowledge that guides action and frames policy in the contexts and settings of daily life. We take our questions to neighborhoods, businesses and non-profits, schools and families who are diverse in ethnicity, class, gender, culture, age, and disability status. This makes ours a science that is often collaborative not only with other researchers nationally and internationally, but also with people in the settings where they live and work. Through collaboration, we endeavor to help our community collaborators use and sustain what we have learned together.

We educate both undergraduate and graduate students about human behavior, about the theories in which research is rooted, and about how to actively critique the assumptions, methods, and ethics that are a part of generating and using psychological knowledge. Along with our research, our work with students reflects our commitment to realizing human and organizational possibilities to their fullest.

Philosophy and Purpose

These guidelines outline policies and procedures that are designed to foster and evaluate faculty teaching and scholarship.

The essence of scholarship is contributions to knowledge. Consistent with university guidelines, our guidelines are based on the notion that scholarship can be conducted in the domains of research, teaching, and community outreach. Whatever their scholarly profiles, our faculty are expected to engage in the highest levels of life-long learning and inquiry. As scholars, our faculty are expected to establish a coherent program of work focused on important issues, to develop and maintain expertise in the relevant areas, to employ state of the art methods to examine these issues, and to communicate the results of their work to other members of the scholarly community. (The university guidelines, *entitled Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases* can be found on the PSU website at www.pdx.edu/psy/faculty-resources)

In describing the process of scholarship, that is, the process of making contributions to knowledge, two phases can be distinguished. The first is the phase during which the new knowledge is discovered, generated, constructed, or created. The second phase is one during which knowledge is disseminated and critiqued by scholarly peers, and then refined, revised, or defended. Work during the first phase of scholarship is referred to as *scholarly activities.* For example, scholarly activities of research might include the identification of an important question, the selection of an appropriate methodology for examining the issue, and collection and analysis of empirical data. Or, the scholarly activities of teaching might include the analysis of learning objectives for a specific class, the selection of teaching and classroom activities to meet those objectives, implementing those activities, and conducting in-class assessments to determine if the objectives were met. Scholarly activities are considered to be the basic core fundamentals of a scholar's work.

Following the University Guidelines, the second phase of scholarship, which builds on a foundation of scholarly activities, is referred to as *scholarship*. In this phase, the results of scholarly activities are disseminated to the national or international community of other scholars concerned with these issues, to be reviewed and critiqued by these peers. Through interaction with the community of other scholars, faculty are challenged to rethink their own work and can exert an impact on the field. Accomplishments at this second level, because they require successful completion of the first phase, are considered to be the clearest indicators of scholarship. Hence, the departmental criteria for promotion and tenure are

organized around these indicators. Nevertheless, the scholarly activities of research, teaching, and outreach are also valued and contribute to a faculty member's scholarly profile. Quality and significance are the primary criteria for evaluating faculty scholarship and scholarly activities. Scholarship with underserved populations is highly valued. Contributions to the development of collaborative, inter-disciplinary, and inter-institutional programs are also valued.

Activities and scholarship of research, teaching, and outreach and their evaluation are described in more detail in the section on General Criteria. Scholarship and activities organized around these three foci are overlapping, and are not meant to be mutually exclusive. For example, research activities can target teaching or outreach outcomes. Outreach activities can be based on empirical findings. Both outreach and research can have teaching or training functions. A scholar's profile can include multiple foci and can change in focus or balance over time.

Self-governance and professional service activities. Faculty participation in self-governance activities is crucial to the functioning of a university. Self-governance and professional service activities include a faculty member's service to the department, the university, and the profession. These include essential activities that do not always engage the faculty member's scholarship.

Scholarly agenda. A scholarly agenda encompasses the general set of serious intellectual issues that engage a faculty member. This agenda lends direction and purpose to scholarly work. It is useful in clarifying the goals and relevance of activities and in establishing a coherent program of important work. A scholar's agenda is embedded in a particular field and a particular historical and social moment, as well as in a particular institutional context, all of which will shape the scope and direction of a scholar's agenda.

Within the current Psychology guidelines, a faculty member's scholarly agenda is the basis for several different documents. It can be used to supplement reports of activities that are submitted to the *Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee* (PRT) or Post-Tenure Review Committees. Finally, its retrospective reconstruction is the basis for the "Self-Assessment" which is a required part of documentation for consideration for promotion or tenure, and for post-tenure review.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Mentoring

Both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty have the option of receiving mentoring. Mentoring relations are not meant to interfere with or replace supportive relations with other faculty. In general, it is advisable for non-tenure track faculty to work with mentors who are within their area as well as mentors who are from other areas or other departments.

