Introduction

Dear Colleague,

The University of Portland Academic Administration Manual (Article II, Section C - F), located in the *Faculty Handbook*, governs promotion and tenure. Section G of the Manual concerns Periodic Review. The *Handbook* can be found on the Faculty Resources page of the University website. All faculty members should familiarize themselves with this material. The primary purposes of the tenure and promotion processes are to strengthen the academic quality of the University as a learning community and to assure scholarly integrity and academic freedom of inquiry. This Guide seeks to clarify these processes.

Candidates for tenure and promotion prepare and submit their files for review. Several individuals and groups add their recommendations to the files, which are forwarded to the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Committee reviews and evaluates the files, which are central to all deliberations and discussions. The Committee writes a letter for each file with its recommendation, forwarding it with the complete file to the Provost. The Provost reviews each file and forwards a recommendation to the President, who makes the final decision.

The Committee on Rank and Tenure also conducts the periodic review of senior faculty members. Whereas its role regarding decisions on tenure or promotion is purely advisory, the Committee makes the decision regarding the success of a periodic review.

The Committee on Rank and Tenure is organized to represent many disciplines within the University. It comprises seven senior faculty members who are ordinarily appointed on a three-year rotating basis, structured to provide continuity over time.

Faculty members should become familiar with the criteria for promotion and tenure, and with the review process and requirements as soon as possible in their academic careers. *The burden of proof that a candidate has met all criteria rests on the candidate.*

Key documents regarding procedures, policies, standards, criteria, and values have been collected here to guide candidates and evaluators by clarifying the processes and articulating expectations regarding tenure, promotion, and periodic review. If you have any questions on these matters, please do not hesitate to ask any Committee member.

The Committee on Rank and Tenure

May 2012

To assist faculty members, Department Chairs and Deans in these matters, the Committee on Rank and Tenure has prepared the following documents:

Excerpt from the *Faculty Handbook*, Academic Administration Manual		Page 3
Document A:	Time-Lines for the Tenure and Promotion Processes	Page 4
Document B:	Documentation, Details and Suggestions: Applying for Tenure or Promotion	Page 5
Document C:	Recommendations on the Evaluation of Applicants for Tenure or Promotion	Page 9
Document D:	Periodic Review: Timeline, Details and Suggestions	Page 10
Document E:	Candidate's Checklist to ensure the File is Complete	Page 13
Document F:	Dean's Checklist to ensure Candidate's File is complete (Tenure and Promotion)	Page 14
Document F1:	Dean's Checklist to ensure Candidate's File is complete (Periodic Review)	Page 15
Document G:	Standards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	Page 16
Document G1:	The Rank of Professor	Page 17
Document H:	Guidelines concerning the Relative Significance of Scholarship	Page 18
Document I:	Guidelines for the Establishment of Lectureships	Page 19

Further information on tenure, promotion and periodic review is provided in the Academic Administration Manual of the University found in the *Faculty Handbook*, on the Faculty Resources page of the University website.

Excerpt from the *Faculty Handbook*, Academic Administration Manual

The qualifications and criteria for considering the granting of advancement in rank and/or tenure are stated in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II. The Committee on Rank and Tenure is guided by the following, from II.C, in making its recommendations:

a. Teaching

Since excellent teaching is creative, both in teacher and student, there can be a variety of signs of excellence in teaching, such as: presenting subject matter with the clarity that arises from a deepening grasp of the central facts and their vital interplay; exhibiting enthusiastic commitment to seeking, possessing, and sharing knowledge; bringing subject matter, when appropriate, to bear on the present human situation; consciously creating the atmosphere that will draw students on to develop and use their powers of invention and discovery; creating the desire in students for further education.

b. Scholarship

Beyond advanced degrees earned, there must be other acceptable evidence of a habit of scholarship, such as:

- Continued study and progress in general and specialized areas of one's discipline;
- Familiarity with current scholarship and publications in one's field;
- Direction of and participation in research or in the production of creative works and/or performances of quality;
- The advancement of theory and methodology;
- Participation in scholarly symposia;
- Scholarly or professional contributions to public service, government, or industry;
- Conference papers, reviews, analyses, bibliographies, textbooks, and pedagogical works;
- Publication of significant research or creative works;
- The respect of competent colleagues and professional recognition;
- Other marks of scholarship.

Schools and departments shall provide to the administration and the Committee on Rank and Tenure statements concerning accepted scholarly practices in their disciplines.

c. University and Community Involvement

- Faculty members show a sense of responsibility in achieving the objectives of their academic unit and of the general University in carrying a share of the non-teaching duties usually expected.
- Faculty members are actively involved in professional societies in the field of their competence.
- Faculty members make a contribution to the public service role of the University through community involvement.

d. Personal Attributes

Personal attributes are those qualities faculty members display of character and personality that contribute to the objectives of the University.

Document A

Time-Line: Applying for Tenure

April 1	The Provost informs faculty members scheduled for tenure consideration in the following academic year. Copies of that notification shall be sent to the Dean, Department Chair (CAS), and the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
May 1	Department Chairs and senior faculty members should begin preparing their evaluations of faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion. (See Document C)
June 15	Deadline for applicant to submit the file, with supporting data, to their Dean (see Document E). Deadline for Department Chairs and senior faculty members to submit their evaluations to the Deans.
September 1	Deadline for all materials to be received by the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure. (see Document F).
December 15	The Committee on Rank and Tenure submits its recommendations to the Provost. The Provost gives a recommendation to the President.
January 31	The President communicates his decisions to the applicants around this date.

