

Instructions for Incorporating University Procedures into Departmental Revisions for the Evaluation of Instructional Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Continuous Employment

Instructions for Academic Unit Chairs and Directors:

*In accordance with Portland State University (PSU) Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in continuous Employment at PSU, dated **May 1, 2017**, hereafter referred to as University NTTF Evaluation Procedures, you, in collaboration with your faculty, are expected to **add** a section about NTTF Evaluation to your department's Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines.*

Included below is:

- Information taken from the University Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) Evaluation Procedures that you **may choose** to include in your department guidelines.
 - Language that ***must be created*** by the department and added to your department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines as per the University NTTF Evaluation Procedures, as denoted by an action word in bold.
 - Language from the University NTTF Evaluation Procedures that ***must be included*** in your department P&T Guidelines. This language is provided for your use and cannot be changed.
 - NOTE: All section heading from University NTTF Evaluation Procedures should also be used in departmental guidelines.
-

Introduction:

The following describes the process through which eligible non-tenure-track (NTT), instructional faculty may be considered for continuous employment. It covers NTTF hired after September 16, 2016.

For NTT instructional faculty hired prior to this date, see also the Implementation Plan, University NTTF Evaluation Procedures, AAUP CBA, Letter of Agreement (LOA) #12, pages 81-82.

The University NTTF Evaluation Procedures take priority, and additions or modifications within your departmental guidelines may not contradict those approved by the Faculty Senate. Updates to these NTTF Evaluation guidelines must be approved by the dean and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and final approval.

Revisions to **Departmental Name** NTTF Guidelines

Non-tenure Track Instructional Positions – Continuous Appointment-Related Evaluations

This section describes the process through which eligible non-tenure track (NTT) instructional faculty may be considered for continuous appointment, and are evaluated. This document covers NTTF hired after September 16, 2016. For NTT instructional faculty hired prior to this date, see also the Implementation Plan. Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions – Continuous Appointment-Related Evaluations.

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department.

Add language that describes the department process.

Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section A and AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 6, (pgs. 26-27) for a description of the approval process following the development of departmental procedures.

B. Initial Appointment

Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section B, AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 2(a), pages 22-23.

C. Type of Appointment

Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section C and AAUP CBA, Article 18 (pg. 22).

D. Faculty Offer and Position Descriptions

Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions- Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section D and AAUP CBA, Article 18, Sect. 4 (pg. 25).

Note: 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 NTTF member's workload without a reduction in instructional load.

E. Annual Review

NTTF 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.

Describe how the department will establish and maintain guidelines for review of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate.

Specify how the department chair or equivalent and the NTT Instructional Faculty who hold annual contracts with more than one unit during a probationary period will mutually decide which unit will be responsible for the evaluation. 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 departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:

- Be in writing and be made available to members;
- Require each department to identify 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;
- State 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;
- State that 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; and
- State that 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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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, and
- Evidence of service activities related to unit mission.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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.

Describe how the department will establish and maintain guidelines for a Milestone Review for Continuous Appointment of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by Faculty Senate.

The departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:

- Be in writing and made available to members;
- Require each department to identify 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; 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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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).¹⁶ 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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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 unit mission; and
- The annual self-appraisals prepared by the faculty member.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

H. Procedures for Milestone Review

Refer to University P&T Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Positions-Continuous Appointment Related Evaluations, Section H.

I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment

Non-tenure track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment are to be evaluated after three years of continuous appointment and then after every three years following the last evaluation or promotion.

Materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation 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.

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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

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

Department may add other requirements as appropriate.

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

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.

¹ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2 g (also including following three paragraphs)

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.

I. Conditions Under Which Continuous Employment May be Terminated

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