Scholarly Goals and Activities

As part of their annual or post-tenure reviews, tenure-track and tenured faculty members prepare a personal narrative of "Scholarly Goals and Activities." This narrative includes an overview of the general set of serious intellectual issues that currently engage the faculty member, as well as the main scholarly goals that the faculty member intends to pursue in the coming year(s). It also includes any special responsibilities the faculty member will assume. The narrative of scholarly goals and activities may mention the most interesting scholarly experiences and accomplishments of the past year. The narrative of the department chair, when up for review, will include a description of his or her prior activities and future priorities and plans as chair.

Any faculty member who wishes may also meet separately with the department chair to discuss the faculty member's scholarly agenda. In the case of untenured faculty, an additional senior faculty member may also be present, if desired by the tenure-track faculty member. Preparation and communication of scholarly agenda serve a formative developmental purpose. They cannot be used as part of a faculty member's file for evaluation unless placed there by the faculty member.

POLICIES

The evaluation policies of the department comply with all PSU guidelines and the PSU-AAUP 2015-2019 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Voting

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

Voting membership. To be a voting member of the department, faculty must hold at least a .50 FTE and meet all the additional criteria for that specific vote. For example, to vote on tenure-decisions, the faculty member must also be tenured. The specific requirements for eligibility to vote on each kind of decision (e.g. tenure, promotion to full professor, merit, etc.) are specified below at the beginning of those respective sections. The department has the right to give voting membership to other individuals for one year, but doing so requires an absolute (at least 51%) 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 issues. In addition to the criteria specified in each section, additional requirements are placed on eligibility to vote for personnel decisions, such as hiring, promotion, or tenure. To vote on personnel issues, a person must have been present during all the deliberations on a particular case to vote on that case. Those votes are signed, as required by the university.

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 consecutive terms. After that, he or she becomes eligible to run again after being out of office as long as he or she was in office 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. The PRT chair asks each eligible member of the department (typically via e-mail) 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 (at least 51%) 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 votes are announced to the faculty one week in advance, and they must respond by the end of that week. The chair chooses his or her own associate chair.

Chair review. After the fourth quarter of the chair's appointment, the faculty shall review the performance of the chair. This review is overseen by the immediately previous chair, or if the immediately previous chair is not available, then it is overseen by the PRT chair. The chair submits a self-

assessment to the immediately previous chair or the PRT chair, depending on who is overseeing the review. The self-assessment summarizes his or her activities in the role of chair during the last year. In addition, the statement should include a brief description of the chair's vision for the department, and future priorities and plans for activities. Graduate student input shall be sought by the faculty.

Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee

The PRT committee chair is selected by rotating through those faculty committee members who are eligible to participate in all decisions. This shall be done by May 1st of the prior academic year. The term of service is two years. The PRT committee is made up of several subcommittees: a Retention Subcommittee, a Tenure Subcommittee, and various promotion subcommittees, the number of subcommittees actually required in any given year depending on the number of categories (see below) in which the committee has to make decisions. The membership of the PRT committee to consider the promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty to any given rank shall consist of all members of the department who are tenured, hold that rank or above, hold at least a .50 FTE appointment, and (because of either ineligibility or self- deferral) are not currently being considered for promotion to that rank. The membership of the PRT committee to consider the promotion of Non-tenure Track Instructional faculty (NTTF) to any given rank shall consist of all tenured faculty and all NTTF who hold that rank or above, hold at least a .50 FTE appointment, and (because of either ineligibility or self-deferral) are not currently being considered for promotion to that rank. If none of the other NTTF in the department are at or above the given rank, then one NTTF of lower rank will be on the committee. If there are no other NTTF in the department, then a NTTF from another department will be invited. For a committee member to vote on an individual case, he or she must attend every meeting at which that case is considered.

When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the PRT committee may include a nonvoting faculty representative from a second department or program mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the PRT committee. In addition, the committees are instructed to obtain information from graduate students (when graduate teaching, mentoring, and/or research supervision are part of the candidate's profile of responsibilities), in a manner that provides the most complete and accurate information, while protecting respondents' confidentiality and ensuring candidates access to any written reports upon which promotion, retention, or tenure decisions are based.

CALENDAR of REVIEW PROCESSES for Tenure-Track Faculty	
Review	**Timing**
First Year Review	Fall of Year 2
Optional: Second Year Review	Fall of Year 3
Cumulative Third Year Review	Spring of Year 3
Fourth Year Review Updated review of activities during the third year	Fall of Year 4
Fifth Year Review Review of activities during the fourth year	Fall of Year 5
Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate	Fall of Year 6
Review for Promotion to Full	At least 3 years in rank as Associate
Post-Tenure Review	Every 5 years post- tenure; review for Full counts as a post-tenure review. (See PTR Calendar on page 21)

<center>**EVALUATION of FACULTY**</center>

EVALUATION of TENURE-TRACK FACULTY for RETENTION, PROMOTION, and TENURE

General Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty

The overarching criteria for retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review are:

1. quality scholarly activities and scholarship;

2. satisfactory teaching, mentoring, and research supervision at the graduate and undergraduate levels; and

3. participation in self-governance and professional service activities

The standards for evaluation are performance that is (a) satisfactory on each of these criteria taken separately, and (b) commensurate with rank in terms of the entire set of criteria, considered in a manner that allows strengths to compensate for weaknesses.

