**Department of Public Administration**

**Tenure, Promotion and Review Policies, Procedures and Guidelines**

The Department of Public Administration (hereafter, Department) conducts reviews of faculty in accordance with existing PSU policies and guidelines. We seek to make these reviews collegial and emphasize peer feedback. Review committees are charged to provide thoughtful and careful review using PSU and Department standards, with an emphasis on helping faculty progress through the ranks and on being successful in their teaching, scholarship, community engagement and service activities.

**Article I Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Tenure-Track and**

**Non-tenure Track Research, Clinical and Practice Faculty**

**for Promotion, Tenure and Emeritus Status**

(Adopted by the faculty: October 2014, Provost Confirmation Nov. 5, 2014)

1. **Appointment of Committees and Chairs:**

All review committees are appointed by the Department Chair after consultation with the individual faculty member eligible for review and the tenured members of the faculty.

1. **Composition of Review Committees:**
2. Annual review committees for tenure track faculty in years 1-5 pre-tenure review are composed of three PA faculty at the rank of associate professor, professor or non-tenure track Continuous Employment. There are no external or student members on these committees.
3. The promotion and tenure committee (normally conducted in a junior faculty member’s sixth year) is composed of three PA tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor; one tenured member from another Department in the Hatfield School; and one graduate student from one of the MPP, PAP PhD, MPA, MPA-HA, or EMPA programs.
4. Committees for review of tenure track faculty seeking promotion to professor are composed of three PA tenured faculty at the rank of professor; one tenured member at the rank of professor from another Department in the Hatfield School; and one graduate student from one of the MPP, PAP PhD, MPA, MPA-HA or EMPA programs.
5. Committees for review of all non-tenure track research, clinical and practice faculty are composed of three PA faculty at the rank of associate professor, professor or non-tenure track Continuous Employment, at least one of whom will have relevant experience related to the work of the faculty being reviewed.
6. Where there may not be sufficient or appropriate expertise available among the PA tenured faculty to ensure a well-informed review of the faculty member, the Department Chair will consult with the review candidate and other colleagues to identify a suitable committee member (tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor, or rank of non-tenure track Continuous Employment), from within CUPA or elsewhere in the University. In such cases, at least the review committee chair and one member of the committee must be faculty from the PA Department.
7. The faculty member being reviewed may request addition or removal of a committee member if they perceive a lack of content knowledge or a threat of bias.

1. **Schedule of Reviews**

The Department follows the University’s guidelines articulated in *Cycles for Annual, Third Year, and Tenure Reviews* (see [*https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-and-tenure-information*](https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-and-tenure-information) *right column bottom):*

* First year reviews are conducted in fall of the second year.
* Second year reviews are conducted in spring of the second year.
* Third year reviews are conducted in winter of the third year.
* Fourth and fifth year reviews are conducted in fall of the relevant year.
* The tenure and promotion review is conducted in fall of the sixth year.

Documentation for the first and second year reviews will consist of an updated CV and a statement of research agenda and academic plan, addressing the major criteria of the PA Tenure and Promotion Policies. The third year review documentation should be more complete, mirroring that of the full dossier for tenure/promotion review and including relevant examples of documentation to provide evidence of all of the major criteria of the review. Fourth and fifth year documentation may be more brief, including an updated CV and statement of research agenda and academic plan. The dossier for tenure/promotion reviews should provide complete documentation of the faculty member’s work and be organized to respond to the major Tenure and Promotion Policies criteria; sufficient examples of evidence should be included for each criterion.

Tenure and promotion reviews will be initiated in spring quarter; faculty will be notified of the upcoming review by the Department Chair, and they will respond regarding their intent to be reviewed. Where a review goes forward, the faculty member will provide an updated CV, brief statement of research agenda, and names of four potential external reviewers. The committee will then identify another four potential reviewers, and seek approval of the list from the CUPA Dean. After approval, the review committee chair will invite reviewers, indicating that the actual timing of review will be in late September/early October. Faculty under review will submit their complete dossier electronically and with one hard copy within the first week of the annual contract in September, and materials will be sent out to reviewers at that time, with a three-week turnaround. The review committee will review the dossier and the external letters, meet with the faculty under review, and then write their report to the CUPA Dean, submitting this no later than the fourth Monday in November.

1. **Ranks Eligible for Review**

The following ranks (approved by the Department of Public Administration in October 2014 in compliance with Faculty Senate guidelines amended October, 2013 to add new non-tenure-track faculty ranks) are eligible for review under Article I of this document. Promotional path options for NTTF hired prior to September 16, 2014 are outlined in Appendix IV of the University Guidelines *(at https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-and-tenure-information)*.

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

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

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

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

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the individual to have made contributions to knowledge as a result of the person’s scholarship, whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, and community outreach. High quality and significance (see *University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Section* *II. D*) are the essential criteria for evaluation. Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member’s responsibilities. Finally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the faculty member to have performed his or her fair share of governance and professionally-related service activities of the University.

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

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

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

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

Promotion to Senior Instructor I is based on criteria such as: quality of instruction, as determined by classroom observation, assessment of student-learning outcomes, and review of student evaluations and course materials; expertise in the discipline, as demonstrated by activities such as ongoing revision of course materials, curricular innovations, participation in continuing education, conferences, and other professional activities; evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations; and participation in departmental, college/school, and university governance as appropriate to assignment and contract.

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

Professorial Research Appointments**:** This isa non-tenure track appointment for a faculty member who is primarily engaged in research at a level normally appropriate for a professorial rank. Ranks for these appointments are Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.

