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Faculty Senate, December 2013

In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Senate Agendas are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have public notice of curricular proposals, and adequate time to review and research all action items. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full proposals are available at the PSU Curricular Tracking System: http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com. If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate. Items may be pulled from the Curricular Consent Agenda for discussion in Senate up through the end of roll call.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of his/her Senate Alternate. An Alternate is another faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator. A faculty member may serve as Alternate for more than one senator, but an alternate may represent only one Senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than 3 meetings consecutively, will be dropped from the Senate roll.
TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on December 2, 2013, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the November 4, 2013 Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Report on Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Meeting, 11/22-23 – Hines
   2. PSU Graduation – Gelmon and Running

Discussion item: Program Prioritization (to be considered under G, Report from the Provost)

D. Unfinished Business
   *1. Proposal to revise the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases to add new ranks
      *a. Revisions for Articles I, IIA, III-IV, V-NTTF: A-C & Appendix II.4
         b. (full text): http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

E. New Business
   *1c. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

F. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report (16:00)
   Provost’s Report
   Report of the Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships
   *1. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
   B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 4, 2013 and attachments
   D-1 Proposal to Revise PSU Policies & Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases
   D-1a Revisions for Articles I, IIA, III-IV, V-NTTF: A-C & Appendix II.4
   E-1c Curricular Consent Agenda
   G1 Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Secretary to the Faculty
hickeym@pdx.edu • 650MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4624
## FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

### 2013-14 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer... Leslie McBride  
Presiding Officer Elect... Bob Liebman; Past Presiding Officer... Rob Daasch  
Secretary.....Martha W. Hickey  
Committee Members: Amy Greenstadt and  
David Hansen *ex officio*, Chair, Committee on Committees, Maude Hines, *ex officio*, IFS Representative

### ****2013-14 FACULTY SENATE (63)****

| All Others (9) |  
|----------------|---|---|
| O’Banion, Liane | TLC | 2014 |
| * Faalea, Toeutu (for Hart) | AA | 2014 |
| Kennedy, Karen | ACS | 2014 |
| Hunt, Marcy | SHAC | 2015 |
| †Luther, Christina | OIA | 2015 |
| Baccar, Cindy | EMSA | 2016 |
| Ingersoll, Becki | ACS | 2016 |
| Popp, Karen | OGS | 2016 |
| Skaruppa, Cindy | EMSA | 2016 |

| Business Administration (4) |  
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Pullman, Madeleine | SBA | 2014 |
| †Hansen, David | SBA | 2015 |
| Layzell, David | SBA | 2016 |
| Loney, Jennifer | SBA | 2016 |

| Education (4) |  
|---------------|---|---|
| Rigelman, Nicole | ED | 2014 |
| Stevens, Dannelle | ED-CI | 2014 |
| Smith, Michael | ED-POL | 2015 |
| †McElhone, Dorothy | ED | 2016 |

| Eng. & Comp. Science (6) |  
|-------------------------|---|---|
| †Recktenwald, Gerald | ME | 2014 |
| Treheway, Derek | ME | 2014 |
| Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata | ECE | 2015 |
| Zurk, Lisa | ECE | 2015 |
| Bertini, Robert | CEE | 2016 |
| Karavanic, Karen | CS | 2016 |

| Fine & Performing Arts (4) |  
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Magaldi, Karin | TA | 2014 |
| Wendl, Nora | ARCH | 2014 |
| †Boas, Pat | ART | 2015 |
| Griffin, Corey | ARCH | 2016 |

| LAS – Arts and Letters (9) |  
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Friedberg, Nila | WLL | 2014 |
| †Greenstadt, Amy | ENG | 2014 |
| Jaen-Portillo, Isabel | WLL | 2014 |
| Dolidon, Annabelle | WLL | 2015 |
| Mercer, Robert | LAS | 2015 |
| Reese, Susan | ENG | 2015 |

| LAS – Sciences (8) |  
|-------------------|---|---|
| †Santelmann, Lynn | LING | 2015 |
| Lindsay, Susan | LING | 2016 |
| Perlmutter, Jennifer | WLL | 2016 |
| Lafferriere, Gerardo | MTH | 2014 |
| †Works, Martha | GEOG | 2014 |
| Burns, Scott | GEOL | 2015 |
| Eppley, Sarah | BIO | 2015 |
| Sanchez, Erik | PHY | 2015 |
| Daescu-Dacian | MTH | 2016 |
| George, Linda | ESM | 2016 |
| †Rueter, John | ESM | 2016 |

| LAS – Social Sciences (7) |  
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Liebman, Robert | SOC | 2014 |
| †Bluffstone, Randall | ECON | 2014 |
| Brower, Barbara | GEOG | 2015 |
| †DeAnda, Roberto | CHLT | 2015 |
| Hsu, ChiaYin | HST | 2016 |
| Luckett, Thomas | HST | 2016 |
| Padin, Joe | SOC | 2016 |

| Library (1) |  
|-------------|---|---|
| †Beasley, Sarah | LIB | 2015 |

| Other Instructional (1) |  
|------------------------|---|---|
| †*Carpenter, Rowanna (for Jhaj) | UNST | 2015 |

| Social Work (4) |  
|-----------------|---|---|
| Talbott, Maria | SSW | 2014 |
| †*Taylor, Michael (Pewewardy) | SSW | 2014 |
| Holliday, Mindy | SSW | 2015 |
| Cotrell, Victoria | SSW | 2016 |

| Urban and Public Affairs (6) |  
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| *Labissiere, Yves (for Newsom) | CH | 2014 |
| Gelmon, Sherrill | PA | 2014 |
| †Clucas, Richard | PS | 2015 |
| Brodowicz, Gary | CH | 2016 |
| Carder, Paula | IA | 2016 |
| Farquhar, Stephanie | CH | 2016 |

* Interim appointments
† Member of Committee on Committees

* Date: Oct. 18, 2013; New Senators in italics
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 4, 2013

Presiding Officer: Lesllie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Baccar, Beasley, Bertini, Boas, Brower, Burns, Carder, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, De Anda, Dolidon, Faaleava, Gelmon, George, Greenstadt, Griffin, Hansen, Hsu, Hunt, Jaen-Portillo, Karavanic, Kennedy, Labissiere, Lafferrerie, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, McElhone, Mercer, O’Banion, Padin, Perlmutter, Pullman, Rigelman, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Stevens, Talbott, Taylor, Wendl, Works

Alternates Present: Wooster for Bluffstone, Sussman for Brodowicz, Cruzan for Eppley, Schrock for Carder (after 4pm), Messer for Farquhar, Wadley for Friedberg, Paradis for Ingersoll, Harmon for Popp, Hines for Reese, De La Vega for Smith, Weislogel for Tretheway, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: Holliday, Loney, Recktenwald, Skaruppa,

Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 7, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. HARMON, no longer a Senator, was removed from the October roll. The October 2013 minutes were approved as amended.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIDE welcomed visitors and noted a very full agenda. She introduced two new senators, Yves Labissiere and Toeutu Faaleava, filling terms for faculty on leave or who had left PSU. MCBRIDE asked senators to communicate any problems or inaccuracies with district email lists to the Secretary, so that email can be used as an effective channel of communication with represented faculty.

MCBRIDE introduced AAUP Vice President of Collective Bargaining Ron Narode, and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development Carol Mack, to offer an update on 2013 collective bargaining process. She announced that to avoid disruptions, there would be a brief recess after the presentations and questions to allow visitors to depart.
Bargaining Updates

NARODE expressed thanks for the opportunity to update Senate and explain why this bargaining session is so different from past ones. His comments were delivered from a prepared text (see attachment to the minutes B1). [Applause.]

MACK thanked the Senate for the opportunity to offer an update on negotiations on behalf of the University’s bargaining team. She stated that she would be reading directly from bargaining notes, where negotiations had begun on March 15, 2013. The required 150 days of negotiation passed on August 15. Articles had been exchanged and some concessions made. A 1% salary increase in 2014 and 2015 and coverage of 95% of health care premiums through 2015 were offered. Substitute language was proposed for Articles 8, 14, and 16 to allow Faculty Senate latitude to establish and implement non-contractual guidelines. They did not propose to limit the Association’s ability to file a grievance to allege a violation of those guidelines. They withdrew a proposal to make similar changes for Academic Professionals and proposed on-going, rather than time-limited contracts for Non-tenure track faculty to allow NTTF with 3 or more years of service a minimum of 2 terms prior notice of non-renewal. MACK explained that the number of open articles and distance between the parties over economic issues led to the offer to call for mediation. She expressed confidence that a fair settlement could be reached. [Applause.]

MCBRIDE announced that each speaker would be given the chance to respond to questions; visitors could pose questions when recognized by the Presiding Officer.

LUCKETT: What action would each speaker recommend to the Senate?

MACK responded that the bargaining process between the union and management was well established and happens at the table, where it should continue. Labor practice rules constrain how she, as a part of the administration, can answer questions in Senate, where those present are represented employees. NARODE responded that there are many issues being negotiated that impinge directly on the Faculty Senate and that the Senate has the prerogative to take a position with respect to those issues if it chooses.

BURNS: Other universities are getting pay raises that seem bigger than 1% and 1%. What are those numbers?

NARODE stated that the recently unionized U of Oregon faculty are getting on average about 6% a year; OSU decided to given 10% compression increases; at OIT the raise is 7.5% and 1.5% or 2% at Southern Oregon. MACK did not respond.

PADIN: If the administration’s final offer is not one that PSU faculty can stand behind, what options are left?

MACK described the PECBA [Public Employee Collective Bargaining Act] process that allows either party in negotiation to request mediation after 150 days: If mediation does not produce an agreement and an impasse is reached, a series of mandated assignments and deadlines would follow. Each side must give a cost accounting of its final offer, which goes to PECBA. After a 30-day cooling-off period, either side can give 10-day notice of action—the union to strike, or the administration to implement its contract. She expressed hope for a positive outcome.
MCBRIDE stated that there was time for one last question.