Scholarly Activities and Scholarship

Research. Engagement in research *activities* includes contributions to empirical investigation, with special weight placed on primary data collection in field settings. In addition, research includes scholarly work on meta-theory, theory, measurement construction, design, and statistical analyses. Research includes both discovery of new knowledge, and integration and application of existing knowledge. Hence, research includes evaluation research, social policy research, cost-benefit analyses, intervention research, and teaching and curricular research.

Scholarship of research involves the use of scholarly expertise to establish a coherent ongoing program of research on an important topic, and to disseminate research findings, subjecting them to critique by peers. Research with underserved populations is highly valued. Contributions to the development of collaborative, inter-disciplinary, and inter-institutional research programs are valued. Scholarship of research is evaluated on the basis of nationally-recognized expertise in a specific area; number and quality of publications (especially peer-reviewed publications); grant proposals submitted and grants awarded; presentations at scholarly meetings; editorships of and reviews for scholarly journals; honors and awards; offices in professional organizations, and attendance at scholarly meetings.

Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities. Teaching *activities* are evaluated on the basis of classroom teaching and include keeping current with the field, evaluating critically the materials in the field, and organizing material coherently and logically; lecturing, leading discussions, implementing learning activities, and stimulating student curiosity and critical thinking; and providing feedback to students and assessing their performance. Effectiveness must, at least in part, be operationally defined, for example, in terms of student ratings.

In addition, teaching includes advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, including supervision of their research, teaching, and outreach (practica, internship, service-learning) activities. Teaching activities also include contributions to curricular development and reform.

Scholarship of teaching is the use of scholarly expertise to contribute in a coherent ongoing way to the generation and dissemination of knowledge about teaching, mentoring, or curricular reform. Service-learning and teaching underserved populations are valued. Contributions to the development of collaborative, inter-disciplinary, and inter-institutional teaching programs are also valued. Scholarship of teaching is evaluated based on nationally-recognized expertise; publication and dissemination of

information about teaching (especially in peer-reviewed publications); grant proposals submitted and grants awarded to support teaching or curricular evaluation; presentations and attendance at scholarly meetings; editorships and reviews for scholarly journals; honors and awards; and offices in professional organizations.

Community outreach. Outreach *activities* are ones that use scholarly expertise in service to the university, profession, or community. These include the creation, revision, implementation of intervention programs; revision and evaluation of existing practices or services; and significant contributions to public policy.

Scholarship of outreach includes the use of scholarly expertise in a coherent series of activities that contribute to the definition or resolution of problems or issues in society. Outreach to underserved populations is highly valued. Contributions to the development of collaborative, inter-disciplinary, and inter-institutional outreach efforts are also highly valued. Scholarship of outreach is evaluated based on nationally-recognized expertise in community issues; publication and dissemination of information about outreach, intervention, or evaluation (especially in peer-reviewed publications); grant proposals submitted and grants awarded to support outreach or evaluation; presentations and attendance at scholarly meetings; editorships and reviews for scholarly journals; honors and awards; and offices in professional organizations.

Self-governance and professional service activities. Faculty support the mission of the department and university through their active and sustained participation in self-governance and professional service to the department, the university, and the profession. All faculty are expected to show consistent and constructive engagement in departmental self-governance activities, as well as leadership commensurate with their rank, including participation in Faculty Meetings, annual departmental Retreats, service on standing departmental committees and departmental initiatives, and contributions to planning and innovation in the graduate and undergraduate programs.

Retention: Annual Review

Eligibility. Unless specified differently in the supplemental letter of hire, all Annual/Tenure related faculty must be considered for: (1) a First Year review conducted in fall after the completion of their first year of appointment, (2) a Third Year review conducted in spring during the third year, (3) a Fourth Year review which is an updated review of activities completed during the third year and is conducted in fall after the completion of their third year of appointment (4) a Fifth Year review which is a review of activities completed during the fourth year and is conducted in fall after the completion of the fourth year, and (5) consideration for the final tenure decision conducted in fall after the completion of the fifth year. At the discretion of the faculty member or the PRT committee, faculty may also be considered for a second year review conducted in fall after the completion of their second year of appointment. If this additional review is conducted, it has the same status and is treated in the same manner as the other required reviews.