Conversion of a Senior Research Associate II to Research Assistant Professor is based on the nature of the position, its intended duration and responsibilities, and the incumbent’s record of scholarly accomplishment and responsibilities. The conversion must be approved by the Dean and Provost. Promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor requires review outlined in *University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Section V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Promotion to Senior Research Assistant I will be based on criteria such as: years of research experience and demonstrated ability to perform focused research or evaluation tasks. Responsibilities may include assisting in the coordination of research activities; communicating with community and interdisciplinary collaborators; basic qualitative or statistical analysis; maintaining databases; collecting, processing and reporting of data; assisting in the preparation of reports and presentations.

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

Appointments as Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fellow: This rank may be used in a variety of cases when individuals are associated with the institution for limited periods of time for their further training or experience. This rank can be bestowed at the discretion of the Department Chair or by the Director of an Institute with the approval of the Hatfield School Director.

1. **Policies Governing Preparation of Review Materials**

The PA Department uses the PSU *Tenure and Promotion Policies* document to conduct faculty reviews. This document is supplemented by a faculty member’s letter of appointment and other expectations and responsibilities outlined by the Department Chair. The Department does not apply any additional explicit standards of productivity or performance beyond those specified in PSU policies *(see* [*http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/promotion-and-tenure-information*](http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/promotion-and-tenure-information)*).* These policies provide faculty with additional information that is helpful in preparing their portfolios for review.

The department embraces the University’s integrative and holistic approach to evaluation which treats “scholarship” as consisting of discovery, integration, interpretation and application that apply equally to formal research, teaching and community outreach. This means that the weight to be given factors relevant to the determination of promotion, tenure, and merit necessarily varies with the individual faculty member’s assigned role and particular areas of scholarly interest. The Department recognizes that research, teaching and community outreach often overlap and are mutually reinforcing.

The burden is on the applicant to provide the review committee with sufficient documentation to determine the faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness. Documentation for promotion and tenure should include:

* 1. Self-appraisal of scholarly agenda and accomplishments. A self-appraisal should include:
     1. a discussion of the scholarly agenda that describes the long-term goals and purposes of a scholarly line of work, explains how the agenda fits into a larger endeavor and field of work, and demonstrates how scholarly accomplishments to date have advanced the agenda.
     2. a discussion of how the candidate views the relationship among the scholarship of teaching, community outreach and more formal academic publications.
     3. a description of how the agenda relates to the departmental academic mission, within the context of the University mission and the discipline as a whole.
     4. an evaluation of the quality and significance of the candidate’s scholarly work.
     5. an evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching, research, or community outreach when it is part of a faculty member’s responsibilities

1. A curriculum vitae including a comprehensive list of significant accomplishments.
2. A representative sample of an individual’s most scholarly work rather than an exhaustive portfolio.
3. Evaluations of accomplishments by peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., students, community participants, and subject matter experts). Candidates for tenure are required to participate in a formal external peer review process. The candidate will provide the Chair of the Review Committee with a list of at least 3 scholars qualified to review their work. The Chair of the Review Committee in consultation with the Department Chair, shall prepare a final list of external reviewers (3-5) who will receive a representative sample of the candidate’s scholarship for their review of the quality and significance to the field. At least two of the reviewers will be from the list provided by the candidate. These letters will be confidential. Peers include authoritative representatives from the candidate’s scholarly field(s).
4. **Criteria Used in Evaluating Promotion and Tenure**
5. Research

A significant factor in determining a faculty member’s merit for promotion and tenure is the individual’s accomplishments in research and published contributions to knowledge in the appropriate field(s) and other professional or creative activities that are consistent with the faculty member’s responsibilities. The following criteria are considered in evaluating research:

* 1. Research is evaluated on the quality and significance of publication of scholarly books, monographs, articles, presentations, reviews in journals, grant proposal submissions, peer-reviewed technical reports and awards. The evaluation will consider whether the individual’s contributions reflect continuous engagement in research and whether these contributions demonstrate future promise. Additionally, the evaluations consider whether publications are refereed. This includes publications that are peer reviewed in formal journals as well as applied research that results in publications that are peer-reviewed by academically qualified professionals.
  2. Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, or inter-institutional research programs are highly valued. This work is evaluated by considering both the individual contributions (e.g., quality of work, completion of assigned responsibilities) and contributions to the successful participation of others (e.g., skills in teamwork, group problem solving).
  3. Honors and awards represent recognition of stature in the field when they recognize active engagement in research or creative activities at regional, national, or international levels.
  4. Effective participation in disciplinary or interdisciplinary organizations’ activities are deemed important. These activities are evaluated in the context of their contributions to emerging fields of knowledge and impact on peers and others. Such activities include serving as editor of journals or other learned publications, serving on an editorial board, chairing a program committee for a regional, national, or international meeting, or providing scholarly leadership as an officer of a major professional organization.

1. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities

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

Teaching scholars often study pedagogical methods that improve student learning. Evaluation of performance in this area includes creative and effective use of innovative teaching methods, curricular innovations, and software development. Scholars who teach also should disseminate promising curricular innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review. The Department encourages publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally-focused presentations at disciplinary and interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovations or practice. Evaluation of teaching and curricular contributions is not be limited to classroom activities. It also includes a faculty member’s contributions to larger curricular goals (for example, the role of a course in laying foundations for other courses and its contribution to majors, specializations, or contributions to broad aspects of general education or interdisciplinary components of the curriculum).