SUSSMAN: How do you both interpret the necessity for the severe restrictions on shared governance that apparently are going to occur in the next contract?

MACK replied that shared governance is a different process than what is contractually obligated, which differentiates what is permissive for negotiation and what is mandatory. The administration stated its position at the beginning of bargaining regarding which issues in the contract it saw as permissive subjects related to shared governance and over which it is not bound to negotiate with the union.

NARODE responded that shared governance also happens at the bargaining table. Discussions about the contract deal with what is good for the University, not just what is good for the faculty. Both sides often preface remarks with the hope that clarifying language in the contract will make things better, or work more smoothly. The permissive language makes for a better contract. He noted that in the past when the union had made concessions, as it did when it accepted furlough days, it had negotiated with the administration for other things that could be permissive. So in some sense we have all worked very hard to get to where we are in the current contract. [The administration’s position] doesn’t really take those efforts into account.

MCBRIDE thanked the speakers. [Applause.] She invited a motion for a recess.

DAASCH/_______ MOVED a five-minute recess. The MOTION PASSED.

Senate resumed its regular meeting at 3:40.

MCBRIDE announced that the Question for Dean Beatty received the previous week had been withdrawn earlier in the day. She introduced Bob Liebman, co-chair of the Senate’s ad hoc committee to implement new faculty ranks.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Interim Report of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Revision Committee

LIEBMAN reviewed the committee’s charge and its process, initiated after the passage of Senate motions in Spring 2013 to selectively adopt ranks introduced in new OARS that institutionalize the term "Non-Tenure-Track" Faculty (NTT) for fixed-term faculty. The Committee was staffed with equal numbers of tenure-line and NTT faculty. (See slides 2-3, attachment B2). LIEBMAN shared data on the distribution of tenure and non-tenure-line appointments, adding that some of the shift in ratio is due to faculty success in securing research grants (slide 4). He outlined the Committee’s guiding principles and the steps that led to the drafting of new language for Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the PSU promotion and tenure guidelines (slides 5-9, B-3). He noted that a motivating force for the OAR changes across the state had been the wish to provide promotional opportunities for NTT faculty that parallel the three-step tenure-track model. The Committee recommends that language formerly in the Appendix regarding research appointments be incorporated in the main document. In addition, the committee is proposing a Template Letter that allows NTT faculty the option of seeking external support for their promotion, since many NTT faculty are
engaged in professional and scholarly activities outside the classroom. He invited comments from the floor and requested that suggestions for editing be sent in the document as Track Changes. The draft document is available on the web: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/additional-resources

LIEBMAN stated that a motion to approve the document would be formally introduced at the December meeting, to be voted on at the January 2014 meeting. Prior to that time, the Educational Policy Committee and AAUP would review it. The AAUP will look at the revised guidelines to determine whether they meet the standards of PEBCA and follow past practice. The Senate will vote in January in one motion, based on the belief that we can trust in the work that has been done since 1996 to craft the document that exists today, one that is admired for its acknowledgment of the diversity of the PSU faculty in assessing questions of tenure and promotion. Finally, he thanked the faculty who gave generously of their time to work on this project over the summer. [Applause.]

GREENSTADT asked about the timeline for responding to the draft document. LIEBMAN clarified that it will be a two-step process: the first reading will happen in December with the vote based on any subsequent edits in January. STEVENS expressed her appreciation for the transparency and clarity of the process and for the provision for letters of external support in the NTT faculty review process.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

MCBRIDE explained that like the minutes, the Curricular Consent Agenda was a standard item of business and did not require a formal motion and vote to approve.

Since no items had been withdrawn, the Consent Agenda as listed in E1c was APPROVED.

2. Proposed Online Grade-to-Grade changes from SSC

MCBRIDE introduced the proposal (E2) from the Scholastic Standards Committee:

The instructor of record can make grade-to-grade changes online through Banweb within one year of the term in which the course was offered. The Registrar’s Office will provide Department Chairs with a report at the conclusion of each term that includes all grade-to-grade changes made within that term.

DAASCH/BURNS MOVED the proposal for Online Grade-to-Grade changes.

O’BANION, SSC chair, summarized the benefits of the change, including the belief that the online process would be more timely, efficient and secure, and made possible end-of-term audit reports from the Registrar’s Office.

KARAVANIC asked if audit reports could be sent to the faculty? BACCAR thought this would be possible, although, if there were problems, faculty would probably hear about it straight from the chair. DAASCH wondered when the change would be
implemented and if there would be a period of duplicate paper and online submission. BACCAR noted that they were working on the process, which would probably debut Spring term at the earliest. She said the Registrar’s Office would do the appropriate outreach to assure a smooth transition and to determine preferences.

The MOTION TO APROVE Online Grade-to-Grade changes PASSED as published by unanimous voice vote.

F. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

None

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

President’s Report [Secretary’s note: delivered after the Provost’s Report]

WIEWEL acknowledged the passing of Dean Emeritus of Urban Affairs and Planning Nohad Toulan. He also noted the impending retirement of Geologist Scott Burns, recently celebrated at an event that had raised over $100,000 in scholarship funding. He reported that the recent ALPS retreat (Academic Leadership Planning Symposium) in October had involved about 80 people, including student, staff, and faculty representatives, and had discussed the reTHINK project and budget rebalancing. He announced that a web site would be open for suggestions for realizing permanent savings that could help the University avoid across the board cuts: [http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/budget-feedback-form](http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/budget-feedback-form)

WIEWEL also reported on the success of the 64 events of the Portland State of Mind, with the Simon Benson Awards dinner attracting over 1800 attendees and raising 1.2 million dollars, and the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Native American Community Center. At the end of fourth week, enrollment, which has remained essentially flat, saw an increase in out of state students and a 12.6% increase in Freshmen. Finally, he announced that PSU had been chosen to be one of five Transportation Centers in the country, with the award of a 2.8 million grant to fund OTREC, and recognized the efforts of Jennifer Dill and many other colleagues to advance the study of sustainable, livable communities.

BURNS: What is the number of students enrolled?

WIEWEL: About 28,900 and some students. It didn’t quite reach 29,000.

STEVENS: Are the percentage cuts to programs and departments permanent?

WEIWEL: Yes, it has to be a permanent adjustment because the expenditures being cut are permanent base-budget expenditures. The FY15 base budget has an excess of expenditures over revenues of about 15.5 million dollars.

DOLIDON asked to yield the floor to Gina Greco.
GRECO: I’m curious about something that happened in my class that has several members of student government in it. They said that they had met with the President and were told that if they wanted their tuition to go down, then faculty salaries had to go down and faculty couldn’t have a raise. That seemed odd. I wondered what your memory of the discussion was?

WEIWEL: That’s not my recollection. What I have said is that no organization can increase its expenditures more than it increases its revenues for very long. In that sense, there is a relationship between everything that we do, including tuition and salaries, not just for faculty, but any salaries. The amount we spend on goods and services and travel is significant, but in total it is primarily salaries and wages that drive the budget of the University. You can either keep individual salaries lower or have fewer people you pay salary; these are the only ways to make it work.

______: While I can’t vouch for the veracity of the numbers, the five million dollar increase attributed to administrative salaries stands out.

WEIWEL: I cannot speak to specific numbers; we do have seven colleges and schools.

LUCKETT: Why are we rushing to settle the budget by December this year?

WEIWEL: We are not trying to settle it; we always plan budgets quite a bit ahead. In most years we have to determine what kind of tuition increase we will be requesting and go through the exercise of what does our budget look like. We always do that well before June or July when it might be finalized. Now, in the second year of the biennium we already have a very good sense of what our budget will be from the State.

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS shared her sense of the community’s loss upon the report of the death Dean Toulan and his wife and said a memorial was planned. She then welcomed the new Dean of the College of the Arts Robert Bucker, and noted the recent press-conference to announce the implementation of PSU’s Four-Year Graduation Guarantee.

ANDREWS outlined strategies for rethinking PSU, assessment, and academic program prioritization. (See slides, minutes attachment B3.) She stated that ReTHINK PSU has moved from the Provost Challenge phase to rethinking all of the ways we do things in order to serve more students with better outcomes. Her road map calls for cross-campus involvement to review proposed strategies--to establish outcomes, recognize gaps that exist, and test out various scenarios prior to implementation. As an example of scenario analysis she offered asking what would happen if 10% of PSU students took 5% of their requirements through credit for prior learning. Screening by campus "filters" (slide 2, B4) like University mission, budget, curricular planning, and shared governance would help determine if the strategy made sense for PSU. Provost Challenge award recipients are required to follow the road map.

Announcing the membership of the Institutional Assessment Council, ANDREWS reported that this year the Council would focus on a long-term assessment strategies
and planning (slides 4 & 5). An outside consultant has been reviewing PSU’s current assessment strategies and this report will be shared with the Council for its review.

ANDREWS said that a systematic assessment of our entire array of academic program offerings would help PSU figure out the continuum along which expansion or phasing out decisions might occur. It would not be a protracted deep dive into detail, but it would be a shared governance process over the course of the coming year. She acknowledged that there were lots of questions to resolve and that the University was at the very beginning stage of a multi-step process (see slides 8 & 9, B3). The Senate Steering committee has been asked to help determine what the committee structure for doing the work would be. A committee would likely be convened to define what constitutes a "program," the criteria for assessment, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate based on data gathered. ANDREWS said that she expected a report from the Faculty Senate by the end of the year with a set of recommendations around those academic programs that are in need of investment all the way to those that need to be phased out. Around Stage 6 it gets difficult. Recommendations would be implemented in FY15. The goal was not to eliminate faculty positions; whether positions were eliminated would depend on recommendations based on the criteria developed.

DAASCH: This looks like a very aggressive schedule. Is this a typical schedule for this kind of prioritization?

ANDREWS: I would say that this is the average schedule, some institutions going through stage 6 in less than a year, others taking more than a year for stages 1 to 4. She noted that a book by Robert Dickeson, Prioritizing academic programs and services had some great examples (available as an e-book through the PSU library).

BROWER: Could you explain what it is that is broken within this institution that this the fix that might address it?