Documentation. Faculty members under review should submit:

1. an updated curriculum vita in PSU format (the CV should make clear what accomplishments are new since the CV submitted for the prior review),
2. a personal narrative of scholarly goals and activities in research, teaching, and outreach, which entails:
   a. a statement of scholarly agenda and accomplishments in research since the last review, including:
      - the long-term goals and purposes of one's program of research,

- the theoretical perspectives framing the research,
- how research activities and accomplishments have advanced those goals, and
- an overview of the direction of and plans for future research.

    b. a statement describing teaching (teaching philosophy and goals, pedagogical methods, and self-evaluation of both classroom and individual instructional processes) and outreach efforts as well as service and self-governance activities since the last review,

3. copies of their publications since the time of the last review, and
4. syllabi for courses taught and teaching evaluations since the time of the last review, summarized and presented graphically.

In making their evaluation, the PRT committee will consult copies of reports received from prior PRT committees and the ad to which the individual responded and a copy of the supplemental letter of hire.

    Criteria. The annual reviews are typically developmental in nature. The criteria for retention are satisfactory progress toward achieving the criteria for tenure and promotion.

As a result of this review, faculty members should be given an assessment of their progress toward tenure and of any deficiencies that need to be addressed prior to the award of tenure. The recommendation categories are Ineligible, Deferred, Positive Recommendation, and Negative Recommendation. The recommendation is made by a simple majority vote of the PRT committee.

In addition to making a retention recommendation in the case of each tenure-track faculty member, the PRT committee provides that faculty member with an evaluation of his/her progress towards tenure. The report should provide the faculty member with details on their strengths and weaknesses in the areas of research, teaching, outreach, and self-governance and professional service activities.

Although these reports are not forwarded to the Dean at the completion of each review cycle, they will all be included in the faculty member's complete file when it is forwarded to the Dean for consideration at the time of promotion and tenure.

Retention: Third Year Review

    Eligibility. A special annual review is conducted in spring of the third year. The results of this review are sent to the Dean following the completion of the review. This review is cumulative and covers the entire three years since the time of hire.

    Documentation. Materials are cumulative and should cover the entire three years since the time of hire. Accomplishments over the entire span of a faculty member's career can be included, with greater emphasis given to accomplishments achieved since starting at PSU. Faculty members under review should submit:

1. an updated vita in PSU format (the CV should make clear what accomplishments have been achieved since the time of hire),
2. a one-page summary that summarizes major accomplishments in research, teaching, outreach, and self-governance since the time of hire;
3. a personal narrative of scholarly goals and activities in research, teaching, and outreach, which entails:
        a. a statement of scholarly agenda and accomplishments in research since the time of hire, including:
        - the long-term goals and purposes of one's program of research,

- the theoretical perspectives framing the research,
- how research activities and accomplishments have advanced those goals, and
- an overview of the direction of and plans for future research,

  b. a statement describing teaching (teaching philosophy and goals, pedagogical methods, and self-evaluation of both classroom and individual instructional processes) and outreach efforts as well as service and self-governance activities since the time of hire,

4. copies of their publications since the time of hire, and
5. syllabi for courses taught and teaching evaluations since the time of hire, summarized and presented graphically.

In making their evaluation, the PRT committee will consult copies of reports received from prior PRT committees and the ad to which the individual responded and a copy of the supplemental letter of hire.

  Criteria. The criteria for retention are satisfactory progress toward achieving the criteria for tenure and promotion.

As a result of this review, faculty members should be given an assessment of their progress toward tenure and of any deficiencies that need to be addressed prior to the award of tenure. The recommendation categories are Ineligible, Deferred, Positive Recommendation, and Negative Recommendation. The recommendation is made by a simple majority vote of the subcommittee.

In addition to making a retention recommendation in the case of each tenure-track faculty member, the PRT committee provides that faculty member with an evaluation of his/her progress towards tenure. The report should provide the faculty member with details on their strengths and weaknesses in the areas of research, teaching, outreach, and self-governance and professional service activities. This report is forwarded to the Dean.

Promotion and Tenure

  The PRT committee also makes recommendations in the categories of Tenure and Promotion. Documentation, eligibility for consideration, and criteria are presented below for each of the four categories.

  Documentation. Materials are cumulative and should cover the years since the time of hire or time of last promotion. Accomplishments over the entire span of a faculty member's career can be included, with greater emphasis given to accomplishments achieved since starting at PSU. Faculty members under review should submit:

1. an updated vita in PSU format including a comprehensive list of significant accomplishments,
2. a one-page summary that summarizes major accomplishments in research, teaching, outreach, and self-governance since the time of hire or time of last promotion;
3. a personal narrative of scholarly goals and activities in research, teaching, and outreach, which entails:
  a. a statement of scholarly agenda and accomplishments in research since the time of hire or time since last promotion, highlighting the work of highest quality. A narrative statement includes:
- the long-term goals and purposes of one's program of research,
- the theoretical perspectives framing the research,
- how research activities and accomplishments have advanced those goals, and
- an overview of the direction of and plans for future research,

b. a statement describing teaching (teaching philosophy and goals, pedagogical methods, and self-evaluation of both classroom and individual instructional processes) and outreach efforts as well as service and self-governance activities since the time of hire or time of last promotion,

4. copies of their publications since the time of hire or time of last promotion, and

5. syllabi for courses taught and teaching evaluations since the time of hire or time of last promotion, summarized and presented graphically.