In addition, the Department recognizes that student mentoring, academic advising, thesis advising, and dissertation advising are important departmental functions. Faculty may take on differential mentoring responsibilities as part of their personal scholarly agenda. The Department considers the following criteria in the evaluation of teaching and curricular accomplishments:

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

1. Community Outreach

Community outreach is an important part of the Department’s mission. Public Administration faculty are expected draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of community outreach. The Department considers community outreach to include the following kinds of activities:

* 1. contribute to the definition or resolution of a relevant social problem or issue

1. use state-of-the-art knowledge to facilitate change in organizations or institutions
   1. use disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise to help groups organizations in conceptualizing and solving problems
   2. set up intervention programs to prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes for individuals or groups or to optimize positive outcomes
   3. contribute to the evaluation of existing practices or programs
   4. make substantive contributions to public policy
   5. offer professional services such as consulting (consistent with the policy on outside employment), serving as an expert witness, providing clinical services, and participating on boards and commissions outside the university.

Contributions to knowledge developed through community outreach is judged by considering the following factors:

* 1. publication in journals or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach
  2. honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition received for community outreach
  3. adoption of the faculty member’s models for problem resolution, intervention programs, instruments, or processes by others who seek solutions to similar problems
  4. substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice
  5. evaluative statements from clients and peers regarding the quality and significance of documents or performances produced by the faculty member.
  6. applied research publications by agencies and organizations that are products of a faculty member’s significant contributions and an extension of his/her scholarship.

1. University, Community and Professionally-Related Service

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

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

**Article II: Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Faculty**

**for Post Tenure Review**

(Adopted by PA Faculty: October 26, 2015)

1. **Post-Tenure Review Goals**

Post Tenure Review is intended to serve the professional development goals of the faculty member under review, minimize the additional work involved in the review process, maintain collegiality and reinforce the standards and norms of the Department for teaching, research, service and community engagement.  The Department fully embraces the goals, procedures and processes for post-tenure review outlined in the *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at Portland State University* (see <http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-affairs/files/FINAL_PTR%20MOU%20ratified%209-4-2015%20CLEAN_with%20signature%20page.pdf>).

The specific goals of post-tenure review are:

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

1. **Guidelines and Eligibility**

AAUP-represented tenured faculty members in the Public Administration Department must undergo PTR every five years after the award of tenure.

1. **Procedures for Post Tenure Review**
   * 1. OAA shall forward the list of faculty members eligible for review in any given year to the Dean of the School/College where they have their principal appointment.
     2. The Dean of the School/College shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the chair of their respective departments.
     3. The department chair notifies the faculty in their department who are eligible for the review. In schools without department chairs, the Dean shall notify the faculty members directly.
2. Faculty Member Role: Upon notification that he or she is subject to post tenure review the faculty member shall compile a dossier that contains the following materials:
   1. Current curriculum vitae.
   2. Narrative/documentation of work done since last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) with regard to his or her scholarly agenda.
   3. Scholarly Agenda. If the scholarly agenda has changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain the revised scholarly agenda.
   4. Quantitative summaries of student evaluations (where available).
   5. Names of faculty that the faculty member being reviewed has asked and who have agreed to serve on his/her post tenure review committee.
   6. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he/she feels are relevant for the review.
   7. **The Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)** 
      1. Composition
   8. The committee shall be comprised of three people; two selected by the faculty member being reviewed and one by the department chair. The chair shall appoint the chair of each PTRC.
   9. Committee members shall be selected from tenured faculty and non-tenure track Continuous Employment faculty (including emeritus or retired faculty) whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member’s scholarly agenda.
   10. Faculty members whose work is multi-disciplinary may select one committee member from outside the university whose work aligns with the faculty member’s scholarly agenda.
   11. Should any faculty member selected to serve on a post tenure committee be unavailable to serve, the faculty member under review shall propose a new committee member.
   12. The department chair’s nominee should be mutually acceptable to the faculty member being reviewed and the chair of the department.
       1. Committee Responsibility and Review Criteria
          1. The committee shall review the faculty member’s dossier and all submitted materials in preparation for its meeting with the faculty member.
          2. At the meeting, the committee and the faculty member shall discuss the faculty member’s past work and future plans in the dimensions of research, teaching, outreach, and service with regard to the scholarly agenda. Prior to the committee meeting, committee members may contact the faculty member and seek clarification about submitted materials. Any clarification provided by the faculty member before or at the meeting shall be provided to all committee members and will become part of the faculty member’s dossier.
          3. The committee shall meet and discuss the faculty member’s dossier with the faculty member. After the meeting, the committee shall discuss the faculty member’s materials, and the information provided by the faculty member at the meeting. The committee’s review shall focus on the faculty member’s teaching, research, outreach, and service while considering the factors that the faculty member has identified that contributed to his or her record of contributions. The committee’s overarching review shall focus on whether the faculty member performed in a manner consistent with his or her scholarly agenda. The committee shall use the following criteria for their review:
             1. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements, as applicable (Research)
             2. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching)
             3. Community Outreach (Outreach)
             4. Service to the department, school, university and profession/academic community with attention to the leadership roles and accomplishments in administration, governance, or for the academic community (Service)
3. The committee shall consider situational and circumstantial factors that affect a tenured faculty member’s contributions if the faculty member in his/her narrative explains their significance during the review period. 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:
   * + - 1. The faculty member’s teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation required for forms of instruction such as online teaching.
         2. Time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of teaching, research, outreach or service.
         3. The level of resources and number of assistants provided to the faculty member in support of his/her teaching, research, outreach or service.
         4. Increased departmental service as a consequence of the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty whose assignment to service cannot exceed 10% of their workload.
         5. Departmental circumstances such as deaths, injuries or illnesses, crises, or transitions, or other circumstances that had impact on the member’s work situation.
         6. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances in the faculty member’s life or the faculty member’s family; that had impact on the member’s work.
     1. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee’s findings shall be determined by the majority. The committee chair shall report the findings of the committee in writing, unless the chair of the committee was the minority vote in the decision, in which case the report shall be written by one of the majority votes, as selected by the committee. The committee may find that:
     2. the faculty member’s contributions are satisfactory if they meet the standards of quality set forth above;
     3. the faculty member’s contributions are unsatisfactory if they are less than consistent with the standards of quality. If the Committee finds the faculty member’s contributions to be unsatisfactory, the committee report shall provide the elements of the committee’s criteria the committee felt were not met and provide evidence.
     4. The committee’s report shall be provided to the faculty member directly prior to the report being forwarded to the Chair or the Dean. If the faculty member questions the committee’s recommendation, he/she may appeal that recommendation as in Section H below.
4. Procedures for Reconsideration of the Committee’s Decision
   * 1. Within 10 working days of receipt of the committee’s report, the faculty member must write a request for reconsideration to the committee chair.
     2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair within 10 working days of a request for reconsideration
     3. In their reconsideration, committee members must consider all materials presented by the faculty member to justify reconsideration.
     4. The committee chair must report in writing the results of the committee’s reconsideration. The report may include additional documentation or statements that bear on its recommendation.
     5. Should the committee reverse its original decision and find the faculty member’s contributions satisfactory, the committee shall write a report with their new finding and attach it with the original report with the faculty member’s request for reconsideration, and forward all materials to the department chair.
     6. Should the committee reaffirm its finding of unsatisfactory, the chair of the committee shall notify the faculty member and request they propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate the unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below.
   1. **The Role** **of the Department Chair**
5. The department chair must assure that the faculty member’s post tenure review committee has followed departmental, school/college, and university post tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member’s scholarly agenda, and that the committee’s appraisals are complete and in proper form.
6. Department chair shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the post tenure review committee.
7. Department chair shall write a letter finding the faculty member’s contributions satisfactory or unsatisfactory based upon the criteria in the Departmental Post Tenure Review Guidelines, considering the situational and circumstantial factors above and the faculty member’s scholarly agenda. If the department chair finds the faculty member’s contributions to be unsatisfactory, the chair must explain and document which criteria the chair feels were not being met.
8. The department chair’s letter must be sent to faculty member within 10 working days from the transmittal of the committee’s report.
9. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the department chair’s letter before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost and should indicate s/he has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1.
10. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the Post Tenure Review committee and the department chair. If a faculty member questions the department chair’s recommendation, he/she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendation prior to the recommendations being sent to the Dean/Provost as described below.
11. Department chairs must make a separate recommendation for each member of the department being reviewed.
12. In units where there are no departments, the department chair role may be filled by an area director or other person who is charged with the leadership role for the academic discipline.
13. Procedures for Reconsideration of Decisions by the Department Chair
    * 1. Within 10 working days of receipt of department chair’s report, the faculty member must write a request for reconsideration to the Department chair.
      2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair within10 working days of the request for reconsideration
      3. In his or her reconsideration, the chair committee must consider all materials presented by the faculty member for the reconsideration.
      4. The chair must report in writing the results of his or her reconsideration. The report may include additional documentation or statements that bear on his/her recommendation.
      5. Should the department chair reverse his or her original decision and find the faculty member’s contributions satisfactory, the department chair shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member’s submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.
      6. Should the department chair reaffirm his/her finding of unsatisfactory, the chair shall notify the faculty member and request they propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate the unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below
14. **Procedure if the department chair and the post tenure review committee disagree after reconsideration.**
15. The faculty member requesting reconsideration is notified of the disagreement between the Post Tenure Review Committee and/or the department chair by the chair
16. The faculty member’s materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her decision prior to the faculty member’s development of a PDP.
17. Procedure in the event of an unsatisfactory post tenure review that is not challenged.
18. Within 10 days of notification of an unsatisfactory review, the faculty member shall propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below.
19. **Chair’s Report to the Dean**

