

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY AFTER THE
AWARD OF TENURE**

(Agenda item E4: Dated November 24, 2014)

REVISED by the PSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee

1/26/15

Agenda item D1: February 2, 2015

- I. Preamble**
- II. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility**
- III. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**
- IV. Procedures for Post Tenure Review**
- V. Procedures for Administrative Review**
- VI. Professional Development Plan**

I. Preamble

By awarding tenure, Portland State University recognizes its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty and their scholarly agenda. The purpose of tenure is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution.

A scholarly agenda:

- articulates the set of serious intellectual, aesthetic or creative questions, issues or problems which engage and enrich an individual scholar;
- describes an individual's accomplished and proposed contributions to knowledge, providing an overview of scholarship, including long-term goals and purposes;
- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, or governance; and
- articulates the manner in which the scholar's activities relate to the departmental mission and programmatic goals. (*PSU Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases* 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014)

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their scholarly agendas will change to reflect varying proportions of time dedicated to research, teaching, advising, outreach, departmental, university, and professional service, administration, and academic leadership.

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay.

The goals of post-tenure review are

- to reward and motivate faculty engagement in their scholarly agendas, not to monitor and sanction, with the understanding that an individual's scholarly agenda will evolve over the course of a career;
- to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly with their units to ensure the unit functions as a whole and the burden of service is distributed equitably. A key aspect of this program is therefore the collaborative establishment of a scholarly agenda for each faculty member under review.

II. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility

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

All tenured faculty members, including department chairs and program directors shall undergo post tenure review.

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for post tenure review with regard to the year of the last review. Faculty members subject to post tenure review in an academic year shall be notified in accordance with Article IV.

III. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

- A. The primary responsibility for assessing an individual faculty member's contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish in its Promotion and Tenure Guidelines procedures and criteria for post tenure review. Departments/units must ensure that their guidelines are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Post Tenure Review Guidelines, which have priority.
- B. Approval of departmental/unit procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he/she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his/her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution.
- C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department/unit faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.
- D. In cases where a faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary teaching or research, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is responsible for post tenure review and how the other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed.
- E. In schools that do not have departments or colleges that do not have schools, the faculty in the academic discipline will establish post tenure review guidelines that: 1) describe the procedures and criteria to be used, 2) are consistent with the procedures and criteria set forth in the University's post tenure review guidelines, which have priority, and 3) provide procedures to choose review committee members from academic disciplines closely aligned with the faculty's member's scholarly agenda. In SBA, disciplines shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty of the School as a whole. In the Library, a committee elected by faculty in the major divisions (Resource Services & Technology and Public Services & Government Information) shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty in those divisions. In GSED, departments shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty of the School as a whole.

IV. Procedures for Post Tenure Review

A. Notification

1. OAA shall forward the list of faculty members eligible for review in any given year to the Dean of the School/College where they have their principal appointment.
2. The Dean of the School/College shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the chair of their respective departments.
3. The department chair shall notify the faculty in their department who are eligible for review. In schools without department chairs, the Dean shall notify the faculty members directly.

B. Dossier

1. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes
 - i. Current curriculum vitae.
 - ii. Scholarly Agenda, as described above
 - iii. Narrative of work done since the last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) in relation to the scholarly agenda. If the scholarly agenda changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative
 - iv. Any additional materials required by departmental/unit P&T guidelines. Documentation of teaching accomplishments in keeping with department/unit practice is expected.
 - v. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that-he/she feels are relevant for the review.

C. The Post Tenure Review Committee

1. Composition

- i. The committee shall be comprised of three people. Departments/units shall specify in their guidelines a process for constituting committees.
- ii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's scholarly agenda. An emeritus tenured faculty may be included if department guidelines allow.
- iii. A non-PSU tenured faculty member should be permitted if the colleague being reviewed can justify a claim that there are not any PSU faculty who is in a position to assess the contributions.

2. Committee Review Procedures and Criteria

- i. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member.
- ii. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review, and any other criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines:

- a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements (Research);
 - b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching);
 - c. Community Outreach (Outreach);
 - d. Service to the department, school, university and profession/academic community with emphasis on leadership roles and significant contributions to administration, governance, or to professional/academic communities. (Service).
- iii. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. The committee will find the faculty member's contributions either *meets the standards* with regard to the criteria set forth by the Department P&T Guidelines or that they do not meet the standards for post-tenure review set forth in the Department P&T.
3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report. In its report to the chair, the committee shall explain its decision. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions to meet the standards set forth for post-tenure review, they shall document this in their report to the chair. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions to not meet standards, the report shall document the areas which should be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.
 4. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority.