ANDREWS: I don’t think that there’s anything broken. As an institution we haven’t looked systematically across our programs to get a sense of those that need investment and those that need to be phased out. We have not, in the last ten years, changed our program array dramatically, other than adding a lot of programs and not really looking at all the programs we already have. Many institutions that have adopted program prioritization do it on a continual basis, every two-three years.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE: What would you hope to accomplish at the end of the process? And what will be happening in Stage 6?

ANDREWS: I hope that there will be a new understanding by all of us as to where we need to make adjustments or phase out programs. I had Institutional Research run some numbers on students that had graduated in each of our programs over the last three years and we have some academic programs (as distinct from departments) that have graduated a handful or no students. We should collectively be asking ourselves, should we be offering that program. Stage 6, implementation, is pretty well outlined in the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws that talk about how you phase out an academic program. You have an entire process that you’ve laid out.
SCHROCK: Would you anticipate all programs going through review at the same time? And in Stage 3, who is doing the metric analyzing?

ANDREWS: We do it with all programs at one time; you can’t just take a subset. Your second question is one of the questions that we have—what data is needed, who collects it, who puts it together. That’s my question to the Steering Committee, do you want an existing committee to help with those kinds of decisions or do you want to form a new committee to determine how that happens?

LAFERIERE requested that Marek Elzanowski be recognized.

ELZANOWSKI: I believe that Stage 2 is the most difficult, setting the criteria, only because every program needs investment and every program could be thought about and even eliminated. It all depends on what the goal is and what you want to achieve. This review is being driven by the administration, as I see it, so I would expect that there have got to be some goals set a priori to the process, so one knows how one looks at a program.

ANDREWS: I would agree with you that stage 2 will be difficult. I think experience at other institutions has demonstrated that people can come together pretty well around Stage 2 and even Stage 3. It’s Stage 6 when particular units are impacted that issues emerge.

WENDL, stating agreement with the previous speaker, asked whether there would be Faculty Senate input or discussion about criteria. ANDREWS said that she had asked the Senate Steering Committee about where they wanted this work done because it would be a shared process with faculty involvement. MCBRIDE responded that this topic illustrates how important the districts could be. She encouraged senators to communicate with their districts to surface issues involved and share these with Steering. More involvement would insure a better process. EPC has already been discussing how some of the work of program prioritization might be organized.

**Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

MCBRIDE reminded senators that an item was sent out for distribution to their districts asking them to encourage conversation about the 10 questions about doing research at PSU being discussed.

FINK said that he wanted to broaden his perspective on what faculty think about how we do research beyond his Research Advisory Council of about 35 faculty. He noted that past increases in research activity seem to have leveled off, in part, due to the end of federal stimulus money and earmarks, and newly hired faculty reaching the saturation point. He asked what is the appropriate level of research, if PSU defines itself as an urban-serving university: How much do we need and how much does our reputation depend on that versus the teaching that you do? Research isn’t free. We can’t have a research active faculty if some faculty are not really dedicated to teaching. PSU is good at partnerships. How much should it preferentially focus on research with those partners? FINK then briefly reviewed past and future planned investments. (See presentation slides, attachment B4.)
DAASCH encouraged including the leveraging of research faculty in the thinking about trade offs. FINK said that one area he did not mention was the Regional Research Institute, which generates a large amount of funded research and training. Many of their staff are non-tenure track faculty. To some extent RRI pay for themselves, but their research does not bring in full overhead, so RRI faculty are being subsidized administratively by the faculty in the Sciences and Engineering. Other large research universities will have a much larger cohort of these kind of faculty than PSU and PSU could grow this aspect more.

KARAVANIC: I think that PSU’s reputation depends on our ability to offer quality programs and as long as PhD program are operating, research is how we are training and educating the people in that program. Teaching and research are intertwined. Students have to be standing next to me while I’m doing quality research.

FINK: In the context of the budget discussions over the last year or two that hasn’t been a very visible part of the discussion. It’s more about undergraduate tuition, and getting more out of state tuition, and foreign students, none of which contribute to research, except that many [foreign students] are graduate students. And we are only going to keep those programs going, like you said, if we have vibrant research.

BERTINI: Research funding is what allows us to recruit the graduate students and pay their tuition through remissions. Otherwise those students are going to other universities. If we didn’t have research, programs would diminish in size, and especially in quality.

FINK: I would agree with that, but a question for the larger group—those who aren’t actively pursuing research today—how is you viewed of PSU shaped by a comment like this?

BROWER: I have an active constituency group, I shared the questions and nobody responded. I am a social scientist and I think that this isn’t something that resonates very well with my constituents. That’s not the way we see our graduate students.

LAYZELL: I am an NTTF. This audience is the choir. When you look at the output—it is hugely undergraduate and hugely poor—then I am not sure that you can sell the idea that our reputation is based on research outside of this choir.

FINK: To me the choir is the Research Advisory Council, the Senate is a more heterogeneous group.

SANTELMANN: I would argue somewhat against that point. In Applied Linguistics we have a Masters program and fairly large undergraduate program for a faculty of our size. The quality of our program would diminish considerably if we had faculty that were not doing any research and keeping current. I admit that when half the faculty get course releases that does create havoc, but I wouldn’t want that tension to go away.

FINK acknowledged his surprise in coming to PSU upon learning that Applied Linguistics and Speech and Hearing were some of PSU’s most prominent research-active departments and part of PSU’s identity today. The question going forward should be what are the connections between the degree programs and research.
JAEN-PORTILLO: To what extent does our institution recognize the differences that exist across the disciplines in ability to obtain external funding and the need to provide more internal help to those who cannot access grants?

FINK: That’s a key question about the non-well-funded disciplines. My view is that research office funding comes largely from those people who bring grants in and we tend to use most of that money to support them. My assumption is that the Deans are able to support those other programs with their discretionary money. Part of the reason to have this discussion is to have you express these views and be willing to talk about this in your departments. FINK expressed a willingness to meet with departments

GREENSTADT: I want to echo that we can also be known for providing a high quality liberal arts education in an urban setting, where people traditionally have not had access to that kind of an education. You can’t do that without having faculty involved in research or teaching at all levels.

[Applause.]

**Report of the Internationalization Council**

MCBRIDE introduced Steve Thorne, chair of the Internationalization Council, with the final report.

THORNE noted the release of the Council’s Strategy for Comprehensive Internationalization, 2012-2020. Last year they focused on student learning, faculty research and inter-institutional strengthening. He said the Council is looking at ways to internationalize what is happening on campus by enhancing existing initiatives and mobilizing international students and alumni. These important resources enable our students to be integrated in, contribute to, and learn from the world around them. Kevin Reynolds, to whom they report, will meet with the Council on 11/5 to discuss strategies. This year they plan to work with Chris Broderick, V.P. for University Communications, on a publicity campaign to make international activities of faculty and students more visible. He invited faculty to submit examples. Julie Haun (IELP) and Chaz Lopez (Global Diversity and Inclusion) are helping to catalyze ideas for addressing PSU’s lack of a structured orientation or training for new faculty, staff, and ultimately students, in intercultural communication skills. Additionally VP Reynolds has suggested that the Council look at ways to make Study Abroad options more accessible to more students.

THORNE is especially interested having the committee think about leveraging virtual international learning options to augment residential instruction, what in Europe is called virtual mobility, for example, MOOCs and SPOCs (small, private online courses) with intercultural components, international students, and international exposure.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.
First I want to thank the Faculty Senate Steering committee for allowing me the opportunity to address the Senate about bargaining. I thought a short presentation could help you understand where we are in bargaining and why this bargaining round is so different from the bargaining of past contracts.

This is the 3\textsuperscript{rd} time I've been on the faculty bargaining team at Portland State and I've got to tell you this time feels radically different than the previous contracts. This year, with the exception of Vice-Provost Mack, there are no Deans, Associate Deans, or managers of faculty and academic professionals on the Administration side of the table. This is an important departure from the tradition of bargaining at Portland State University. It means that the daily work and interests of faculty are nearly inaccessible in negotiations. When our team tries to explain the interests of faculty, we don't feel like we are making a connection at all. Instead of discussing the possibilities around proposals we shuffle paper --- we exchange written proposals from one session to the next with little or zero negotiation at the table.

At the last bargaining session, the Administration rejected our proposals and started the impasse process with their announcement that they would call in a mediator. We have not even begun discussions of our respective packages. The Administration's current proposal is virtually identical to their initial proposal. Everything they have proposed diminishes faculty rights, working conditions, and benefits with one exception- the article on Health Insurance- where we proposed that the 5\% employee contribution to our premiums not increase. Here are some of the articles that I would like to draw to your attention.

**Article 8, Past Practice** - Past practice is the covenant between Faculty and Administration that ensures that policies and procedures that are not in the contract will be applied in the same way to all faculty members. If the Administration decides to implement changes to these policies, the contract currently requires that the Administration bargain to obtain faculty agreement. Examples of past practice protections are: Employee leaves that are not in the contract, such as sick leave, vacation leave, bereavement leave, holiday leave, inclement weather leave; procedures for Winter Closure; the PSU Telecommuting policy; policies and procedures on reimbursement for personal expenses incurred for work; employee use of University property; broadband internet reimbursement policy; outside employment and consulting; and many others.

The Administration has proposed changes in Article 8 that gives them the authority to change policies without faculty agreement. The Administration would have the freedom to create and apply the policies as they wish. We want to guard against bad policy applied in an arbitrary, capricious, and discriminatory manner.
**Article 14, Promotion and Tenure** – Currently our contract requires the Administration to obtain faculty approval for changes in the P&T Guidelines. If the Faculty Senate adopts revisions to the P&T guidelines, and the Administration objects, then the faculty and the Administration negotiate to come to agreement. The Administration wants to remove faculty negotiation and approval from this article. Any provisions of the P&T Guidelines adopted by the Senate can be altered or removed by the Administration, and the faculty will have no recourse.