The department chair must submit a report to the Dean that includes the following:

* + 1. a completed and signed recommendation form for each faculty member reviewed.
    2. the Post Tenure Review committee’s and the department chair’s written reports for all faculty members who have received satisfactory or unsatisfactory reviews.
    3. if a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member’s request, the materials submitted and the reconsideration reviews undertaken by the department chair and/or the committee.
    4. a list of faculty members who were asked to propose a Professional Development Plan (PDP) by the department chair after the committee and/or department chair determined contributions were unsatisfactory
    5. The chair must inform the Dean when the committee and the department chair do not agree and provide an explanation in writing to the Dean regarding his/her findings. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain and document which criteria in the department’s post-tenure guidelines were not being met.

1. **The Professional Development Plan (PDP)**

1. Purpose and Objective

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

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

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

3. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the chair, the Dean shall sign the required PDP form.
2. Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the chair and the faculty member.
3. If the faculty member and the chair agree on the modifications requested by the dean, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the chair, whereupon the University shall make available the appropriate resources to implement the PDP.
4. The Provost will make the final determination if the faculty member, the department chair, and Dean do not agree on the modifications requested 2015 09Sep04 PSU/AAUP MOU PTR Ratified Agreement PL Page 17 of 20 Portland State University Faculty Senate Post-Tenure Review Guidelines AAUP/PSU Ratified Agreement by the Dean. Items 1-4 of this section (C) will be completed no later than June 15 the year of the review.

4. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair shall meet with the faculty member every 6 months for the duration of the PDP to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the department chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member’s request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member’s request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who shall reply within 15 working days. If the department chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination within 15 working days.
3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.
4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member’s report to the Dean.
5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member. Additional funding may be required.
6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the department chair within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair’s letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.
7. If the department chair reverses his or her decision, he or she shall write a revised letter to the Dean. The Dean will wait to make a decision until receiving the reconsideration letter from the department chair.
8. Should a faculty member refuse to create and/or follow the PDP (except due to circumstances that are substantially outside the faculty member’s control, he or she shall be notified and subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA.
9. If the department chair and Dean agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will be eligible for the post tenure review increase that is currently in force effective at the start of the following academic year.
10. The PDP, with information on how it was fulfilled, must be signed within 20 working days of completion by the faculty member, the department chair/unit head, and dean and filed with the Provost Office.

