

English Department Procedures and Practices - Appendix I

Guidelines on Promotion, Tenure and Salary Increases

[Changes from December 3, 1997 Department meeting incorporated into this copy of the guidelines—
approval from OAA still pending]

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

INTRODUCTION

Within the context of Policies and Procedures established by Portland State University, and consistent with the applicable Oregon Administrative Rules, the AAUP contract, and internal University governance procedures, the following principles and practices shall apply when evaluating faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit increases.

I. PRINCIPLES

- A. Processes and criteria for formative and evaluative activities shall be consistent with the department's academic mission.
- B. The department's academic mission shall be determined as the result of a collective process of planning and decision-making.
- C. To ensure consistency and communication between department mission and department faculty, faculty members shall work in groups of three (meeting at least once a year and to include at least one full professor) to guide the development of each member's scholarly agenda. In these groups the senior member(s) shall mentor the junior member. Each group will be responsible for articulating the individual agenda with the area or areas of professional responsibility agreed

¹. *Policies and Procedures For the Evaluation of Faculty For Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases* (adopted by Faculty Senate June 12, 1996).

upon in the department's academic mission and will act as advocates when a group member goes forward for promotion and tenure.

- D. Promotion and tenure shall be based on the evaluation of the appropriate level, mix, and quality of achievements in teaching, scholarship, community outreach, and governance and other professionally-related service consistent with the individual's agreed-upon role in the department mission and in accordance with definitions found in Section III (Ranks) of the University's Policies and Procedures.
- E. Faculty on annual review shall be reviewed at the end of their first year of appointment and each subsequent year as elaborated in Section IV (misnumbered V) of the University's Policies and Procedures document.
- F. Faculty on indefinite tenure, annual tenure, or fixed term appointments at 0.5 FTE or higher are eligible for promotion and merit review.
- G. Only English faculty who are tenured will be eligible for election to the department's Promotion, Tenure, and Salary Increase Committee (PTSI). One student will serve as a nonvoting member of the committee.
- H. The PTSI Committee will not recommend its own members for merit but will ask the department chair to make such determinations. Committee members under review for promotion will not participate in their own deliberations.

II. PROCEDURES

- A. Each spring the department shall elect a committee to serve for one year to evaluate and recommend action on promotion, tenure, and salary increases. The committee will be composed of four members, drawn from the tenured faculty, and a nonvoting student. When an individual faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion, the committee will consult with the faculty member's scholarly agenda group who serve as advocates in shaping the candidate's case.
- B. The Promotion, Tenure, and Salary Increase Committee forwards its recommendations in narrative form to the Department chair. The Department chair prepares his or her own set of narrative recommendations. Both sets are sent forward in accordance with

Section V (which is presently misnumbered IV) of the University Policies and Procedures.

- C. A faculty member who is deferred or negatively recommended by the Promotion, Tenure and Salary Increase Committee has the right to appeal, in accordance with Section V (Administrative Roles and Procedures). In instances in which a faculty member wishes to discuss a merit increase recommendation, he or she should meet with the Department head, in accordance with University internal grievance procedures.

III. Areas of Professional Responsibility

The English Department endorses the position that faculty on tenure-track and indefinite tenure appointments (as distinguished from fixed-term and graduate assistant appointments) are expected to be active to some extent in each of four areas: (A) teaching; (B) scholarly and aesthetic creation; (C) community outreach; and (D) governance and other professionally-related service. The extent of activity in each area is determined by the department's collective agreement on the deployment of each faculty member's talents in fulfilling the department and University missions. Fixed-term faculty responsibilities are defined by the terms of their contracts. Their performance, therefore, will be evaluated in terms of their contractual responsibilities.

Tenure-track faculty will normally emphasize the scholarship of research and aesthetic creation until tenure is awarded. Tenured faculty may present (but are not limited to) one area of emphasis--scholarship of teaching, scholarship of research and aesthetic creation, scholarship of community outreach--for promotion and merit consideration.

Department members in the instructor and professorial ranks are responsible for developing and maintaining a scholarly agenda in accordance with section II. A. of the University guidelines. As set forth in Section I (**Principles**) of this document, faculty will work in groups of three to define, maintain, or redefine their scholarly agendas. As set forth in II. B. 3. of the University Policies and Procedures, the primary use of a scholarly agenda is formative, not evaluative. Faculty, however, may include items from a previously agreed upon scholarly agenda in tenure and promotion documentation or for merit and other salary increase deliberations.