The PRT committee will consult copies of reports received from prior PRT committees, and in the case of tenure, the ad to which the individual responded and a copy of the supplemental letter of hire.

Tenure

Eligibility. Normally, the Psychology Department consideration of faculty for tenure will occur in the sixth year of appointment in a tenure-track position. Recommendations to award tenure earlier can be made at the department's discretion, although this would be rare. For faculty members recommended for tenure, the PRT committee's evaluation report should survey all years being counted toward tenure, including years of prior service that have been extended to the faculty member in his or her original letter of hire.

Criteria. Criteria for tenure are evidence of professional growth and continued promise; and quality scholarship of research. In addition, criteria include (a) satisfactory undergraduate and graduate instruction, and graduate mentoring and research supervision; and (b) performance of a fair share of departmental self-governance activities. Scholarship of teaching and outreach, as well as university and professional service activities are included in the evaluation of a faculty member's profile, but cannot replace scholarship of research. In addition, since the granting of tenure reflects a long-term commitment of the department to the individual, the committee will consider the candidate's potential value to the institution as evidenced by professional performance and growth.

The recommendation categories are Positive Recommendation or Negative Recommendation. The recommendation is made by a two-thirds majority vote of the committee.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Eligibility. In almost all cases, decisions about promotion to Associate Professor are considered together with decisions about tenure. However, in specific cases and at the discretion of the department, tenure-track faculty can be considered for promotion to Associate Professor either before or after decisions about tenure. To be eligible for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor, faculty must have at least three (3) years as Assistant Professor.

Criteria. Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are evidence of professional growth and continued promise; and quality scholarship of research. In addition, criteria include (a) satisfactory undergraduate and graduate instruction, and graduate mentoring and research supervision; and (b) performance of a fair share of departmental self-governance activities. Scholarship of teaching and outreach, as well as university and professional service activities are included in the evaluation of a faculty member's profile, but cannot replace scholarship of research.

Promotion to Full Professor

Eligibility. All tenured faculty with at least three (3) years as Associate Professor are considered for promotion to Full Professor. Individuals may request not to be considered, and the subcommittee will comply with any such request.

Criteria. Criteria for promotion to Full Professor are significant contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship of research, teaching, and/or outreach. In addition, criteria include (a) quality undergraduate and graduate instruction, and/or graduate mentoring and research supervision, when these are part of the faculty member's profile of activities; and (b) performance of a leadership or significant role in department or university self-governance or professional service activities. Activities of research, teaching, and outreach are included in the evaluation of a faculty member's profile but cannot replace scholarship.

The recommendation is made by a two-thirds majority vote of the subcommittee.

Promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor

Eligibility. All faculty in the year before their retirement becomes effective are eligible to be considered for promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor. The lifelong professional contributions of the individual, with full recognition that any career manifests peaks and valleys of accomplishments that unfolded in a specific social context, will be used when considering individuals for this promotion. To be considered, an individual will request the promotion and provide the committee with a personal narrative of their accomplishments and a statement of what they see as their continuing contributions to the department and the university.

Criteria. Criteria for promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor are significant contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship of research, teaching, and/or outreach. In addition, criteria include (a) quality undergraduate and graduate instruction, and/or graduate mentoring and research supervision, when these are part of the faculty member's profile of activities; and (b) performance of a leadership or significant role in department or university self-governance or professional service activities. Activities of research, teaching, and outreach are included in the evaluation of a faculty member's profile but cannot replace scholarship.

The individual will present a clear plan to continue contributions to the department and the university. The application will be evaluated based on the demonstration of the individual's continuing competence in the area that their contribution will be made, and the needs of the department. The recommendation is made by a two-thirds majority vote of the subcommittee.

Each PRT subcommittee recommendation is noted on the appropriate university form, signed by the subcommittee members, and explained in an accompanying report. The committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each evaluated faculty member. The report must address each of following areas: research, teaching, outreach, self-governance and professional service activities, interdisciplinary and inter-institutional contributions (when applicable). Both the form and the report are delivered by the PRT committee to the department chair.

Procedures for Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty

These procedures are consistent with the University P&T guidelines, entitled *Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases,* which is available on the PSU website at www.pdx.edu/psy/faculty-resources.