5. Funding of PDP

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

**Article III Non-tenure Track Instructional Faculty**

**Review Policies and Procedures**

(Adopted by the PA Faculty: March 5, 2018)

**1. Non-tenure Track Instructional Positions—Continuous Appointment-Related Evaluations:**

The following describes the process by which eligible non-tenure-track (NTT) instructional faculty may be considered for continuous employment. It covers NTT instructional faculty hired after September 16, 2016, (refer to *https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-and-tenure-information, University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions – Continuous Appointment-Related Evaluations*). For NTT instructional faculty hired prior to this date, see the Implementation Plan, University NTTF Evaluation Procedures, AAUP CBA, Letter of Agreement (LOA) #12, pages 81-82.

**A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**

The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member’s performance rests primarily with the department. The Department holds authority and responsibility under the University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section A, and the AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 6 to establish and maintain guidelines for the review of non-tenure track instructional faculty that are consistent with guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate. The faculty will follow the procedures in the Department Bylaws (PA Bylaws Article IX) to propose and adopt guidelines and procedures for evaluating NTT instructional faculty.

**B. Initial Appointment**

Department procedures and guidelines for appointing NTT instructional faculty shall be consistent with University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section B, and AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 2(a).

**­­ C. Type of Appointment**

The Department shall follow the procedures defined in PA Bylaws Article VIII, Section C Faculty Search Committees in filling an NTT instructional faculty position. Department appointment procedures shall not conflict with the University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section C and AAUP CBA, Article 18. The letter of offer to a prospective NTT instructional faculty member shall identify the appointment type as probationary with annual contract renewal.

**D. Faculty Offer and Position Descriptions**

Department NTT instructional faculty position descriptions, letter of offer, and workload practices will comply with the University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section D and AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 4. For NTTF instructional appointments, 1.00 Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) will include no more than 36 course credits of assigned teaching per academic year. Assigned University/community/professional service and scholarly work shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of an instructional faculty member’s workload without a reduction in instructional load.

**E. Annual Review—Probationary Period**

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

The Department will use the procedures in the PA Bylaws Article IX, to adopt into the Department *Tenure, Promotion and Review Policies and Procedures* as approved by the faculty in October 2014 (hereby referred to as *“PA P&T Guidelines”* at <https://docs.google.com/a/pdx.edu/document/d/1JqyJ_M2uDVgz9gy1ORYinSX7e1PCMl0FWiTGl_E5Yt8/edit?usp=sharing_eid&ts=56463d91>), articles providing for guidelines and procedures for the review of NTT instructional faculty members. Any adopted guidelines shall follow the procedures and guidelines prescribed in the Faculty Senate guidelines of June 6, 2016 (<https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pds.edu.faculty-senate/files/NTTF_Review_Guidelines_as_Amended.pdf>. The Department faculty may per procedures in PA Bylaws Article IX make necessary revisions to the NTT faculty review procedures and guidelines.

In the case of an NTT instructional faculty member holding appointments in the Department and in one or more other departments or units in the University, the Department Chair will consult with the other chairs to establish a review committee for the member. In consultation, the chairs of the several departments shall designate a chair of the review committee. Should the member teach in a jointly administered degree program (e.g. MPP or PAP PhD), the Department Chair will consult with the program directors or leads on review committee membership. At minimum, one tenured faculty member or NTT instructional faculty with Continuous Employment rank from the PA Department will serve on the committee. Additionally, a NTT instructional faculty member without a Continuous Employment rank from the PA Department may serve as the NTT member of the review committee.

The Department Chair and the chair(s) of the other departments or units shall consult with the member on the proposed chairperson designation and membership of the review committee. Following consultation with the faculty member, the Department Chair shall designate the review committee membership.

Should the NTT faculty member object to the proposed chairperson or review committee membership, the Chair shall document the finding, share it with the other chairs and reconsider the proposed committee membership. Following consultation and review, the chairs shall report their designation of a committee chairperson and membership to the NTT faculty member. If a mutual decision cannot be reached, the dean or designee, or the Provost or designee, in the case of multiple colleges, will make a determination.

The Department and review committees will follow these guidelines:

* Make available to instructional faculty members written copies of these guidelines;
* Identify to the faculty member(s) the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
* Establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
* Provide that the results of the review be in writing and be provided to the member;
* Provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
* Provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, that will be attached to the review;
* Provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
* The member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
* Provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
* If the Department has more than one NTT instructional faculty member, at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee; and
* If the event a Department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the Department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college, or another school or college if necessary.
* If a faculty member serving as a review committee member holds less than at 1.00 FTE appointment in the Department, the Department Chair may consult with the member to discuss possible compensation.

**Annual review submission materials submitted by the faculty member should, at a minimum, include the following:**

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

**Annual review submission materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:**

* Peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
* Description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
* A reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
* Evidence of scholarly activities, beyond the classroom, as defined by the discipline;
* Evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations,
* Evidence of service activ1ities related to the Department or to missions at all other levels of the University, and
* Evidence of additional scholarly activities including peer reviewed publications, non-peer reviewed professional publications and consulting reports, professional conference presentations, and grant or contract-related activities that further the Department or other CUPA/University program missions.