**Article 16, Post Tenure Review** - The Administration wants to remove the current post tenure review process from the contract completely and start over - not with the faculty bargaining team but with you, the Faculty Senate. They have, in fact, refused to continue talking to us about it by invoking a technically correct but ill-advised legal argument that they don’t have to negotiate because it is a “permissive subject of bargaining.” This means you will be charged with creating a new process that, presumably, would go into the P&T guidelines. Given the changes the Administration proposed for Article 14, they could veto or alter anything the Senate adopts.

While the Administration has rejected our proposal for a 6% pay increase as a reward for a successful post-tenure review, we are especially concerned about the Administration’s attention to negative consequences of post-tenure review. In 2011 bargaining, they sought to insert a punitive element into Article 16. Our concerns are also fueled by a more recent, apparently capricious exercise of authority to the detriment of strong and dedicated faculty; some of you may know that the Administration fired Hillary Jenks in year 4 of her tenure track position in Honors without cause. In short, we must guard against the possibility that the Administration could adopt a post tenure review process that undermines the tenure system at PSU.

**Article 18, Fixed Term Instructional and Research Faculty** – The Administration proposes removing multi-year contracts for Non-tenure track Faculty with seniority. The longest notice period for non-renewal of faculty contracts that the Administration is proposing is 6 months for faculty with seniority, and as little as 3 months notice for those without seniority.

**Article 19, Professional Development and Support** – The Administration is proposing no increases in Faculty Development and Travel, and they have removed the $50,000 in our current Article 16 for Post-Tenure Review Professional Development. We have made strong arguments to increase funds based on reports from the Faculty Development Committee to the Faculty Senate. We proposed increasing faculty development funds from $500K to $750K and travel funds from $250K to $400K. Much more is needed to meet even half the faculty requests to that committee. In comparison, the administration’s travel budget is more than twice
the current level of travel support for all faculty applying to the Faculty Development Committee.

**Article 30, Salary and Retirement** - The Administration is proposing 1% increases in salary per each of the two years of our contract. We proposed greater across the board increases (2.5% COLA + 1% Comparator Adjustment) and changes to rewards for promotion (10% of salary), post tenure reviews (6% of salary), equity adjustments (1% pool), and increases for positive annual reviews for APs and NTTF (1% of salary). We also proposed compensation systems for the cancellation of courses and for summer session teaching. Finally, we included a Retirement Incentive Offer similar to the one the Administration offered faculty and staff two years ago.

**Article 27, Progressive Sanctions** - This article defines the procedure through which the University must determine that a faculty member should be disciplined. Discipline includes anything from oral reprimand to termination. The Administration proposes changes to this article that will make it easier for them to discipline and fire faculty - even tenured faculty. Currently written reprimands stay in a faculty member’s personnel file for only a year, and the faculty member may gripe the reprimand. The Administration proposes that written reprimands remain a permanent part of a faculty member’s personnel file and remove their ability to gripe it. Currently the President is the only administrator that can seek severe sanctions, like multi-term suspensions without pay or termination. The Administration’s proposal makes it easier for Deans and Department Chairs to seek severe sanctions against faculty.

All of our proposals for needed safeguards against investigatory abuse have also been rejected. There are dozens of faculty members who have recently suffered through investigations of misconduct at the new Office of Equity and Compliance. Most of these are baseless and go nowhere. Faculty members have had their research agenda, academic opinions and academic judgment expressed in faculty meetings questioned, and their personal and PSU email scoured and misinterpreted outside the scope of complaints. Many faculty are forced to wait weeks for investigations to start without knowing why they were being investigated. Most nervously persist through intrusive and confrontational interrogations, then wait months before hearing anything further. This is not right. Faculty deserve to be treated with respect in these proceedings, and we are alarmed that the Administration has dismissed the safeguards we propose.

**Two New Articles** - We proposed two new articles: one for Parental Leave similar to the one at the University of Oregon, and another for Academic Quality that establishes task forces to suggest changes for our next contract. These task forces are to consist of 2 Faculty Senators, 2 AAUP faculty, 2 Administrators, and 2 student
members from ASPSU. They are charged with looking at and making recommendations about Research Support, Online Learning and Awarding Credit for non-academic experience, and Evaluation of Administrators on campus. The Administration has refused all of these.

Conclusion

The Administration would remove many important protections that we have had in our contract for a long time. These are protections of the work of the faculty senate and protections of individual faculty members from all kinds of abuse. The Administration also proposes that our salaries further erode due to inflation. We won’t ask you to ratify a deal like that. We continue to bargain this last month of our contract. Please, come to bargaining tomorrow, November 5, and again November 19- there are flyers in the back. We must stand together. Thank you for your attention.
Interim Report
Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of PSU P&T Guidelines 11/4/13

Our charge:

Craft job descriptions, promotion criteria, and evaluation procedures for the new ranks of
• Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor
• Senior Instructor I & II
• Senior Research Assistant I & II
• Senior Research Associate I & II

Committee

Members (Tenure-Track and NTTF)
Mike Bartlett (BIO)  *Bob Liebman (SOC)
Rachel Cuniffe (CR)  Michael Taylor (SSW)
*Sandra Freels (WLI)  Gayle Thiemann (GSED)
**Christina Gildersleeve-Neumann (SPHR)  Diana Yatchmenoff (RRI)
Julie Haun (IELP)

Margaret Everett (OGS)  Carol Mack (OAA)  Ren Su (MCEES)
Ex officio

* co-chairs
** joint member of New Academic Ranks Task Force & our committee

PSU Faculty Profile
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2012 598 420 811
2008 530 432 691
2003 476 273 514
1998 434 213 262
1993 409 100 173
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Guiding Principles
From 1996 PSU P & T Guidelines
- a career orientation from hiring to promotion in keeping with a profession
- broad guidelines, implementation delegated to departments
- regular and fair procedures for the evaluation of all faculty +
The Senate's approved motions for
- grandfathering
- reclassification
- maximizing promotion possibilities under the newly created ranks

May–June:
- Reviewed the June 2012 Final Report and Minority Report of the New Academic Ranks Task Force
- Gathered DHRP data on the distribution of NTTF in PSU schools & colleges
- Consulted with Vice-Provost Carol Mack
- Compared policies at peer universities such as
  - UI which has career NTTF
  - IUPUI which offers extended (fixed term) contracts:
  - U of Maryland NTTF report (March, 2013)

June–September: Circulated templates of our draft job descriptions and promotion criteria/procedures to:
- Associate Deans of all schools and colleges and the Library
- Directors of major research institutes and IELP
- Department chairs in many disciplines
- Principal Investigators in sciences and engineering
September – October: Revised P & T Sections for

III. Ranks – Added job descriptions and promotion criteria for 9 new ranks

IV. Academic Appointments – Revised language for consistency

V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure – Added language for non-tenure track instructional positions and incorporated language from the 2009 Appendix for research positions*

Appendix II – Added template for NTTF seeking letters of support

Today: Invite substantive comments from the floor on our recommended language.

This week: Comments and proposed text edits also welcome (Please use Track Changes to log corrections and additions)

Next week: Committee will review feedback and make revisions which we’ll deliver to Steering by 11/18

December 2, 2013: Motion for discussion and amendments

December, 2013: Review by EPC and AAUP (Article 14, Section 3)

January 6, 2014: Senate votes to approve one motion without amendments

Committee

Members (Tenure-Track and NTTF)

Mike Bartlett (BIO) * Bob Liebman (SOC)
Rachel Culp (CR) Michael Taylor (SSW)
Sandra Freels (WLL) Gayle Thiemer (GSEED)
** Christina Gildensleeve-Neumann (SPHR) Diana Yatchmenoff (RR)
Julie Haus (EUP)

Margaret Everett (OGS) Carol Mack (DAA) Ren Su (MCECS)
Ex officio

* co-chairs
** joint member of New Academic Ranks Task Force & our committee

Endnotes

We welcome comments and corrections on the proposed new language for P & T Guidelines. A working draft is available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

Data for PSU Faculty Profile from OIRP Fall Term Fact Book - selected years

1993 NTTF faculty count based adding those with research rank to Fixed Term Instructional faculty

Mark A Jones CSE helped prepare the slides. Many thanks are due him. Errors are ours alone.
To deliver an education that serves more students with better outcomes, while containing costs through curricular innovation, community engagement and effective use of technology.

Through reTHINK, Portland State University will empower learners and establish a national model for academic innovation.

### reTHINK Goal

**Roadmap**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>reTHINK PSU</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes Navigators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>SAP Analyses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scenarios</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment**

### Institutional Assessment Council (IAC)

A Faculty Senate governance committee will promote and oversee the continued implementation of assessment across the campus.

- **This year’s focus:**
  - Develop a strategy for implementing assessment long term
  - Create guidelines for assessment planning and implementation that reflect student learning at the program, department, and institutional level.
Membership

» Rowanna Carpenter, Director of Assessment and Clusters, UNST
» Micki Caskey, Associate Dean, GSE
» Peter Collier, CLAS
» Jeanne Davidson, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services
» Jim Hook, Associate Dean, MCECS.
» Kathi Ketcheson, Director, OIRP.
» Leslie McBride, Interim Director, CUPA
» Tyler Matta, Manager, Student Learning and Success, SBA
» Jeremy Parra, Assistant Professor, CLAS
» Janelle Voegelle, Interim Director, Teaching, Learning and Assessment, OAI
» Vicki Wise, Director of Assessment, EMSA. Replacement Lisa Hatfield, EMSA

Academic Program Prioritization

What are we talking about?