The evaluation process for promotion, retention, and tenure normally involves three entities: the individual faculty member being evaluated; the Promotion, Retention and Tenure Committee; and the department chair, who is not eligible to serve on any of the committees.

Evaluation Process. The evaluation process normally involves the following steps:

1. Submission of pertinent materials by faculty members under review to the PRT committee;

2. Evaluation of eligible department members by the PRT committee;

3. Evaluation of eligible department members by the department chair;

4. Report of PRT committee and department chair recommendations by the department chair to the individual faculty member being evaluated;

5. Opportunity for the faculty member to request reconsideration of the departmental recommendation; and

6. Forwarding of PRT committee and department chair recommendations by the department chair to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

External Peer Review Process. To substantiate the quality of scholarship and, when appropriate, for the assessment of teaching and service, external peer reviews must accompany recommendation for tenure and for promotion to associate and full professorships. For faculty to be reviewed for one of these personnel decisions, a list of potential external reviewers, which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and value of research and service directly impacting the external community, shall be compiled in the following manner.

1. The PRT chair will ask the faculty member for a list of reviewers (at least four) from outside the university. The list includes a brief description of the potential reviewer, his or her contact information, and a description of his or her relationships with the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator, colleague at another university, etc.). The faculty member may also provide a list of possible reviewers perceived as negative or biased; although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, the faculty member's exception will be included as a matter of record, if an evaluation is requested.

2. At least three additional external reviewers will be selected by the PRT chair in consultation with other faculty as needed. The PRT chair will send the list by the date specified by the Dean (typically June 1st of the prior academic year) to the Dean for review and the Dean may add names to the list.

3. The chair of the PRT committee will select evaluators from the combined list of outside reviewers. The letter (or e-mail) of solicitation will be sent to the reviewers by the second week in June. Materials sent to external reviewers include: (1) copies of the departmental and university guidelines for promotion and tenure; (2) a vita in the format of the faculty member's choice and a statement of scholarly goals and activities supplied by the faculty member; and (3) samples of the faculty member's work, chosen by the faculty member being reviewed, in consultation with the PRT chair.

A complete evaluation file to be considered by the PRT committee must include at least three such letters from external reviewers.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair. The department chair must be satisfied that the PRT committee has followed these guidelines and that the reviews are complete and in proper form. The chair is to make a separate recommendation for each member of the department reviewed, adding his or her own written narrative to the committee's. If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the PRT committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for specific differences.

The chair shall inform each faculty member in agreement with university guidelines in writing of the departmental committee's and his/her own recommendations. Faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean and Provost and they should

then indicate they have done so by signing the "*Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form.*" A copy of the complete appraisal should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations.

Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision. If a faculty member questions either the PRT committee's recommendation or the recommendation by the department chair, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation. Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of departmental action, the faculty member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation. If the request is for reconsideration of the PRT committee's recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the PRT committee chair. If the request for reconsideration concerns only the chair's recommendation, only the chair need be notified in writing.

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

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The PRT committee and/or the department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The PRT committee and/or the department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation with their recommendation(s) at that time. The department chair shall forward the appraisal to the Dean in a timely manner.

EVALUATION of FACULTY for POST-TENURE REVIEW

Goals. The goals of post-tenure review are:

• to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly within their units;

• to ensure that unit contributions are shouldered equitably. A key aspect of this program is therefore collaboration in aligning each faculty member's career path with unit missions while upholding academic freedom and a faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction;

• to be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development; and

• to recognize and motivate faculty engagement.

Post-tenure review is neither a merit review nor a re-evaluation of tenure or promotion.

EVALUATION of TENURE-TRACK FACULTY for POST-TENURE REVIEW

Eligibility. Tenured faculty members shall undergo post-tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post-tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post-tenure review.

All AAUP-represented tenured faculty members, department chairs/unit heads, and program directors shall undergo post-tenure review.

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

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

Tenured faculty who provide a letter stating they will retire within 2 years shall be allowed to opt out of post-tenure review. In these cases, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five year cycle of reviews.

With written agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer post-tenure review if review for promotion occurs within the same year, or for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions. As faculty in a quintile are deferred, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five year cycle of reviews.

Criteria. Criteria for satisfactory performance are (a) active, sustained engagement in high quality activities and/or scholarship in any combination of research, contributions to teaching and the undergraduate and graduate programs, outreach, and professional service at the regional or national level; and (b) consistent participation in a fair share of institutional service. Institutional service includes regular participation in departmental faculty meetings, self-governance committees, and routines, such as departmental retreats or review of graduate students; providing assistance to other faculty such as through mentorship or consultation; and participation on service committees of the college or university.