**F. Timing for Continuous Employment Consideration and Appointment**

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

**G. Milestone Review for Continuous Employment**

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

The Department faculty shall adopt into the *Tenure, Promotion and Review Policies and Procedures* as approved by the faculty in October 2014 (hereby referred to as *“PA P&T Guidelines”* at <https://docs.google.com/a/pdx.edu/document/d/1JqyJ_M2uDVgz9gy1ORYinSX7e1PCMl0FWiTGl_E5Yt8/edit?usp=sharing_eid&ts=56463d91>), following the procedures in PA Bylaws Article IX articles providing for guidelines and procedures for the review of NTT faculty members. Any adopted guidelines will be consistent with the procedures and guidelines prescribed in the Faculty Senate guidelines of June 6, 2016 (<https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pds.edu.faculty-senate/files/NTTF_Review_Guidelines_as_Amended.pdf>. The Department faculty following the procedures in PA Bylaws Article IX, may make necessary revisions to the procedures and guidelines.

The Department and review committees will follow these guidelines:

* Make available to faculty members written copies of these guidelines;
* Identify to the faculty member(s) the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
* Establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
* Provide that the results of the review be in writing and be provided to the member;
* Provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
* Provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, that will be attached to the review;
* Provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
* Provide that the member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
* Provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
* In a department with more than one NTT instructional faculty member, provide that at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee. The Chair will make every effort to ensure that the NTT instructional faculty member appointed to the review committee has attained Continuous Employment rank; and
* In the event a department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college, or another school or college if necessary. The Chair will make every effort to ensure that the external review committee member has attained Continuous Employment rank.

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

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

**The Milestone Review materials submitted by the faculty member should, at minimum, include the following:**

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

**The Milestone Review materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:**

* Peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
* Description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
* A reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
* Evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
* Evidence of service activities related to Department or to missions at all other levels of the University;
* The annual self-appraisals prepared by the faculty member; and,
* Evidence of additional scholarly activities including peer reviewed publications, non-peer reviewed professional publications and consulting reports, professional conference presentations, and grant or contract-related activities that further the Department or other CUPA/University program missions.

**The following additional items may be included in the evaluation of teaching and curricular accomplishments, to the extent consistent with a faculty member’s letter of appointment:**

* Contributions to courses or curriculum development;
* Materials developed for use in courses;
* Results of creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning;
* Results of assessments of student learning
* Accessibility to students;
* Ability to relate to a wide variety of students for purposes of advising;
* Mentoring and guiding students toward the achievement of curricular goals;
* Results of supervision of student research or other creative activities including theses and field advising
* Results of supervision of service learning experiences in the community;
* Contributions to, and participation in, the achievement of departmental goals, such as achieving reasonable retention of students;
* Contributions to the development and delivery of collaborative, interdisciplinary University Studies, and inter-institutional educational programs;
* Teaching and mentoring students and others in how to obtain access to information resources so as to further student, faculty, and community research and learning;
* Grant proposals and grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques;
* Professional development as related to instruction, e.g., attendance at professional meetings related to a faculty member’s areas of instructional expertise; and
* Honors and awards for teaching.
* Quality of service to the Department or to missions and programs at all other levels of the University.
* Quality of service to the Department, and to other units and programs, in the conduct of NTT and tenure track annual evaluations.

**H. Evaluation of Post-Continuous Appointment Performance**

Non-tenure track (NTT) instructional faculty that have attained the status of a Continuous Appointment are to be evaluated every three years following the last evaluation or promotion.

**Materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluations following Continuous Appointment should at minimum, include the following:**

* A cumulative self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member’s job description and highlights activities and achievement;
* Current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU P&T format approved by the Provost;
* Appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range) or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
* Representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

**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 the Department mission or to missions at all other levels of the University; and,
* Evidence of additional scholarly activities including peer reviewed publications, non-peer reviewed professional publications and consulting reports, professional conference presentations, and grant or contract-related activities that further the Department or other CUPA/ University missions.

In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the faculty member and department chair or chair equivalent will meet to discuss the deficiencies identified in the review. Following the meeting, the chair will develop a remediation plan to address the deficiencies. If the faculty member disagrees with the remediation plan, the faculty member may appeal to the dean or the dean's designee, who shall review the plan and make the final decision regarding the contents of the plan. The remediation plan is to be developed before the end of the academic year in which the unsatisfactory evaluation occurred. If the chair and faculty member identify resources that would assist with the remediation plan, a request for access to such resources will be made to and considered by the Dean. Resource unavailability could result in modification or extension of the remediation plan.[[1]](#footnote-1)

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

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

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

**2. Conditions Under Which NTT Continuous Employment May be Terminated**

Refer to the AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 2(e) (pgs. 23-24).

**Article IV: Hiring, Promotion and Review of Adjunct Instructional Faculty**

(Adopted by PA Faculty: March 5, 2018)

Adjunct faculty (i.e. instructors working less than 0.50 FTE at PSU) play an important role in achieving the instructional mission of the Department and its jointly administered programs. The rights and responsibilities of Adjunct faculty members and the University are detailed in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the American Federation of Teachers and PSU, currently found at: <https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-affairs/files/AFTCBA-CBA-9-15-16_Formatted_signatures.pdf> ) Department procedures to appoint, evaluate and promote adjunct faculty members will comply with the CBA.