D. Role of the Department Chair

1. The department chair must assure that the faculty member's post tenure review committee has followed departmental, and university post tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member's dossier and that the committee's report is complete and uses the proper forms.
2. The department chair shall write a letter affirming or challenging the committee's decision and recommendation based on the criteria in the Departmental Post Tenure Review Guidelines, and explain his/her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member's contributions to not meet standards, the chair's letter shall document the areas which should be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.
3. The department chair's letter must be sent to faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee's report.
4. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the post tenure committee report(s) and the department chair's letter before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost. The faculty member should indicate s/he has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E.

5. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the Post Tenure Review committee and the department chair.
 6. The department chair must provide to Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
 - i. A completed recommendation form signed by members of the Post Tenure Review Committee and chair;
 - ii. The Post Tenure Review committee's report and the department chair's letter;
 - iii. If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member's request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the chair and/or committee.
- E. Procedures for Reconsideration of Recommendations by the Post Tenure Committee and Department Chair
1. If a faculty member questions the Post Tenure Review committee's recommendation and/or the department chair's recommendation, he/she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendations within 10 working days of receiving them.
 2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supporting materials must be submitted to the department chair within 10 working days of the request for reconsideration.
 3. The chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee's reconsideration and his or her reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her consideration.
 4. Should the department chair reverse his or her original decision and find the faculty member's contributions to meet standards, the department chair shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member's submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.

V. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review

A. Role of Dean or Equivalent Administrator

1. The Dean shall provide to the Provost a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed.
2. The Dean shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the report of the post tenure review committee and the chair with regard to the dossier submitted by the faculty member in order to write a letter affirming or challenging the recommendation of the committee and the chair

3. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain the decision and document which criteria in the department's post-tenure guidelines were not being met.
4. The Dean's letter shall be delivered within 10 working days to the department chair, the post tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member.
5. If the Dean finds that the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the department chair, chair of the committee, and/or the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean's letter. The conference must be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost.
6. If upon reconsideration, the Dean reverses his or her original decision and finds the faculty member's contributions meet standards, the Dean shall so report in writing and send with the original letter and all materials to the Provost.
7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member has met standards when the post tenure review committee's and the department chair's finding disagree, the Dean's letter to the Provost shall give his or her reasons.

B. Role of the Provost

1. The Provost shall review the materials forwarded by the Dean for each faculty member.
2. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her decision affirming the recommendation of the Dean.
3. If the Provost finds a faculty member's review does not meet standards after the Dean has found the faculty member's review does meet standards, the Provost must provide give reasons in writing for his or her decision.
4. The faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Provost within 10 working days of the receipt of the Provost's letter and may add additional evidence to the file. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.

C. Role of the President

1. After receiving a report of the outcome of a reconsideration requested by a faculty member of the Provost's decision, the president shall make a final determination of the review as meeting or not meeting the standards set forth in the P&T Guidelines for post-tenure review.
2. Appeals of the president's final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).

VI. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)

A. Purpose and Objective

1. A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop, in conjunction with the department/unit chair, a Professional Development Plan (PDP).
2. The PDP can be from one year to five years in duration as deemed appropriate.
3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda.
4. Based on discussions with the faculty member, and consultation with the department/unit review committee, the department/unit chair shall draft a PDP which will be forwarded to the Dean with a form (Appendix B) signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair.

B. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the Chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix B). Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the Chair who will then discuss the changes with the faculty member.
2. If the faculty member agrees, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the Dean, whereupon the University shall make available resources to implement the PDP.
3. If the faculty member and the department chair do not agree on modifications requested by the Dean, they may consult with the Provost to reach agreement.

C. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair or designee in schools where there are no department chairs shall meet with the faculty member annually to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member's request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member's request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination.
3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the

department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.

4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member's report to the Dean.
5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached, what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member.
6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair's letter to the Dean.
7. Should a faculty member not complete the PDP successfully, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

END

[Appendix A]. APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year, 20_____

Name _____
Last First Middle

College or School/Department _____

Date of First Appointment at PSU _____ Current Rank _____

Date of Tenure, Promotion, or most recent Post-Tenure Review _____

Each voting member of the Departmental Committee and each reviewing Administrator is required to sign and indicate his or her vote or recommendation. Please use **M** to indicate meets standards and **U** to does not meet standards.

NAMES	SIGNATURES	Meets/Does not meet standards	DATE
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:			
COMMITTEE MEMBERS*:			
COMMITTEE CHAIR:			
DEPARTMENT CHAIR:			
DEAN:			
PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT:			
PRESIDENT:			

*If more space is needed for committee membership, please attach an additional page.

I have been apprised of the recommendations indicated on this form and have been given the opportunity to review my file before its submittal to the Dean's Office.

Faculty Signature *Date*