» A systematic assessment of all of our academic programs (distinguished from Departments)

» Simultaneous

» Goal is to help PSU (though the shared governance process) to make decisions along the continuum of expansion or phase out of programs

Many Questions

» What is a program?
» What are the appropriate criteria?
» How do we measure, analyze, prioritize?
» How do we implement decisions?
» What are the process issues/shared governance considerations?
Stages

» Stage 1: Preparation Stage (October/November 2013)
» Stage 2: Criteria Stage (November/December 2013)
» Stage 3: Measuring, Analyzing and Prioritizing Stage (January/March 2014)
» Stage 4: Create & Adopt the Plan Stage (April/June 2014)
» Stage 5: Implementing Decisions Stage (FY 15)

More info on potential process available:
Dickeson, R. 2010. Prioritizing academic programs and services. (Jossey-Bass)

Available via
ebook from PSU Library
http://portlandstate.worldcat.org/oclc/646068774
Senate discussion of research at PSU

November 4, 2013

Discussion questions

1. What level of research do we want? What can we afford?
2. What do we mean by an urban-serving research university?
3. How much does PSU’s reputation depend on research?
4. How important is the quality of our faculty? Our students?
5. How important is PSU to Portland’s entrepreneurial economy?
6. How should PSU’s partnership work be funded?
7. What is our ability to fund risky ventures?
8. What is our strategy for getting large center-style grants?
9. How do we engage undergraduates in research?
10. What is our globalization strategy for research?
**Discussion questions**

1. **What level of research do we want? What can we afford?**
   - Research growth costs money (lower teaching loads, more faculty, more facilities, more staff)
   - Teaching in support of research and/or vice versa?

2. **What do we mean by an urban-serving research university?**
   - What kinds of research are most relevant to Portland? To all cities?
   - Should we preferentially support research linked to partnerships?

3. **How much does PSU’s reputation depend on research?**
   - Are we resting on laurels from the past? (OGI, CLAS, ISS, CBL)
   - Are we willing to make further investments? (CLSB, SoPH, Multnomah)
PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES.

Submitted by the Senate Ad Hoc Committee for Promotion and Tenure Revisions. November 15, 2013
Bob Liebman and Sandra Freels, co-hairs

Rationale: To accommodate the addition of 9 new NTTF faculty ranks as voted by the 2012-13 Faculty Senate

Revisions to be voted in a single up or down vote.

The full document is published on the Faculty Senate web site, under Senate Schedules and Materials as D1b (full text):
http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

D-1a.

Articles I, IIA, III, IV, and V New: NTTF: A-C, and Appendix II-4, Sample Letter to External Evaluators Outside the Department for NTTF are reproduced in their entirety in the following pages.

Additions underlined, deletions struck out
Reader’s Guide

Strike-outs are used for deletions; underlining for additions

To prepare for discussion December 2, 2013, we invite you to focus on
III. Ranks
IV. Academic Appointments
V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

In response to feedback from Senators and constituents, the draft posted 10/21 has been modified. The draft below incorporates corrections and changes that we call to your attention in your reading.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES

Dated May 17, 1996

Adopted by the PSU Faculty Senate June 12, 1996

Amended July 2009 to incorporate new guidelines for promotion within selected research ranks

Adopted by PSU Faculty Senate June 8, 2009

Amended October, 2013 to add new non-tenure-track faculty ranks

For discussion by the PSU Faculty Senate, December 2, 2013

To be voted January 6, 2014
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES

I. INTRODUCTION

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty are established to provide the means whereby the performance of individual faculty members and their contributions to collective university goals may be equitably assessed and documented. In the development of these policies and procedures, the university recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty members, of the departments of which they are a part, and of their specific disciplines; and, because of that uniqueness, the main responsibility for implementation of formative and evaluative procedures has been placed in the departments\(^1\).

Departmental guidelines should set forth processes and criteria for formative and evaluative activities which are consistent with the department’s academic mission. For example, departmental guidelines might identify evaluative criteria which are appropriate to the discipline, or might delineate which activities will receive greater or lesser emphasis in promotion or tenure decisions. They should also include appropriate methods for evaluating the interdisciplinary scholarly activities of departmental faculty. The Deans and the Provost review departmental procedures in order to ensure that faculty are evaluated equitably throughout the university.

Evaluation instruments provide a means for gathering information that can provide a basis for evaluation, but these instruments do not constitute an evaluation in themselves. "Evaluation" is the process whereby the information acquired by appropriate instruments is analyzed to determine the quality of performance as measured against the criteria set by the department.

Policies and procedures shall be consistent with sections 580 -21-100 through 135 of the Oregon Administrative Rules of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Approval and implementation of these policies and procedures shall be consistent with the agreement between Portland State University (PSU) and the American Association of University Professors, Portland State Chapter, and with the internal governance procedures of the University.

Each year the Provost will establish a timeline to ensure that decision makers at each level of review will have sufficient time to consider tenure and promotion recommendations responsibly.

At present, PSU faculty can be appointed as tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

\(^1\) “Departments” includes departments, schools, and other similar administrative units.
II. SCHOLARSHIP

A. Overview of Faculty Responsibilities

The task of a university includes the promotion of learning and the discovery and extension of knowledge, enterprises which place responsibility upon faculty members with respect to their disciplines, their students, the university, and the community. The University seeks to foster the scholarly development of its faculty and to encourage the scholarly interaction of faculty with students and with regional, national, and international communities. Faculty have a responsibility to their disciplines, their students, the university, and the community to strive for superior intellectual, aesthetic, or creative achievement. Such achievement, as evidenced in scholarly accomplishments, is an indispensable qualification for appointment and promotion and tenure in the professorial faculty ranks. Scholarly accomplishments, suggesting continuing growth and high potential, can be demonstrated through activities of:

• Research, including research and other creative activities,
• Teaching, including delivery of instruction, mentoring, and curricular activities, and
• Community outreach.

All faculty members should keep abreast of developments in their fields\(^2\) and remain professionally active throughout their careers.

At PSU, individual faculty are part of a larger mosaic of faculty talent. The richness of faculty talent should be celebrated, not restricted. Research, teaching, and community outreach are accomplished in an environment that draws on the combined intellectual vitality of the department and of the University. Department faculty may take on responsibilities of research, teaching, and community outreach in differing proportions and emphases. Irrespective of the emphasis assigned to differing activities, it is important that the quality of faculty contributions be rigorously evaluated and that the individual contributions of the faculty, when considered in aggregate, advance the goals of the department and of the University.

All faculty have a responsibility to conduct scholarly work in research, teaching, or community outreach in order to contribute to the body of knowledge in their field(s).

Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach, must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member’s responsibilities, must meet an acceptable standard as determined by the faculty in each unit. In addition, each faculty member is expected to contribute to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the University, school/college, and department, as appropriate. All tenure-track faculty have a further responsibility to conduct scholarly work in research, teaching, or community outreach in order to contribute to the body of knowledge in their field(s).

\[\text{[OMITTED: SECTION II B. -- one change: p. 12, nt 4: departmental to "department"]}\]

---

\(^2\) Faculty fields may be disciplinary or inter-disciplinary in nature.
III. RANKS

The following definitions of academic rank are based on the premise that a vital University depends on the active participation of all of its members. Inherent in this charge are the basic activities of research, teaching, community outreach, and governance and professionally related service. All personnel decisions will reflect the need to create and maintain a diverse faculty. The academic ranks in the faculty and the minimum criteria for each rank are:

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

**Professor:** A faculty member 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 criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see 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 faculty member 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, or community outreach. High quality and significance (see 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:** 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.

[Per Senate Motion 1 Grandfathering]
For non-tenure track faculty members whose initial date of hire was prior to September 16, 2014, the promotional path from Instructor to Senior Instructor to the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor shall be preserved according to Article 18 of the 2011-13 Collective Bargaining Agreement, and no timelines in rank for promotion to Senior Instructor I or II shall apply. Current Senior Instructors shall be transitioned to Senior Instructor I. The Senior Instructor I shall have a minimum rate of pay no lower than the current Senior Instructor position, and no current Senior Instructors shall have their pay reduced in the transition from Senior Instructor to Senior Instructor I. Senior Instructor I faculty members may seek promotion to Senior Instructor II or Assistant Professor in accordance with these guidelines. Should a senior instructor I hired before September 16, 2014 seeking promotion to Assistant Professor not be found to meet the criteria for promotion, they shall be subsequently reviewed for promotion to Senior Instructor II with the same promotion packet during the same cycle by the same committee.

**Senior Instructor:** The rank of Senior Instructor is used in those cases where the nature of the assignment requires special skills or experience in the instructional program but does not warrant the rank of Assistant Professor and in those cases where the performance of the individual could warrant the award of tenure.

**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:** Appointees to the rank of Instructor ordinarily hold an advanced degree associated with their fields of specialization or have comparable experience. An instructor at 0.50 or more is appointed for a period of one year, may be reappointed, and can only be awarded tenure with concurrent promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor or Assistant Professor. Normally persons appointed at the rank of Instructor are not eligible for consideration for promotion within the first year of their appointment. 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:**
Professorial ranks will be available for faculty on Senior Research Associate Appointments. Such appointments are for faculty who are 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. 

**Research Associate and Senior Research Associate:** See Addendum IV for description of these research ranks and the promotion guidelines governing them. 

**Research Assistant and Senior Research Assistant:** See Addendum IV for description of these research ranks and the promotion guidelines governing them.

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.

*Per Senate Motion 1 Grandfathering*
For faculty members hired prior to September 16, 2014, the timelines for promotion to Senior Research Associate I and Senior Research Associate II and Senior Research Assistant I and Senior Research Assistant II shall not apply.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor requires the customary University promotion review.
reviews as outlined in 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 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 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.

Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor Appointments
Normally, professors of practice 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. The description, rank, and promotion criteria for Professor of Practice and Clinical Professor are equivalent.

Professor of Practice/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/Clinical Professor:** Typically, candidates 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 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/Clinical Professor:** 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.

**IV. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS**

**A. Regulations**

Academic appointments in the State System of Higher Education are governed by four sets of regulations that define the conditions under which faculty ("unclassified academic employees") may be appointed. Highlights are summarized below.

1. **Board Rules**

   The Board of Higher Education Administrative Rules (OAR 580-20-005) separate academic ranks into two categories: graduate rank (Graduate Research Assistant, Graduate Teaching Assistant) and faculty rank (Fellow, Lecturer, Research Assistant, Research Associate, Instructor, Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor). The Board Rules further note that "academic rank is assigned to staff members in the unclassified academic service whether the type of service is teaching, research, extension, administration, or other service," without a requirement for assigning rank to all staff members.

