“Promotion and tenure are among the most important decisions a university makes.”

(PSU Faculty Handbook)

P&T Guidelines: Annual training to ensure consistency and adherence to PSU policy
The Guidelines

• **Non-Tenure Track**: All of Faculty Handbook Section 2.0 pertinent P&T:
  • 2.1 Faculty Appointments/Qualifications
  • 2.4 Responsibilities
  • 2.5 Evaluation
  • 2.7 and 2.8: A guiding framework for the P&T process for candidates, departmental / discipline committees, and University administrators

• **Tenure Track**: Articles 7 & 12

• **Teaching Lecturers**: Article 12.11
Annual Evaluation vs. P&T

From the *Faculty Handbook*:

• Success in achieving tenure /and promotion requires that candidates present evidence making a strong case that they have achieved the criteria articulated below, relative to the academic rank sought, and in alignment with the appointment status and workload assignments as negotiated and reflected in annual Work Plans.

• While faculty Work Plans are evaluated on an annual basis, the P&T portfolio provides a holistic view and demonstrates a body of work over a period of time.
### Faculty Appointment Types and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tenure Track: Rank and promotion, tenure eligibility</th>
<th>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track: Rank and promotion, tenure eligibility</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty: Rank and promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty: Rank and promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty (subset of contract faculty): Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Lecturer: Rank &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Lecturer: Rank &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
<td>Evaluation Domains: Teaching, scholarship, &amp; service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Tenure Track
- Research Faculty
- Clinical Faculty
- Teaching Faculty
- Teaching Lecturer
Review of Guidelines (ref. 2.7 & 2.8 [FH]/ 8.1.5 [CBA])

2.4 C.I (FH) and 8.1.5 (CBA): Expectations of Faculty

2.5 : Annual Evaluation
  • Work Plan
  • Pre-Tenure Meetings

2.7.A: Eligibility
  • Time in Rank
  • Eligibility in Rank
  • Degree Requirements

2.7.B: Change of Requirements
P&T Criteria*
(ref. 2.7.C – 2.7.E [FH]/ 7.4 [CBA])

TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP  SCHOLARSHIP  SERVICE

*Not all criteria apply to Clinical, Research, Teaching faculty, and/or Teaching Lecturers. Consult faculty member contract and Faculty Handbook.
• For each area: Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship, Service, candidates are evaluated annually.

• Evaluations take a disciplinary/programmatic perspective appropriate to the rank and will consider the weight that each activity, teaching, scholarship, and service in candidates’ Work Plans.
Teaching/Librarianship (ref. 2.7.C [FH]/ 7.4 [CBA])

Criteria

Effective Teaching/Librarianship includes all of the following and will be evaluated by the extent to which these criteria are met (see Appendix for further definition):

- Engages in scholarly teaching
- Uses effective instructional design
- Utilizes appropriate instructional delivery
- Employs instructional assessment
- Mentors and supports students

*See Section C for more detail and refer to section 2.4 Roles and Responsibilities. The above indicators are further defined in the Appendix. Candidates should also refer to section 2.8.G.8 of the Faculty Handbook or Article 7.4 of the AAUP CBA for examples of evidence.
Teaching/Librarianship (cont.)  
(ref. 2.7.C [FH]/ 7.4 [CBA])

• All ranks are required to provide evidence of effective teaching including:
  • Statement on teaching,
  • analysis and self-reflection of student course observations,
  • all reports of teaching observations/evaluations, and
  • evidence of content expertise (course syllabi, learning/assessment/teaching activities, assignments, and student work, along with evidence of fair assessment, availability to students, effective course and classroom management, self-reflection and evaluation of one’s own teaching, and descriptions of pedagogical experimentation).
• Promotion to **Senior Teaching Lecturer**: candidates must demonstrate they have met the criteria for effective teaching in the areas listed in section C.1 above.
• Promotion to **Senior Teaching Faculty**: candidates must demonstrate they have met the criteria for effective teaching in the areas listed in section C.1 above.