PROCEDURES for POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

Documentation. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes:

a. A current curriculum vitae;

b. A narrative of work done since the last review (whether that review was for tenure, for promotion, or a prior post-tenure or post-promotion review) in relation to the faculty member's career path; if the career path changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative; the narrative should highlight what the faculty member sees as his or her quality contributions since the last review, succinctly describing the faculty member's quality activities that demonstrate continuing professional development and contributions to the life of the university and external communities which he or she has served during the review period; the narrative may also inform the review committee of the changes in work or life circumstances that occurred that have affected the faculty member's work during the review period; in addition, the narrative should speak to future plans.

c. Documentation of teaching accomplishments, including contributions to the undergraduate and undergraduate programs;

d. Documentation of the faculty member's fair share of institutional service.

e. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he or she feels are relevant for the review.

Procedures. The chair of the department's Promotion, Retention, and Tenure committee shall ordinarily organize and coordinate the work of post-tenure and post-promotion review committees. Each faculty member under review shall have a review committee comprised of three people. Faculty eligible for review shall be notified of a deadline by which they may request two faculty to serve on the review committee and submit these names for approval of the department. Committee members shall be selected among tenured or emeritus faculty of Portland State University whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory. Teaching faculty also include at least one non-tenure track teaching faculty on their committees. The faculty member may request exceptions for consideration and such exceptions shall be considered at the discretion of the department. If the department receives these nominations by its deadline date, the department shall accommodate these names as fully as possible under terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. If the department does not have the nominations by the deadline date, the department shall appoint the entire committee for that faculty member.

Committee Review Process. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member. The committee shall use for their review the criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career.

The committee will find the faculty member's contributions to have met university standards for post-tenure 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.

Other factors from the faculty narrative to be considered when determining whether the faculty member has met the standards include but are not limited to: (a) the faculty member's teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation time required for new, different and/or non-lecture forms of instruction or delivery; (b) time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of research, teaching, outreach, or service; (c) increased departmental service, research, and/or instruction loads as a consequence of department staffing issues, such as the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty, increasing enrollments, absences of other faculty members due to sabbaticals, personal circumstances, or released time, unfilled vacancies, administrative appointments, changes in instructional support, increasing class sizes and/or changes in the physical workspace in the department; (d) personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member's work that did not result in a deferral; and (e) increased advising or mentoring duties due to departmental changes or to the role the faculty member plays in the campus community.

The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report to the department chair. 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.

Role of the Department Chair. The department chair must assure that the faculty member's post-tenure or post-promotion review 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. The department chair shall write a letter affirming or challenging the committee's decision and recommendation based on the criteria in the departmental post-tenure or post-promotion review guidelines, and explain his/her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the chair's letter shall document the areas he or she finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

Transmittal to faculty member. The department chair's letter and the committee report must be sent to the faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee's report. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the review committee report(s) and the department chair's letter before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost. The faculty member should indicate s/he has done so by signing the appropriate form. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may request reconsideration, as outlined in the university guidelines. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the review committee and the department chair.

The department chair must provide to Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit 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.

The remainder of the procedure will follow the guidelines stated in Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Portland State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and Portland State University. The department faculty member who is coordinating the work of post-tenure or post-promotion review committees shall provide these guidelines for review committee members.

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

Post Tenure Review Cycle and Timelines (effective Sept. 16, 2016)

	Due date	Task
1.	May 1	OAA creates a list of eligible faculty and provides to Deans.
2.	No later than June 1 prior to the year of eligibility.	Eligible faculty notified.
3.	June 15 prior to the year of eligibility.	Faculty request deferment.
4.	Per Dept. P & T guidelines.	Department Committees formed.

5.	1st Friday in October.	Faculty dossier submitted.
6.	End of October.	Committees complete reviews of eligible faculty and submit report.
7.	Within 10 working days from receipt of committee report. (Mid November)	Chair completes reviews of eligible faculty and submits report.
8.	Within 10 working days of the transmittal of committee report. (Mid November)	Faculty member receives chair's letter and committee report.
9.	Within 10 working days of receipt of recommendation. (Late November)	Faculty member requests reconsideration.
10.	Within 20 working days of request for reconsideration. (Mid December)	Faculty member submits supporting material materials to committee and/or chair.
11.	Early January	Committee and/or chair respond to reconsideration request and forward all materials to Dean.
12.	Within 20 working days of the receipt of the committee and chair reports. (Late January)	Dean completes review of eligible faculty and submits report.
13.	Within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean's letter. (Mid-February)	Department chair, chair of the committee, or faculty member requests reconsideration.
14.	Within 10 working days of request for reconsideration. (Late February)	Faculty member submits supporting material materials to committee and/or chair.
15.	Mid-March	Dean completes review, issues report and submits to Provost.

EVALUATION of TENURE-TRACK and INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (NTTF) for MERIT: CRITERIA and PROCESS

Approved by Psychology Faculty on May 30, 2012 and June 10, 2015

Goals. Create a set of criteria and procedures to allocate merit increases in a way that is transparent and equitable, involves broad participation of faculty, and reflects meritorious performance across the range of important faculty activities.