   The Board of Higher Education Administrative Rules (OAR 580-020-0005): Graduate ranks are GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT, GRADUATE
RESEARCH ASSISTANT, and FELLOW.
Faculty titles and ranks are (in alphabetical order): AFFILIATED FACULTY, CLINICAL PROFESSOR (assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, clinical professor) or PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE (assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, professor of practice), INSTRUCTOR (instructor, senior instructor I, senior instructor II), LECTURER (lecturer, senior lecturer I, senior lecturer II), LIBRARIAN (assistant librarian, associate librarian, senior librarian), RESEARCH ASSISTANT (research assistant, senior research assistant I, senior research assistant II), RESEARCH ASSOCIATE (research associate, senior research associate I, senior research associate II), RESEARCH FACULTY (research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor), TENURE TRACK OR TENURED FACULTY (assistant professor, associate professor, professor, distinguished professor). Faculty titles will not be given to graduate students. The Board Rules further note that each institution can select from among these ranks and titles those appropriate to the hiring and retention of their faculty members as it relates to their institutional mission. PSU has elected not to use the Lecturer and Librarian ranks and not to limit the Instructor rank to undergraduate instruction only.


The Board's Financial Administration Standard Operating Manual ("FASOM"), Section 10.012-82, allows for faculty to be appointed with "No Rank." In addition, the Chancellor's office has implemented a new class code, 2971 "Unranked," to assist in processing faculty appointments. These facilitate the appointment of faculty in academic support, student support, and administrative support positions with professional titles, with or without faculty rank. A series of professional titles reflecting responsibilities will provide opportunities for greater clarity as well as appropriate recognition and promotion for many professionals in these units.

3. Oregon Revised Statutes

The Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 240-207) designate specific State System of Higher Education positions as unclassified (i.e., faculty) "the President and one private secretary, Vice President, Comptroller, Chief Budget Officer, Business Manager, Director of Admissions, Registrar, Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer, Research Assistant, Research Associate, Director of Athletics, Coach, Trainer." The Revised Statutes include "all...members in the State System of Higher Education...whether the type of service is teaching, research, extension or counseling" as being unclassified. The Revised Statutes thereby provide a primary guide for determining if a State System of Higher Education position should be designated faculty (unclassified) or classified.
4. Personnel Division Rules

Under authority granted to the Personnel Division by ORS 240-207, the following positions have also been designated as unclassified: Librarian; Director of Alumni; Director of University Development; General Managers; Directors; Producers; and Announcers of the State Radio and Television Service; Interpreters for Hearing-Impaired Students; Director of Information Services; and Director of Publications.

B. Use of Professorial Faculty Ranks

1. As mandated by OAR 580-20-005(4), Deans, Vice Presidents, and the President shall have the academic rank of Professor.

2. For tenure-track faculty hired after September 16, 1990 2014, the professorial ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor will be limited to
   a. teaching-related positions with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
   b. librarians with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
   c. faculty on professorial research-related appointments with an expectation for scholarly accomplishment;
   d. faculty meriting professorial level appointments whose principal responsibilities are related to scholarly research.
   e. d. as mandated by state statute for those in administrative positions;
   f. e. visiting faculty hired at .5 FTE or higher.

3. Faculty in non-tenure track positions hired after September 16, 2014 that do not have an associated expectation for scholarly accomplishment will be appointed with one of the four five following designations:
   a. with professional title but without rank;
   b. at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor I or II;
   c. at professorial rank as mandated by state statute for those in administrative positions;
   d. at the rank of Administrative Research Assistant, Administrative Senior Research Assistant I or II, and Administrative Research Associate and Senior Research Associate I and II for faculty in research support or research training positions.
   e. at the rank of Research Assistant or Senior Research Assistant I or II;
   f. at the rank of Research Associate or Senior Research Associate I or II;
   g. Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor;
   h. Assistant Professor of Practice or Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Professor of Practice or Associate Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor.
C. Definition, Use, and Conditions of Faculty Appointments

Faculty appointments are defined as fixed term, annual tenure, and indefinite tenure:

1. Fixed Term Appointments

a. Fixed term appointments are made for a specified period of time and are not eligible for tenure. Although fixed term appointments do not require timely notice under the provisions of OAR 580-21-305, notices of intent to reappoint or not to reappoint should be sent by April 1 of the first year of a fixed term appointment and by January 1 of subsequent years. Such notices of intent may be based on the availability of funds. The immediate supervisor of faculty on fixed term appointments is required to provide an annual evaluation of the performance of fixed term faculty after the first year consistent with the practices specified in their promotion and tenure guidelines [VI. A2]. It should be understood that fixed term appointments are for specified times and no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

b. Use of Fixed Term Appointments

i. Upon the adoption of these guidelines the use of fixed term appointments for continuing faculty who are .50 FTE or more on instructional accounts and who hold professorial rank shall be reduced as much as possible, consistent with stable funding and the special needs of academic units.

ii. Fixed term positions should be used for:

   a) Non-tenure track faculty;
   faculty in professorial ranks who are less than .50 FTE;
   faculty whose appointments are primarily in academic support, student support and administrative support units and usually do not have academic rank;

   1) Professional titles offer an alternative to appointment at faculty rank for fixed term positions when, in the view of the unit administrator and provost or appropriate vice president, a professional position title most adequately describes the responsibilities of the position and qualifications of the individual holding those positions.
   2) These titles also provide alternative opportunities for promotion. A list of appropriate positions and titles must be defined and promotional opportunities in these positions be established and described and the appropriate criteria and procedures developed.

   e) appointments that are temporary, regardless of rank.
b) Positions established with non-recurring funds that are defined as temporary. Appointments such as a visiting professor or a sabbatical leave replacement are considered temporary.

c. Conditions for Fixed Term Appointments

i. Initial appointments shall be for an appropriate fixed term period, but typically one or two years. Initial appointments of three years may be granted at the discretion of the provost or appropriate vice provost.

ii. After six years of cumulative full time service, *individuals who hold non-ranked appointments in academic support, administrative support, and student support units on multi-year, fixed term appointments* shall be eligible to be considered for administrative leave for professional development. Such leave is at the discretion of the provost or appropriate vice president consistent with State System guidelines.

A fixed term appointment does not foreclose the possibility that a department may wish to consider that faculty member for a tenure-related appointment. In such cases, the years spent under fixed term appointment may be considered as a part of the probationary period for tenure at the time the individual is placed on the annual-tenure track. A mutually acceptable written agreement shall be arrived at between the faculty member and institutional representative as to the extent to which any prior experience of the faculty member shall be credited as part of the probationary period, up to a maximum of three years.

2. Tenure Track (Annual) Appointments

a. Conditions Governing Tenure Track

Annual appointments are given to faculty employed .50 FTE or more who will be eligible for tenure after serving the appropriate probationary period. Only in exceptional circumstances will appointments under 1.0 FTE be tenure track. Termination other than for cause or financial exigency requires timely notice (see OAR 580-21-100 and 580-21-305). Termination other than for cause or financial exigency shall be given in writing as follows: during the first year of an annual appointment, at least three months notice prior to the date of expiration; during the second year of service, at least six months; thereafter, at least twelve months.

Probationary Service and Consideration for Tenure. Tenure should be granted to faculty members whose scholarly accomplishments are of such quality and significance and demonstrate such potential for long-term performance that the University, so far as its fiscal and human resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. The granting of tenure should be even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and is
exercised only after careful consideration of a faculty member’s scholarly qualifications and capacity for effective continued performance over a career.

The granting of tenure reflects and recognizes a candidate’s potential long-range value to the institution, as evidence by professional performance and growth. In addition, tenure insures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University.

Tenure normally is considered in the sixth year of a tenure-track appointment, with a tenure decision to be determined prior to the beginning of the seventh year. Recommendations to award tenure earlier can be made at the department's discretion. If a faculty member is not awarded tenure at the end of six years, termination notice will be given. The six consecutive probationary years of the faculty member's service to be evaluated for the granting of tenure may include prior experience gained in another institution of higher education whether within or outside of the state system. Ordinarily, this is instructional experience at an accredited institution of higher education. Whether such experience will be included, and to what extent must be decided at the time of initial appointment in a mutually acceptable written agreement between the faculty member and Portland State University. The maximum time to be allowed for prior service is three years.

The accrual of time during the probationary period preceding the granting of indefinite tenure is calculated in terms of FTE years. An FTE year is the total annualized, tenure related FTE in a given fiscal year. Therefore, the minimum probationary period may require more than six calendar years if the faculty member's FTE was below 1.00 during the first six years. This could occur for various reasons, including initial appointment date after the beginning of the fiscal or academic year (i.e., Winter Term), leave without pay for one or more terms, or a partial FTE reduction during the probationary period. Care should be taken to be sure to consider a person who has accumulated, for example, 5.67 FTE years. Delay for another year would not allow for timely notice. Should circumstances warrant full tenure review prior to the sixth year, this review should include the external peer review as well (cf. IV,A,1,c).

Indefinite tenure appointments are appointments of .50 FTE or more given to selected faculty members by the institutional executive under authority contained in IMD 1.020 and OAR 580-21-105 in witness of the institution's formal decision that the faculty member possesses such demonstrated professional competence that the institution will not henceforth terminate employment except for (a) cause, (b) financial exigency, or (c) program reductions or eliminations.

Because tenure is institutional, not system-wide, faculty who have achieved tenure status in one state system institution cannot hereby claim tenure in other institutions of the state system (OAR 580-21-105).
Annual and Third Year Reviews. Faculty on annual tenure must be reviewed after the completion of the first year of their appointment and each subsequent year. In order to assure that candidates for tenure have a timely assessment of their progress so as to permit correction of deficiencies, there must be a review at the end of the third year. For faculty who have brought in prior service at another institution, the review will not be conducted until the end of at least one complete academic year at Portland State University. As a result of this review, candidates should be given an assessment of their progress toward tenure and of any deficiencies that need to be addressed. The review shall be in accordance with regular department and university procedures and should specifically evaluate the progress of the faculty member in meeting the standards for the award of tenure; however, reviews prior to the sixth year are normally only for evaluative purposes and do not have to include outside evaluation. Upon the completion of the third year review, the faculty member reviewed will be given an assessment of progress toward tenure as perceived from all appropriate administrative levels.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES/PROMOTION AND TENURE
(For promotion within the range of ranks identified as research assistant to senior research associate, please see the guidelines in Appendix IV.)

TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for recommendations for promotion and tenure, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The criteria to be used for promotion and tenure must be consistent with university and college or school policy and must be formulated early to allow maximum time for making decisions.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the dean and provost is required. If a dean disapproves of existing or newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the provost for resolution.

After approval by the provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

In cases where a faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is to initiate personnel actions, and the faculty member is to be so informed. In cases where a faculty
response to the action of the dean. This statement shall be forwarded to the provost at the same time as the recommendations go forward. *Individual files of faculty reviewed for promotion and/or tenure shall be assembled by the dean's office, following the format specified in the “Promotion and Tenure Checklist” (forms available in Academic Affairs) and submitted to the Provost.*

The dean initiates recommendations for promotion of department chairs. The dean's recommendations shall be forwarded to the provost only after consultation with departmental committees.

C. Responsibilities of the Provost

The provost makes all recommendations for promotion and tenure to the president for final approval according to the following process:

The provost shall review the appraisals forwarded from the various colleges, schools, and other units. In doing so, the provost shall determine whether recommendations are in conformity with the Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines, reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required procedures. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the provost shall consult with the dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.

After reaching a decision, the provost shall notify the affected faculty member, in writing, of his or her recommendation. A faculty member who wishes to request a reconsideration of the provost's decision must schedule a conference with the provost within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. Only after a requested conference is held shall the provost make a final recommendation to the president.

Copies of the provost's recommendation shall be sent to the dean and department chair.

Upon receiving the provost's recommendation and a summary of the outcome of any reconsideration requested by a faculty member, the president shall make a final decision. Appeals of the president's decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42-005).

**NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS**

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for recommendations for promotion, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The procedures and criteria to be used
for promotion must be consistent with university and college or school policy and must be formulated early enough to allow maximum time for making decisions.

The guidelines must be in writing and be made available to all department faculty. Departments with more than one non-tenure track faculty member shall require that at least one non-tenure track faculty member shall be on the non-tenure track faculty review committee. Reviews must take account of job-relevant evaluation criteria in keeping with those specified in letters of appointment. Faculty may submit all relevant materials to the evaluators. Departments shall require the use of quantitative summaries of student evaluations to assure the confidentiality of student responses. To aid review committees in their evaluation, departments shall require a narrative or self-evaluation from each member under review. Faculty must have reasonable notice of their evaluations.

The results of a review must be provided in writing and in sufficient time that one who is reviewed is able to meet with at least one of the reviewers and to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments that shall be attached to the review. Guidelines should be clear and unambiguous and include a calendar for a cycle of reviews. Faculty may request a review if one has not been provided in the time period provided in the guidelines.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves existing or newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the provost for resolution.

After approval by the provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

In cases where a non-tenure track faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is to initiate personnel actions, and the faculty member is to be so informed. In cases where a faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, evaluation must be solicited and provided by all appropriate academic departments. When a faculty member's research has clear impact on members of the external community, including civic groups, practitioners or others, evidence of the value of this work should be solicited from those most affected.

1. Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

a. Notification. The department chair notifies the chair of the Personnel or appropriate departmental committee of those non-tenure track faculty who are eligible for review. Faculty members on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence shall be given equal consideration for promotion in rank with faculty
b. Faculty Curricula Vitae. All non-tenure track faculty members being reviewed should provide to the departmental committee an updated curriculum vitae. Curricula vitae should follow the format provided in Appendix I. A curriculum vitae should be updated at each stage of the review process.

c. Peer Review. Although non-tenure track faculty positions do not carry expectations for scholarly research, departments may require that candidates for promotion be evaluated by peers and other credible sources (e.g., authoritative representatives from a faculty member’s field, students, community participants, and subject matter experts) who are in a position to comment on the candidate’s activities that are required of their position. Evaluations outside the department shall not be solicited or considered unless the use of external reviews is agreed upon by the faculty member and promotion and tenure committee as relevant to their contribution as assigned by the University. For non-tenure faculty to be reviewed for promotion, a list of potential evaluators outside the department which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and significance of the candidate’s professional activities, shall be compiled in the following manner:

i. The department chair will ask the faculty member for a list of at least four evaluators from outside the department. The faculty member may also provide a second list of possible evaluators perceived as negative or biased. Although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, if an evaluation is requested of someone on the second list the faculty member's exception will be included as a matter of record.

ii. Additional evaluators from outside the department may be selected by the department chair or the chair of the departmental committee. The chair will send the list to the dean for review and the dean may add names to the list.

iii. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee will select evaluators from the combined list of evaluators from outside the department. A sample letter of solicitation for letters of support for non-tenure track faculty is provided in Appendix II. Please note, as suggested in the sample letter, the evaluator should be advised that the letter is not confidential and will be available for the faculty member's review. Requests for external evaluations shall include a link to University and departmental criteria for promotion. The faculty member being reviewed, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, shall choose which, if any, samples of the faculty member's work shall be sent to external evaluators. Upon receipt of the evaluations, the chair of the department will send them to the departmental committee. A complete evaluation file must include at least three letters from evaluators outside the department. In cases when promotion decisions are deferred, external evaluations may be used in subsequent considerations for a
period of three years.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Establishment and Authority

All recommendations for promotion and tenure originate with formally established departmental committees; for example, an elected advisory committee, or an elected committee on promotion and tenure. The department as a whole shall determine the composition of the committee and the method of selection of its members and chairperson. Student participation in the consideration of promotion and tenure is mandatory. When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the departmental promotion and tenure committee will include a faculty representative from a mutually agreed upon second department or program. Since the department chair is required to make a separate evaluation of the department faculty, the chair cannot be a member of the committee. The committee may invite other faculty members to participate in its deliberations. This committee acts as an independent reviewer of the performance of department faculty and initiates recommendations for all department faculty except the department chair. Committee members being considered for promotion shall not participate in the committee review of their cases.

Upon notification of the status of eligible faculty from the department chair, the committee will review and evaluate the curriculum vitae of faculty members eligible for promotion, and where required, external peer evaluation. Faculty members being evaluated may submit pertinent materials to the committee, but such data may not be included as a part of the committee's recommendations unless fully evaluated within the committee report.

3. Committee Decision and Narrative Report

The Committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each affected faculty member. The report must address the following areas: effectiveness in teaching, effectiveness in research, and/or effectiveness in community outreach whenever each is part of a faculty member’s responsibilities; and governance and professionally-related service. The departmental committee must make one of three decisions for each member of the department and the votes of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form (Appendix III).

a. Ineligible: This decision is appropriate for faculty who do not have minimum time in rank.

b. Deferral: This decision is appropriate for faculty who have met the minimum time in rank to qualify for promotion but whose requests for promotion are not accepted. Deferrals for faculty who have requested evaluation for promotion must be accompanied by a written report.

c. Positive Decision: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments
warrant promotion. For faculty members recommended for promotion, the committee's evaluation should survey the faculty member's years at Portland State. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix II must accompany the recommendation form.

4. Responsibilities of Department Chair

The department chair must be satisfied that the departmental committee has followed the departmental guidelines and that the appraisals are complete and in proper form. Department chairs are to make a separate recommendation for each member of the department and take the following actions:

a. confirm that all eligible faculty have been considered

b. review justification for deferral at the faculty member's request and decision for deferral made by the committee.

c. review positive and negative recommendations and the curriculum vitae and supporting materials of the faculty member in question. The chairs will make a separate recommendation, adding their own written narrative to the committee's. The chair's narrative must address the following areas: effectiveness in teaching, effectiveness in research, and/or effectiveness in community outreach insofar as each is part of a faculty member’s responsibilities; and governance and professionally-related service. It should also address the general expectations of the department's promotion and tenure guidelines and the candidate’s activities with regard to these expectations, including the contributions of the candidate to the departmental curriculum, i.e. upper and lower division courses taught, difficulty of courses, major requirements, enrollments. If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for the specific differences.

The department chair informs each faculty member in a timely manner in writing of the departmental committee's and of his/her own recommendations (ineligible, deferred, recommended for promotion). The faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost and should indicate they have done so by signing the "Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form". A copy of the complete appraisal and any additional material added by the department chair, should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The department chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department chair. If a department member questions either departmental recommendation, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation.

5. Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision

Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of department action, the faculty
member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation. If the request is for reconsideration of the departmental committee recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the committee chair. Otherwise, only the department chair need be notified in writing.

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

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The departmental committee and/or department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The committee chair and/or department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation or statements with their recommendation(s). The department chair shall forward the appraisal, which shall then proceed through the normal administrative review procedure in a timely manner.

6. Chair's Report to the Dean

The department chair must submit the following to the dean:

a. statement of assurance that all eligible non-tenure track faculty have been reviewed;

b. recommendation form for each faculty member; and,

c. the committee's and the chair's written narratives for all faculty members who have received positive or negative recommendation for promotion.

Upon receipt of the dean's recommendation, the chair must inform the faculty member of that recommendation in a timely manner.

B. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator

The dean shall use an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and departmental committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the dean.

All actions taken by the dean must be reported in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair and chairperson of the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. If the department chair or the chairperson of the promotion and tenure committee requests a conference with the dean within five days of being notified by the dean, a conference shall be held before the dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. If the
dean's recommendation should differ with the recommendation of either the
departmental committee or department chair, the dean must notify the affected faculty
member in writing of the action taken at the college/school level and state the reason for
specific difference. The affected faculty member may seek a meeting with the Dean
prior to the finalization of any report that differs with the recommendation of the
departmental committee. The dean shall provide the affected faculty member with a
copy of any material added to the file. The affected faculty member may attach a
statement in response to the action of the dean. This statement shall be forwarded to the
provost at the same time as the recommendations go forward. Individual files of faculty
reviewed for promotion shall be assembled by the dean's office, following the format
specified in the “Promotion and Tenure Checklist” and submitted to the provost.