• Promotion to **Master Teaching Faculty**: candidates must demonstrate evolution and growth in their teaching while continuing to meet the criteria for effective teaching. (ref. 2.7.C.2)
Scholarship: ref. 2.7.D (FH); 7.4.2 (CBA)

**DISCOVERY**
Building new knowledge through research or creating new works

**TEACHING AND LEARNING**
Investigating teaching theory and/or processes for the purpose of optimizing learning

**INTEGRATION**
Making connections across disciplines and advancing knowledge through synthesis

**ENGAGEMENT**
Utilizing relevant research by linking theory and practice in collaboration with community stakeholders to solve pressing social, civic, or ethical problems
2.7.D (FH)/7.4.2 (CBA) Scholarship (cont.)

1. Criteria: Quality Scholarship will be evaluated by the extent to which these criteria are met (see section 2.8.G. for further definition):

- Conducts scholarship in a manner with clear goals and appropriate methods
- Demonstrates discipline-related or interdisciplinary expertise
- Meets the standards of discipline-related or interdisciplinary scholarship
- Contributes to a body of knowledge through new, original and/or innovative works
- Disseminates to a wider audience in an appropriate forum (presentations and/or publications to scholarly peers, exhibitions, performances, etc.)
- Makes an impact or contribution to the discipline or some community of people
Each area (teaching/librarianship, scholarship, service) articulates expectations for various ranks.

- **For Scholarship**
  - For the rank of Associate Professor, candidates are required to possess an emerging body of scholarship and demonstrate scholarship that meets the criteria outlined above.
  - For the rank of Professor, candidates are required to demonstrate a well-developed and sustained body of scholarship that demonstrates maturity in one’s field and meets the criteria outlined above.
    - Candidates must demonstrate and provide evidence of growth as a scholar since their last promotion.
2.7.E Service

- A core value of PSU ~ Ut Prosim
- Service is expected of all faculty members and must include:
  - Service to the department,
  - the University, and
  - the community and/or profession.
- Contributions to all of these constituents are especially important for promotion to Professor.
  - Candidates are required to continue to meet the same expectations as for Associate Professor and are required to demonstrate leadership in their services activities within and beyond the University
Service (cont.): ref. 2.7.E (FH)/7.4.2 (CBA)

• *Meaningful Service will be evaluated by the extent to which these criteria are met* (see section 2.8.G for further definition):*

• Criteria
  • Demonstrates contributions to the program/discipline, AU, cluster, and the University
  • Conducts activities with integrity and professionalism
  • Accepts responsibilities and follows through on commitments
  • Demonstrates ability to work collaboratively
  • Makes contributions to the community and/or the profession through the application of professional expertise

* Candidates should refer to section 2.8.G.1–8 of the Faculty Handbook for examples of evidence that may be used to meet these criteria.
(P/T)
Evaluation Overview (ref. 2.8.A [FH]/ 12.2.2 [CBA])

Evaluation Levels
- Program/Discipline Promotion & Tenure Committee
- Evaluator
- Provost
- President
Pre-Tenure Review (CBA 12.3.9.)

• **Formative evaluation**
• **Purpose**: give candidates feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion
• **Timeline**: No sooner than the end of the tenure-track faculty member’s second year and no later than the end of their third year at PSU.
  - **February 15**: portfolio due
  - **April 15**: P&T committee summary and recommendations
Pre-Tenure Review (cont.)

Submit an electronic portfolio that includes:

• A short statement (6-10 pages) overview addressing alignment of teaching/librarianship, scholarship agenda, meaningful service, and how work supports PSU's mission
• Copies of observations and work plans
• Summary of student feedback surveys
• Evidence of scholarship and service

• All other ranked faculty are entitled to a joint conference for a discussion of progress toward promotion prior to application.
Teaching Observations

- **TT faculty**: Observed by evaluator or designee in each of the first two years and every other year thereafter until tenure.
  - The provost or designee shall observe all bargaining unit faculty prior to the pre-tenure review and at least once within two years prior to subsequent promotion.

- **Clinical, Research, & Teaching Faculty**: Observed annually by evaluator until promotion.
  - The Provost or designee shall observe all full-time faculty within the first two years of hire and within two years of promotion. *(FH 2.5.C.2)*
Evaluation (P&T) Overview
(ref. 2.8.A. [FH]/ 12.2.2 [CBA])

Evaluation Process

• Each evaluation level reviews personnel files, Personnel Action Folders, and P&T portfolios, along with recommendations made at previous levels.