Criteria for Merit Review

1. Merit is evaluated based on the entire suite of faculty activities, including research and scholarship, teaching and mentorship, community outreach and professional service, and departmental and university self-governance. For tenure-track faculty, research and scholarship are more heavily weighted. For Instructional Faculty (NTTF), teaching and contributions to the undergraduate program are more heavily weighted.

2. Merit raises recognize performance that is more than satisfactory or in keeping with normal execution of faculty duties. Two levels of merit are distinguished: (a) excellent performance and (b) outstanding or exceptional performance. In general, the performance of many more faculty will be satisfactory and "excellent" than "exceptional."

3. Examples of the kinds of activities that are considered in making these distinctions are presented in Table 2. General criteria for meritorious performance can be found on pages 3-4 of the department's PRT guidelines. Each faculty's performance is rated based on the totality of all

their activities; it is not expected that anyone would be exceptional in all categories of activities. Higher standards are expected for faculty from higher ranks.

Procedures for Merit Review

1. The chair of the PRT committee invites faculty who are eligible for merit increases to submit an updated CV with a cover sheet that highlights achievements in the above areas over the past three years, or since the last merit review, whichever time frame is shorter.

2. All faculty are given the opportunity to rate the performance of all faculty who submit materials. Tenured faculty must provide ratings; untenured faculty may do so if they choose. Each faculty's performance is rated as: (1) satisfactory (or not meritorious); (2) excellent; or (3) exceptional. Only 3-4 faculty's performances can be rated as "exceptional," and these faculty are rank-ordered from 1 (top) to 3 or 4. These ratings are submitted anonymously to the PRT office support staff.

3. The PRT office support staff collates these ratings and brings them to the Merit Committee, which consists of the chair of the PRT committee, the department chair, the associate chair, and 1-3 additional members who are appointed by the Steering Committee to provide representation.

4. During a short meeting, the Merit committee makes final assignments of faculty performance to one of the three categories, with the expectation that many more faculty are assigned to "satisfactory" and "excellent" than to "exceptional."

5. Faculty in the first category (satisfactory or not meritorious) are not considered further. Faculty whose performances are rated as "excellent" are assigned a 1; faculty whose performances are rated as "exceptional" are assigned a 1.5. These numbers are added and the merit pool is divided by this total to determine the dollar value of one unit of merit increase. Faculty whose performance is rated as "excellent" receive one unit of merit increase; faculty whose performance is rated as "exceptional" receive 1.5 units of merit increase.

Examples of Criteria for Merit Performance

Excellent	Exceptional
Demonstrated collaboration within or across departments, in scholarship (e.g., authorship of articles or grants), teaching, outreach, service (e.g., committee work), or leadership of high profile work (e.g., editorship).	Substantial productivity or contributions well beyond those required for excellent performance.
RESEARCH and SCHOLARSHIP	
Publication significantly in excess of minimum Journal articles and book chapters At least some of which are empirical and you are first author Significant citations of your work **Excellent grant productivity** As measured by grants submitted and awarded	Exceptional number and quality of publications Top tier journals in your field or area of inquiry Edited or single author books Evidence of impact on field: exemplary citations, invitations **Exceptional grant productivity** As measured by grants awarded
TEACHING and MENTORSHIP	
Outstanding teaching evaluations **Exemplary student advisement** Significant supervision of UG students in research or teaching. **Especially heavy teaching load** E.g., large student enrollment & high quality teaching. **Especially heavy doctoral advisement load** High quality of advisement, taking into account timely progress, student achievements and awards, employment.	Exceptional teaching Exceptional teaching evaluations. Nomination for or awarding of a teaching or advising honor. **Significant contributions to improvements in UG or graduate program** Evidence of sustained efforts to improve teaching and use of exemplary methods of teaching that fit the type of class being used. **Significant contributions to improvements in advising or assessment**
COMMUNITY OUTREACH and PROFESSIONAL SERVICE	
Exemplary service and outreach to community partners **Exemplary service to profession or professional association** Significant contributions as an editorial board member, grant review board member, or professional governance	**Award or other recognition for service or outreach to community partners.** **Exceptional service to your field** Significant contributions as a journal editor, president of a scholarly association, conference program chair, permanent member of a grant review panel or another role.
DEPARTMENTAL and UNIVERSITY SELF-GOVERNANCE and LEADERSHIP	
Extensive service at the department, school, or university level Chair of a departmental search, member of a university level committee. **Exemplary administrative performance** As a program coordinator or in another role, making significant improvements, over and above departmental compensation.	**Exceptional service to the university** Leadership in a university level committee. Membership in multiple university committees that are considered important and that require time and effort.