**1. Initial Adjunct Application, Determination of Initial Rank**

Individuals applying for the first time to teach in the Department as an Adjunct and individuals recruited by the Department to teach as Adjuncts will be vetted through the following process:

* The Chair will convene, and chair, an Adjunct Evaluation ad hoc committee as defined in PA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 8 (Ad hoc Committees) to review and determine the initial rank of Adjunct applications. The Chair will select for committee service faculty members with knowledge of the subject area and courses to be taught by adjuncts. The number of faculty members requested to serve on the committee will reflect the breadth of the applications received and the subject matter breadth of the instructional positions needing to be filled.
* The full faculty may, by majority of those voting, recommend to the Chair one or several faculty members to serve on the Adjunct Evaluation committee. The Chair shall consider the faculty’s recommendation.
* Individuals applying or recruited for Adjunct positions will be asked to submit to the Chair: a letter of interest; resume or curriculum vitae including academic degrees earned; and a sample syllabus.
* The Chair and the Adjunct Evaluation committee will review the submitted materials and determine the initial rank of each applicant.
* The Chair and the Adjunct Evaluation committee will comply with the CBA General Provisions, Article 8, Section 2, Sub-section 3 regarding academic ranks currently held by the applicant.
* Should an applicant disagree with the initial ranking determined by the committee, the applicant may file a written request for reconsideration by the committee. Once a review of the application and committee deliberation has been completed, the Chair shall make a final determination on the initial rank.
* Initial appointments for Adjunct faculty may be granted on a term-by-term basis (CBA Article 8, Section 3, Sub-section 2).

**2. Adjunct Faculty Academic Ranks**

The PA Department (hereafter Department) recognizes the following academic ranks of Adjunct Faculty.

* Adjunct faculty members who hold advanced, but not terminal, degrees or who have comparable experience in the discipline in which they teach will be hired at a minimum academic rank of **Adjunct Instructor.**
  + Comparable experience will be defined as holding a Master’s degree in a relevant field and three years of relevant professional experience, or a Bachelor’s degree with six years of relevant professional experience. Teaching at other universities and community colleges may replace up to three years of professional experience.
* Adjunct faculty members who hold terminal degrees or who have comparable experience in the discipline in which they teach will be hired at the minimum rank of **Adjunct Assistant Professor**.
  + Comparable experience will be defined as holding a Master’s or Bachelor’s degree in a relevant field and ten years of professional policy, legislative, administrative staff, public executive or operational experience. Teaching full-time in a tenure track or non-tenure track capacity at another university may replace up to three years of professional experience.
* Comparable experience will be determined by the Adjunct Evaluation committee based on the faculty member’s professional accomplishments. Departmental guidelines will inform the committee’s determination and a Letter of Agreement will provide additional details for process and criteria in the evaluation of an Adjunct faculty member’s experience.
* PSU faculty who retire from a ranked position that is more than half-time and are thereafter hired as an Adjunct in the Department will retain the equivalent rank prefaced by “Adjunct” (e.g., Adjunct Associate Professor).

Once an initial rank has been granted, an adjunct faculty member may request consideration from the Chair for adjustment of rank for the following reasons:

* An Adjunct faculty member who obtains a terminal degree in their field while employed at the University shall advance to the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor at the beginning of the term immediately following the award of their degree.
* Adjunct instructors will be eligible for advancement to the rank of **Adjunct Senior Instructor** upon completion of a minimum of 3 years or 24 credits, whichever occurs first, at the rank of Instructor at the University. Breaks in service of less than 4 terms, excluding summer term, will not impact progression.
* If a successful performance evaluation, as described in Article IV, Sections 4 and 5 below, was done before the faculty member is eligible to advance in rank, the Chair will consider those materials in their determination of a request for advancement in rank.

**3. Request for and Offer for Professional Evaluation**

An adjunct faculty member who has been employed as an Adjunct by PSU for 3 years or 20 credits, whichever occurs first, will be offered a professional evaluation by the Chair. Professional evaluations are conducted for recognizing excellence in teaching, instructional development, and in other contributions to the Department; for providing feedback and professional development guidance; and to determine if a two-year appointment is appropriate for the adjunct faculty member. This process will not be used for the purposes of discipline or discharge of an employee. Information about the process for professional evaluations will be referenced at the time of hire in each Adjunct faculty member’s letter of appointment.

* Evaluations should be offered and completed during the term immediately following the one in which the faculty member has completed the requirements.
* Once offered, the faculty member may choose whether or not to have an evaluation at that time.
* If an Adjunct faculty member elects not to have an evaluation at that time, they will be offered another opportunity for an evaluation after they have been employed for an additional 2 years or 12 credits, whichever comes first.
* There will be no repercussions for an Adjunct faculty member who elects not to have an evaluation. Future appointments will continue to be offered on a full academic year basis once the faculty member has completed 8 credits or been employed at PSU for 2 years (re: CBA Article 8, Section 3, Sub-section 3).
* Adjunct faculty members who opt out of an evaluation may be offered a two-year appointment at the discretion of the Chair.

**4. Evaluation Materials**

Professional evaluations will be based on the following materials. The Chair will request the following materials from the faculty member.

* A current C.V. or resume
* Summary of student evaluations with a short written reflection
* Short statement on teaching, research, service or professional experience and why the member teaches
* A current syllabus for each course taught during the corresponding academic year
* In addition to the materials listed above, the Adjunct faculty member must provide two items from the following list. The faculty member may choose which of these to provide and is encouraged to discuss this selection with the Chair:
  + Classroom observation by a peer of the faculty member’s choice;
  + Letter of support by a peer of the faculty member’s choice;
  + Examples of special assignments or projects;
  + Description of how the faculty member is staying current in their field.

**5. Adjunct Evaluation Process**

An Adjunct evaluation provides an opportunity for the faculty member’s professional development as an instructor and member of the Department community. The evaluation of Adjunct faculty members helps to enhance the quality of instruction in the PA curriculum. The Department will use the following process for Adjunct evaluations. The Department process will conform to the provisions in the CBA Article 8, Section 7.