The dean initiates recommendations for promotion of department chairs. The dean's
recommendations shall be forwarded to the provost only after consultation with
college/school committee.

C. Responsibilities of the Provost

The provost makes all recommendations for promotion to the president for final
approval according to the following process:

The provost shall review the appraisals forwarded from the various colleges, schools,
and other units. In doing so, the provost shall determine whether recommendations are in
conformity with the Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines,
reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required
procedures. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the provost shall consult
with the dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.

After reaching a decision, the provost shall notify the affected faculty member, in
writing, of his or her recommendation. A faculty member who wishes to request a
reconsideration of the provost's decision must schedule a conference with the provost
within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. Only after
a requested conference is held shall the provost make a final recommendation to the
president.

Copies of the provost's recommendation shall be sent to the dean and department chair.

Upon receiving the provost's recommendation and a summary of the outcome of any
reconsideration requested by a faculty member, the president shall make a final decision.
Appeals of the president's decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the
Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42-
005).

NON-TENURE TRACK RESEARCH POSITIONS

Promotion guidelines for research ranks
A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

Each academic unit (department, school or college) will be required to develop and submit criteria and procedures for promotion within research ranks that are specific to the research activities of that unit. These guidelines will fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. These criteria will be reviewed and approved by the Dean and Provost.

1. Procedures for research faculty evaluation.

   a. The request for promotion can be initiated by the supervisor/principal investigator or the individual herself/himself.

   b. The faculty should be in rank at PSU at least one year before requesting promotion to the next rank.

   c. Changing rank signals a qualitative difference in what the individual will do on the job; specifically there will be an increase in both the level of responsibility and the initiative required. When responsibilities extend beyond the current job description, this may be reason to consider promotion. The reviewers should assess evidence that the individual is prepared to perform the activities at the next higher rank.

   d. All promotions should be accompanied by an increase in salary as set in the collective bargaining agreement.

   e. Requests for promotions may be forwarded to the Provost typically twice yearly, although exceptions can be made if funding cycles make it necessary. This is consistent with the fluidity of research funding and the fact that research project staffing needs do not follow a nine-month academic schedule. Academic units may choose to set their own timelines for request for promotion to be submitted to the Dean.

   f. Each academic unit will articulate a mechanism for allowing the individual to appeal, should the request for promotion be denied.

2. Responsibility of the reviewer (supervisor/principal investigator) and the review group

   a. Normally, the group that conducts the annual performance review according to Article 18 of the 2009-2011 PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement will receive and review the request for promotion, although the academic unit may wish to constitute a different group.

   b. Requests for promotion will go through the same process as annual reviews. The annual review/promotion committee makes a recommendation to the department chair/research center or institute director/school director. This individual then makes a recommendation to the Dean.
B. Responsibility of the Dean.

The Dean forwards all requests with his/her recommendations to the Provost for his/her review and final decision.

VI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON MERIT INCREASES

All members of the bargaining unit shall be included in a department for purposes of evaluation. Faculty members whose appointments are in research units may constitute themselves as a department for the purposes of this section subject to the approval of the appropriate dean(s).

All members eligible to vote must decide whether to have a separate departmental committee to consider salary increases, and, if so, to establish its composition and membership. If a committee is formed, it should work closely with the department chair. Departments should explicitly define the various kinds of meritorious activities. Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the dean and provost/vice president is required. If a dean disapproves existing or newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the provost for resolution. These approved guidelines shall govern the merit pay decision-making process at all levels. Departmental committees shall review, evaluate, and recommend redress of inequities in the same manner as other merit increases. Departments within smaller schools should consider whether they wish to evaluate members and recommend increases as a School, rather than as individual departments.

All participants in the merit pay process shall make merit increase recommendations and awards within designated merit categories. Up to 10% of the available merit pool may be distributed to individuals at the dean's discretion. The dean shall inform department chairs and individuals about the distributions, and shall communicate the reasons for them to department chairs.

Department evaluation committees shall make recommendations to department chairs regarding merit pay increases. Department chairs shall meet and confer with evaluation committees to attempt to resolve significant differences. A significant difference, at this stage of the process, as well as at subsequent stages, would occur when (1) the rank order of individuals as recommended by the evaluation committee would change; or (2) an individual who had been among those recommended by the evaluation committee would be dropped; or (3) an individual who had not been recommended by the evaluation committee would be added; or (4) the amount awarded to one or more individuals by the evaluation committee would be changed by 10% or more. If they are unable to resolve significant differences, then the recommendations submitted to the dean shall include both the evaluation committee's recommendation and the chair's recommendation, and the reasons for the different recommendations shall be stated in writing.

The recommendations made by the evaluation committee and by the chair shall be communicated to the faculty member concerned within one week of their submission to the dean. Before submitting recommendations to the provost, the dean will notify chairs and evaluation committees concerning any significant differences the dean has with recommendations submitted by them and shall state the reasons for specific differences in writing.
4. SAMPLE LETTER TO EVALUATORS OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT FOR PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

(NOTE: Significant deviations from this form must be approved by the Dean and Provost)

Dear (name of evaluator):

The (name of Department) of the (name of College or School) of Portland State University is considering whether it should recommend (name) for promotion to the rank of (rank) effective (date).

To assist in the review of candidates for promotion, the University requires that written evaluations be obtained from multiple and credible sources outside the department.

I am writing to request a letter giving your assessment of the quality and significance of (name’s) professional activities. Your letter will become a part of the file and will be available for review by the affected faculty member.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of (name’s) vita (and when agreed, additional materials.) Since our deliberations must be concluded by (date), I would appreciate your earliest response. If you are unable to respond by that date, please let me know as soon as possible.

I do hope that you will agree to participate in this important part of our review. Let me express in advance our deep appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Name
Title

Enclosures
(attach c.v.)
(attach additional materials, if any)
(attach a copy of the departmental criteria)

Candidate's Name
TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rachel Cunliffe  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**Changes to Existing Courses**
E.1.c.1.  
- ArH 457 Byzantine Art (4) – change course number to ArH 357.

E.1.c.2.  
- ArH 457 Romanesque Art (4) – change course number to ArH 358.

E.1.c.3.  
- ArH 461 Northern Renaissance Art (4) – change course number to ArH 361.

E.1.c.4.  
- ArH 471, 472, 473 Italian Renaissance Art (4, 4, 4) – change course numbers to ArH 371, 372, 373.

E.1.c.5.  
- ArH 476, 477, 478 Baroque Art (4, 4, 4) – change course numbers to ArH 376, 377, 378.

E.1.c.6.  
- ArH 481, 482 19th Century Art (4, 4) – change course numbers to ArH 381, 382.

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**

**Changes to Existing programs**
E.1.c.7.  
- BA/BS Economics – change to allow Ec 410 courses to count as upper-level electives in economics major.

**New Courses**
E.1.c.8.  
- Wr 331 Book Publishing for Writers (4)  
  Provides an overview of the book publishing process, organized around the division of labor typically found in publishing houses. Through readings, discussion, and
participation in mock publishing companies, students learn about editorial, design, production, marketing, distribution, and sales.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.9.
• Anth 367 East Asian Prehistory (4) – change title to The Archaeology of East Asia.
E.1.c.10.
• Anth 368 Oceania Prehistory (4) – change title to The Archaeology of Oceania.
E.1.c.11.
• Soc 460 Youth Subcultures (4) – change description and prerequisites.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses
E.1.c.12.
• PHE 328 Health and Housing Across the Lifecourse (4)
Addresses social, cultural, and environmental forces on the relationships between health and housing throughout the life-course. Topics include health disparities in housing quality and type; interventions to improve housing and neighborhood health; and international models of housing. Public and private strategies to prevent or solve housing-related health problems will be emphasized.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.13.
• PHE 425 Nutrition for Health (4) – change course number to PHE 325; change prerequisites.
E.1.c.14.
• PHE 454 Social Gerontology (4) – change course number to PHE 354.
Date: November 15, 2013  
To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Fr: Robert Gould PhD, Chair,  
     Educational Policy Committee

Re: Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report

The following is a summary of the Fall Term, 2013, Educational Policy Committee activities and decisions:

1. After two discussions with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, EPC is reconsidering the two new flow charts on Research/Membership Centers and Institutes, and Public Service/General Service Centers and Institutes. In the 2011-12 academic year, a concern was raised about how to distinguish the status of various kinds of academic units, including centers and institutes on campus. The Provost convened a small task force consisting of two members of EPC, with input from the Senate Steering Committee.

2. Last spring, EPC provisionally approved the proposal to create a Center to Advance Racial Equity (CARE) in the School of Social Work. However, intra-campus consultations continue this term to create a broader base for this center.

3. Steve Harmon, EPC member and OAA staff, added EPC minutes to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System. This allows EPC and others to track the progress of EPC activities.

4. EPC unanimously approved (10 attending members) a motion to send EPC representatives to join the ad hoc FSBC meetings with all college deans, concerning the budget decisions that are being pushed out to the colleges. This motion was made for two reasons. First, there may be alterations proposed to academic units within colleges, and having EPC representatives aware of these proposals will speed up EPC consideration of these plans. Second, the University has grown so large that EPC needs to have deeper roots in the colleges to be aware of decisions, such as the elimination of the WIC graduate assistant program, which have University-wide impact. Although this is currently an ad hoc process, EPC may propose a constitutional amendment to create ongoing college level EPCs.

5. EPC is currently reviewing a proposal to create an Honors College.

6. EPC is unanimously voted to approve a Program Review proposal, where individual programs are reviewed to meet the concerns of our accreditation reviewers. We also anticipate an additional proposal for Program Review that is part of the Provost's Challenge prioritization process.

7. EPC is also reviewing the questions arising from the Credit for Prior Learning Policy Subcommittee. At some point in the future, we will consider a full CPL proposal.