The English department endorses the principle of scholarly portfolios as the primary source of documentation for promotion, tenure, and salary increase evaluation. See Section I.E. in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

The scholarly portfolio will include a reflective overview which shall discuss the ways the faculty member's professional work fits with the discovery, integration, interpretation, and application of knowledge, explaining significance in the development of the individual's career, with reference to the criteria listed in sections A, B, and C below.

A. Teaching

Recognizing the need for both accountability and flexibility, the PTSI Committee will base its evaluation of teaching scholarship upon the scholarly portfolio developed by the individual with his/her scholarly agenda group. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to articulate teaching goals, methods, and outcomes. The Committee will evaluate the faculty member's contribution to the discovery, integration, interpretation, and application of teaching scholarship in these four areas:

1. Ongoing practice in the classroom.
2. Advising and mentoring.
3. Involvement with development and implementation of department and, where relevant, interdepartmental and University Studies curricula.
4. Dissemination of teaching scholarship.

Because the department endorses the development of scholarly portfolios, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the PTSI Committee with a reflective overview and select documentation of the quality and results of his/her teaching and teaching-related activities. Such documentation might include: summary of teaching responsibilities (including syllabi), summary of teaching practices (philosophy, methods, strategies, goals, and assumptions), summary of student evaluations (for example, ratings, written comments, letters of support, list of advisees, mentees, and theses supervised, examples of student work, etc.), peer and external reviews, teaching awards and honors. Other items for inclusion are listed in II.E.3. of the University guidelines.

In line with University guidelines Sections II.D.1-5. and II.E.3. and principles set forth in this document, the Committee will evaluate the quality and significance of teaching as an area according to the following criteria:

1. How well do the teaching, advising, and mentoring relate to the department and University missions?
2. How well does the documentation show teacher growth and student learning and service?

3. How well do the teaching and curriculum development activities demonstrate significant contributions to current practices and scholarship in the discipline?

B. Research and Other Creative Activities

The Committee will base its evaluation of research scholarship upon the scholarly portfolio developed by the individual faculty member with his/her scholarly agenda group. It is the responsibility of the individual to articulate his/her research goals, methods, and results. In line with the University guidelines (II.D.1-5.) and principles set forth in this document, the PTSI Committee evaluates the faculty member's contribution to the discovery, integration, interpretation, and application of knowledge in these four areas:

1. Publications: monographs, books, refereed and invited articles, chapters, book review essays.
2. Conference presentations.
3. Artistic creations.
4. Interdisciplinary and collaborative projects.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the PTSI Committee with a reflective overview and select documentation of the quality and amount of activity in this area. Such documentation might include: article off-prints, table of contents from book, and other evidence of publication; copies of conference presentations and evidence of other scholarly contributions to professional organizations; professional journal editing; external letters reviewing scholarship or aesthetic work; slides, videos, and other evidence of scholarly or artistic work; grant proposals; and evidence of electronic scholarship. See II.E.2. of the University guidelines for other items.

In line with sections II.D. and E.2. of the University guidelines, the PTSI Committee will evaluate the quality and significance of activities in the area of research and aesthetic creation according to the following criteria:

1. For tenure, has the individual fulfilled the terms of her/his detailed letter of appointment for gaining tenure?
2. For promotion, has the individual published the equivalent of at least three scholarly articles since last promotion? (See Attachment for equivalents.)
3. How well does the scholarship or aesthetic creation contribute to knowledge in the discipline?
4. Are the issues addressed substantive?

5. What theory informs the work?
6. Is the publishing or artistic venue appropriate/respected in the profession?
7. Do critical reviews, where available, support the quality and significance of the work?

C. Community Outreach

The Committee bases its evaluation of community outreach upon the scholarly portfolio developed by the individual faculty member with his/her agenda group. It is the responsibility of the individual to articulate purposes, processes, outcomes, and significance of outreach activities and projects.