* The Department Chair will convene an Adjunct Review committee to review and evaluate an Adjunct faculty member’s instructional performance. The Chair will select for committee service faculty members with knowledge of the subject area and the courses taught by the adjunct. The Chair will ensure that one faculty member of the review committee is of equal or higher, tenure rank or NTT Continuous Employment rank to the member under review.
* The Chair and the Adjunct Review committee will review the Adjunct faculty member’s submitted materials and instructional performance. The committee will consult with any faculty peer not on the committee who has performed a classroom observation of the member’s instructional skills. The committee will come to a verbal consensus on the faculty member’s instructional performance.
* The Adjunct Review committee will then meet with the Adjunct faculty member to present their findings and to discuss their evaluation. The committee will identify areas of excellence and success in instruction, pedagogy and curricular development. The committee will also identify areas where the member may improve teaching skills, course design, and instructional delivery. The committee will discuss any areas of inadequacy needing improvement.
* The Chair will then draft a written summary of the Adjunct faculty member’s evaluation. An assessment of the member’s performance will be provided, and where necessary, recommendations for improvement will be offered. Once completed, the summary will be reviewed by the full Adjunct Review committee to ensure that the written summary reflects, the evidence in the submitted materials, the evidence from the meeting with the faculty member, and the results of discussions and concerns of all members of the committee.
* The written summary, signed by the Chair, will be shared with the Adjunct faculty member. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to acknowledge the evaluation results, and if desired, to create a written response. Upon request of either party, the results will be shared at an in-person meeting with the full Adjunct Review committee.
* Any faculty member’s written response to the evaluation process will be attached to the evaluation documents. Any written evaluation or record of an observation will be included in the Employee’s personnel file and must comply with provisions of CBA Article 9 (Personnel Files).

**6. Post-Evaluation Procedures**

Once an Adjunct faculty member has received a successful evaluation, future appointments will be offered for a term of two academic years, subject to the provisions of the CBA. Further evaluations, using the same procedures detailed above, may be conducted every four years if initiated by the Chair.

An Adjunct faculty member who receives a negative evaluation will not be issued a two-year contract, but will be offered the opportunity to teach one additional course and offered re-evaluation upon completion of the course. All negative evaluations must include a written explanation of the reasons for the evaluation result and a statement that the faculty member is not eligible for a two-year contract. An Adjunct faculty member who is not eligible for a two-year contract as a result of a negative evaluation may appeal subject to the process as set forth below.

Appeals Process

* For the purpose of this appeal process, information provided by email will be considered to have been submitted in writing.
* An Adjunct faculty member who receives an evaluation that results in the Department not offering that faculty member a two-year appointment may appeal to the Chair within 10 days. The Chair shall provide a written response within 5 days of receiving an appeal.
* If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair’s decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean, with a copy to the Chair, within 10 days after receiving the Chair’s appeal response. Within 5 days after receipt of the appeal to the Dean, the Chair shall provide the Dean with all documents pertinent to the evaluation, with a copy to the faculty member. The faculty member may file a written explanation in support of their position. The Dean will render their decision in writing within 5 business days of receiving the required documentation. The Dean’s decision is final.

**Article V: Review of Faculty for Promotion to Emeritus Rank**

(Adopted by the PA Faculty: March 5, 2018 )

Emeritus rank allows retired tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty member to continue to support the Department, the Hatfield School, and the University. Emerita(us) faculty make unique contributions of seasoned leadership, professional contacts, institutional memory, and mentorship to both faculty and students. The Department procedures for recommending Emeritus rank will conform to the University guidelines in the *Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases,* found at: <https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-affairs/files/2017%20P%26T%20Guidelines%20and%202017%20PTR%20Guidelines%20FINAL.pdf> , page 17. The Department will follow the procedures in the Department Bylaws (PA Bylaws Article IX) to propose, adopt and revise guidelines and procedures for making recommendations for advancement to emeritus rank.

**1. Emeritus Rank**

The Emerita(us) rank may be awarded upon retirement in recognition of outstanding performance.

**2. Emeritus Appointment Process**

* Tenured, tenure-track (TT) and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are eligible to apply for Emeritus rank (Faculty Senate report June 22, 2016). Department processes to consider applications for Emeritus rank will follow the regular annual promotion and tenure cycle or the November-December cycle, which immediately follows the regular cycle (strictly for emeritus applications).
* To consider applications for Emeritus rank, the Chair will convene an Emeritus Review Committee. After consultation with faculty members, the Chair will appoint a review committee of least two faculty members. Committee members will hold the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Continuous Appointment. The Department Chair will designate a chair for the review committee.
* Applicants for Emeritus rank will submit to the Review Committee for consideration:
  + A letter requesting promotion to emerita(us) rank that reflects on their experiences and high points of years at PSU.
  + Current CV

* The Review Committee will evaluate the applicant’s recent outstanding performance as indicative of potential future contributions in any of the following areas:
  + Continuing scholarship through their own publications, collaborations with faculty and students, or collaborations with colleagues at other institutions;
  + Participation on Ph.D. committees, or on other committees evaluating and mentoring student development;
  + Mentorship and development of faculty;
  + Active membership in and contributions to professional associations that advance the Department, Hatfield School, CUPA or University missions;
  + Representing the Department, Hatfield School, College or University through initiatives, programs or activities such as, fundraising, maintaining relationships with community or international partners, or special marketing and recruiting;
  + The development and administration of grants or contracts that support the Department, Hatfield School or other University missions;
  + Service to the community and to global partners that supports the Department, Hatfield School or other University missions.
* The Emeritus Review Committee shall review the retiring faculty member’s application materials. The Review Committee may convene an interview to discuss the application with the retiring faculty member. Upon completion of their review, the Review Committee Chair will make a recommendation to the Department Chair on a decision for the member’s advancement to Emerita(us) rank. The Department Chair will consider the Review Committee’s recommendation in preparing a letter of recommendation for Emeritus rank to the Dean.
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