

**As moved February 2, 2015, then published with amendments February 16, 2015 (D1 of the March Agenda) that were adopted at the March 2, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting, with additional amendments.**

**PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

**PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW AT PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**Agenda item D1: March 2, 2015 as  
amended & corrected**

- 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. 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.

The faculty narrative is defined as a document that

- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, and service;
- describes an individual's accomplished and proposed contributions to the above areas;
- articulates the manner in which the individual's activities relate to the departmental needs, mission, and programmatic goals and changes in the department over time.

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their narratives 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. Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his or her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution, the goals of post-tenure review are

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

Post-tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure.

The procedures for post-tenure review herein are a supplement to the PSU *Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases* 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014.

## **II. Post-Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility**

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

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

In the event of changes in Article 30 Section 6b (Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases) of the University/AAUP CBA, the Faculty Senate shall reopen this document to make adjustments that maintain an appropriate balance between workload and incentives.

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.

Tenured faculty who provide a letter stating they will retire within 2 years shall be allowed to opt out of post-tenure review.

With agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer post-tenure review for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions.

## **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 procedures and criteria for post-tenure review that are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Post-Tenure Review Guidelines, which have priority. Guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.
- 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 or she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his or her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution. The final version must be returned by the Provost to the department/unit and ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.
- 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 career interests. The proposed unit guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the unit.

#### **IV. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review**

##### **A. Notification**

- 1. OAA shall notify each tenured faculty member eligible for post-tenure review in any given year.
- 2. OAA shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the Dean and chair/head of the appropriate academic unit.

##### **B. Dossier**

- 1. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes
  - i. Current curriculum vitae.
  - ii. Narrative of work done since the last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) in relation to the faculty member's career path. If the career path changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative. The narrative should succinctly describe the faculty member's activities that demonstrate continuing professional development and contributions to the life of the university and external communities which he or she has served during the review period. The narrative may also inform the review committee of the changes in work or life circumstances that occurred that have affected the faculty member's work during the review period. In addition, the narrative should speak to future plans.
  - iii. Any additional materials required by departmental/unit guidelines for post-tenure review. Documentation of teaching accomplishments in keeping with department/unit practice is expected.
  - iv. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he or she feels are relevant for the review.

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 clearly-articulated process for constituting committees that is collegial, equitable, and formative, and ensures that faculty have input into the selection process.
- ii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory. Exceptions can be made in accordance with department/unit guidelines if warranted.

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/academic unit, school, university and profession/academic community (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 *meet the standards* with regard to the criteria set forth by the department guidelines for post-tenure review or that they do not meet the standards for post-tenure review set forth in the department guidelines.

3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report to the chair. In its report the committee shall explain its decision and provide evidence to support the 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. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the report shall document the areas the committee finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall 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 department/academic unit 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. In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities shall be fulfilled by a person or persons specified in unit guidelines; potential chair designees include program directors, area directors, the faculty member's supervisor, or post-tenure review committee chair.

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 or her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member's contributions to not meet standards, the chair's letter shall document the areas he or she finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.
3. The department chair's letter and the committee report must be sent to the faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee's report.
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 it is forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member should indicate he or she has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he or 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 the 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 (Appendix PT-1) signed by members of the post-tenure review committee and the department chair or chair designee;
  - 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 or 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 post-tenure review committee and/or the department chair as appropriate within 10 working days of the request for reconsideration.
3. If the reconsideration is requested for the committee's decision, the committee chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee's reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the department chair for his or her review.
4. If reconsideration is requested of the chair's decision, the chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of his or her reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her consideration.
5. Should the committee or the department chair reverse their original decisions and find the faculty member's contributions to meet standards, they 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 his or her decision and document which criteria in the department's post-tenure guidelines were not being met and provide evidence to support the decision.
4. The Dean's letter shall be delivered within 20 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. The faculty member has 10 working days to provide additional materials to the Dean in support of the reconsideration.

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 final decision affirming the recommendation of the Dean.
3. The Provost will audit the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and post-tenure review committee to ensure that they comply with university guidelines. If the Provost finds that the review does not comply with university guidelines, then he or she must give reasons for his or her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.
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 within 10 working days of receiving the Provost's letter. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.
5. Appeals of the Provost's final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).
6. Should a faculty member be deemed not to meet the standards of the post-tenure review, 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.

**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 chair or chair designee, a Professional Development Plan (PDP). As per Article 16, Section 3 of the PSU-AAUP CBA, an unsatisfactory review shall not be the basis for just cause sanctions pursuant to Article 27, or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.
2. The PDP can be up to two years in duration. In exceptional circumstances, a third year may be approved.
3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected

results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member's career. The PDP shall only contain tasks that are substantially within the faculty member's control (e.g. the PDP could specify that the faculty member write a book but not that the book be published).

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

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

**C. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP**

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix PT-1).
2. Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the chair and the faculty member.
3. If the faculty member and the chair agree on the modifications requested by the dean, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the chair, whereupon the University shall make available the appropriate resources to implement the PDP.
4. The provost will make the final determination if the faculty member, the department chair and Dean do not agree on the modifications requested by the Dean.

**D. 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 every 6 months for the duration of the PDP to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the department chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member's request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member's request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who shall reply within 15 working days. If the department chair

- does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination within 15 working days.
3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.
  4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member's report to the Dean.
  5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member.
  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. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.
  7. Should a faculty member refuse to create and/or follow the PDP (except due to circumstances that are substantially outside the faculty member's control), he or she shall be notified and subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA.
  8. If the department chair and Dean agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will be eligible for the post-tenure review increase that is currently in force effective at the start of the following academic year.
  9. The Professional Development Plan, with information on how it was fulfilled, must be signed within 20 working days of completion by the faculty member, the department chair/unit head, and dean and filed with the Provost Office.

3/2/15