• At each level of evaluation, reasons for recommendations must be provided.

• Written results of each level’s evaluation will be given to the succeeding levels **and to the candidates**.

• **Send to candidate and upload to Mahara**
Responsibilities (see checklists)

... of Candidates (ref. 2.8.B. [FH]/ 12.3.4 [CBA])

• Submit Intent to Apply form (by April 15 of the academic year prior)
  • Submit the completed Intent to Apply form to the Evaluator/Program Coordinator and the Provost's office stating the candidate's intent to apply for Promotion (desired rank) & Tenure (when applicable) the following fall.

• Grant permission to Review Application Materials and Personnel File
Responsibilities (see checklists)

... of the Discipline/Program (ref. 2.8.C. [FH]/12.3.5 [CBA])

• Have a standing P/&T Committee Chair

• Forward the name of the P/&T Committee Chair to the Provost’s office no later than April 1 of each year.

• Create a committee with appropriate composition depending on position type no later than the end of the Spring semester. (See Handbook 2.8.C.6. or CBAs for details)

• The Evaluator and the P/&T Committee Chair (or committee designee) shall attend annual P/&T training sessions prior to reviewing any applications.
The P/&T Committee

Be fair, impartial, and thorough

Review Personnel File, Personnel Action Folder, and P/&T portfolio

With committee chair, complete recommendation and provide a copy to the candidate and to the Evaluator no later November 15.
The P/&T Committee Chair

- Ensuring confidentiality and integrity of process
- Ensuring all committee members review *Handbook* sections 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, and 2.8 or CBA articles 7, 8 & 12.
- Ensuring all committee members review HR file
- Ensuring all committee members review P/&T portfolio
- Providing copy of committee’s recommendations to the candidate
- Forwarding all materials, including committee’s recommendation, to the Evaluator on or before November 15.
Discipline/Program Evaluator

• Be trained in the role of evaluation as well as all evaluation policies and procedures, including teaching observations. (CBA 12.3.1.2.)

• Forward the name of the P/&T Committee Chair to the Provost’s office no later than April 1 of each year.

• Create appropriate P/&T committee and notify Provost's office no later than end of the spring semester prior to review (See Handbook 2.8.C.6, AAUP CBA 12.3.5, or TL CBA 12.11 for details)

• Observe the candidate's teaching once the application for P/&T has been submitted (this should be written and shared with the candidate and committee)

• Complete evaluator's feedback form

• Provide copy of evaluator's recommendations to the candidate

• Forward all materials, including evaluator's feedback, to the Provost on or before December 15
"Bargaining Unit Members who were employed prior to the changes in this agreement on promotion and tenure criteria shall have up to three years from the date of the ratification of this agreement [July 2018] to follow the P&T criteria for teaching, service and scholarship outlined in the Faculty Handbook that predated this agreement. New faculty hired after the ratification of this contract and all tenure-track faculty three years post ratification shall follow the criteria outlined in this agreement."
I.e., External Review & Cluster Feedback

Please note that External Review is now optional

- Candidates must notify the Chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee if they wish to include that process in their portfolio.

- FH 2.8.C.9. The P&T Committee Chair shall be responsible for seeking external review letters (if applicable) in accordance with the guidelines outlined in this document.
  - See a. – e. in *Handbook*

- While not part of the P&T decision, we are asking candidates to include feedback from someone at the AU or cluster level regarding the candidate’s contributions to cluster development.
Additional

2.8.G. (FH) Contents of the P/&T Application

2.8.H. Checklists

2.8.I. Additional P/&T Support Documents

PERSONNEL ACTION FOLDER

External Reviewer Worksheet (If Applicable)

Sample Letter to External Evaluators (If Applicable)
Evaluation Timeline

- **October 15**: Candidate submits portfolio
- **November 15**: Discipline/AU P&T Committee’s recommendation due
- **December 15**: Evaluator’s recommendation due
- **February 15**: Provost’s recommendation due
- **April 15**: President’s recommendations due

- Each level will, on or before the above dates, communicate its recommendation in writing to the candidate and deliver the file with its recommendation to the next level.