The discovery, integration, interpretation, and application of outreach scholarship that contributes to department and University missions includes:

1. Community-based or outreach learning that is designed as part of a course or curriculum (such as senior capstones).
2. Activities that define or resolve relevant local, national, or international problems and issues.
3. Planning literary or artistic celebrations.

For other relevant activities, see Section II.E.4. of the University guidelines.

Documentation presented to the PTSI Committee to support community outreach as an area must include a narrative overview of activities and should show evidence, where appropriate, of project or event design, involvement of stakeholders, assessment, and dissemination of results. Scholarship of community outreach may also be established by external review.

In line with Sections II.D.1-5. and II.E.4. of the University guidelines, the PTSI Committee will evaluate the quality and significance of community outreach by the following criteria:

1. How well does the documentation show the purpose and importance of the project (including nature and context of outreach, individual preparation, needs, and priorities of external partners)?
2. How clear is the account of the processes (including goals and methods and provisions for feedback and reflection)?

3. How well does the documentation establish the significance of the outcomes (including impact on community and contribution to knowledge of the discipline or field)?

IV. Governance and Other Professionally Related Service

All faculty are expected to maintain an active presence in department, University, and professional activities. This includes attendance at faculty meetings, committee work, and contributions to the life of the University, community, and profession that do not directly relate to scholarship. To be promoted to associate professor a faculty member is expected to carry his or her fair share of department and University governance and professionally-related service. For promotion to full professor faculty are expected to exercise leadership or provide substantial contributions to the governance and professionally related service activities of the University. See Section II.F. and Section III of the University guidelines.

V. Other Matters

A. Minimum Expectations

In conjunction with the overall structure of the scholarly agenda, as outlined in the University guidelines, faculty will be expected to keep their vitas current, engage in on-going creation or scholarship, arrange for and be responsive to evaluations of teaching, advise students when asked, and participate in the life of the department, including scholarly agenda groups and the on-going work of the department mission.

B. Merit Documentation

Faculty eligible for merit consideration will submit a notebook documenting their accomplishments. The notebook should contain a table of contents, a reflective essay, curriculum vita, summaries of activities, accomplishments, and evaluations of teaching, research (to include example of recent publication), and community outreach.

C. Peer Review

Post-tenure review will ordinarily be conducted every three years unless a faculty member is within three years of retirement. Eligible faculty will submit the names of at least three colleagues in writing to the Executive Committee, which will appoint the review committee. In accordance with the AAUP contract, the review committee meets alone and with the

candidate and prepares a narrative report of findings and recommendations for the department head.

D. Senior Instructors

To be eligible to promotion to the rank of senior instructor the individual must possess at least the Master's degree and have at least six years of teaching experience in writing and/or literature. Primarily candidates for promotion must have demonstrated quality in teaching and the scholarship of teaching and in working with students. Candidates for senior instructor will present relevant documentation as outlined in Section III. A. of this document.

ATTACHMENT

With reference to III.B. "The equivalent of at least three scholarly articles since last promotion."

Because of the expanded definition of scholarship (to include the scholarship of teaching and community outreach, as well as the traditional research model) and the changing nature of academic publication, with articles and reviews routinely solicited by major journals and essays solicited by book editors, in addition to blind or refereed submissions, the establishing of equivalencies will be an on-going process. Faculty, tenure and promotion committees, and department chairs need the protection of a procedure and guidelines.

Procedure: The scholarly agenda group will be responsible for the initial evaluation of suitability of each publication or equivalent a faculty member proposes to include in his or her promotion case. This determination should include investigation and written substantiation purpose, value, and quality of the publication or equivalent, and of the venue.

N.B. The scholarly agenda group will function in a "coaching" capacity and will not usurp the role of the PTSI committee to evaluate a faculty member's case. Similarly, the group will not evaluate an individual's scholarly agenda but assist the individual with substantiation and documentation of a case.

Equivalencies:

1. A published book may also fulfill this requirement.
2. One substantive grant proposal submitted to an outside agency (whether funded or not) will be considered equivalent to one scholarly article.
3. One article or review solicited by a publication important in an individual faculty member's field may be considered equivalent to one scholarly article.
4. Documented scholarship of teaching and/or community outreach may be considered equivalent to one scholarly article.
5. Document Internet/Web site projects may be considered equivalent to one scholarly print article.