Time-Line: Applying for Promotion to Professor

November 1	Inform Dean, Department Chair, and senior faculty members of your application, so that they can prepare their confidential letters for your file.
December 15	Deadline for faculty members to submit their files, with supporting data, to their Dean (see Document E). Deadline for Department Chair and senior faculty members to submit their evaluations to the Dean.
January 31	Deadline for all materials to be received by the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure. (see Document F).
April 1	The Committee on Rank and Tenure submits its recommendations to the Provost. The Provost gives a recommendation to the President.
Late April	The President communicates his decisions to the applicants.

Document B

Documentation: Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion

The Committee on Rank and Tenure will review the following documentation:

a. A current Academic Vita containing the following information:
   Academic appointment (include institution, period, rank, tenured or tenure track)
   Education
   Administrative positions
   Professional experience
   Consulting
   Scholarly Work (with full citation): Grants, Publications, Presentations, Research
   Service: University, School/College, Department; Professional; Community
   Awards and Honors
   Professional memberships
   Professional meetings attended

b. A Narrative letter of self-evaluation commenting on teaching, scholarship, service, and personal attributes according to the criteria outlined in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section C. (See page 3 of this Guide)

c. For those applying for tenure, the Dean's evaluation of one's third-year review or half-way-to-tenure review.

d. For those applying for tenure, the two most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations. For those applying for promotion to Professor, the three most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations.

e. A confidential letter of evaluation from the Dean. Those in CAS also have a letter of evaluation from their Department Chair.

f. Confidential letters of evaluation from all senior members of your Department (CAS) or School. Your Dean will collect these letters.

g. Other letters of evaluation which comment on teaching, scholarship, service, or personal attributes. These may come from University of Portland faculty outside your academic unit, experts in your area of scholarship from outside the University, and former students.

h. All student evaluations for all courses taught within the last three years. Include a copy of the course evaluation form.

i. A concise summary of these student evaluations and your analysis of their trends and patterns, your interpretation of their comments and numerical results, and your use of them to improve your teaching.

j. Course syllabi and other course material for the past three years.

k. Materials such as reprints of articles, reviews of performance, etc., which document the scope and quality of the scholarly work.

Submitted materials are to be organized in the following manner:

Volume I (Main Volume) This volume shall contain your Academic Vita, Narrative, list of all those from whom letters were requested, and summary of student evaluations. Those applying for tenure should also include the Dean's evaluation of your third-year review, and your two most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations. Those applying for promotion to Professor shall include the three most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations. Each item should be clearly labeled and demarcated.

Volume II This volume shall contain your all supporting materials, including a copy of your course evaluation forms, original student evaluations, additional letters, copies of articles, papers, newspaper and magazine clippings, etc. Depending on the quantity of materials submitted, this volume may be divided into two parts such as:

Volume IIa Student Evaluations

Volume IIb Other Supporting Materials

The Dean shall provide two separate plastic folders containing copies of the following items: Academic Vita, Narrative, confidential letters of evaluation from the Dean and (where applicable) the Department Chair, and all confidential letters sent directly to the Dean.

Following the President's decision, all materials will be returned to the applicant with the exception of confidential letters, which will be retained in a separate confidential file in the President's office for three years before being destroyed.

DEADLINES FOR APPLICATONS ARE STRICTLY ADHERED TO WITHOUT EXCEPTION.

Details and Suggestions: Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion

1. All faculty members are strongly advised to read the section pertaining to faculty rights and responsibilities, particularly those dealing with promotion and tenure, in the *Faculty Handbook* - See Academic Administration Manual, II: The Faculty, Sections A through H.

2. All faculty members are urged to communicate with their Department Chair and/or Dean each Spring to discuss annual evaluations, and issues relating to promotion and tenure. It is extremely important that a faculty member on tenure track work closely with the Chair (CAS) or Dean during all annual evaluations to determine his/her progress toward promotion and tenure. A third-year (or half-way-to-tenure) review is mandated for those on tenure track, including those who have had a previous appointment as a regular faculty member before coming to the University. This review must be included in the tenure file.

3. As stated in President Beauchamp's memorandum of February 12, 2010: "… effective June 1, 2010, ordinarily there will be no separation of promotion to Associate Professor and tenure." Faculty appointed at the level of Assistant Professor will apply for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time.

4. Your Narrative letter of self-evaluation brings your teaching, scholarship and service alive for the Rank and Tenure Committee. It is the foundational document the Committee uses to understand you as a faculty member. Although the Narrative should be organized with sections on teaching, scholarship, and service, the following suggestions are not meant to restrict the range and ordering of material within each section.

   Opening Section
   - Discuss your background. Why did you choose to come to UP?

   Teaching
   - Tell the Committee about your teaching methods and the nature of your courses, in a way that makes your thinking tangible for the Committee.
   - Explain how you are a reflective teacher. For example, how do you use feedback from students, colleagues, Chair or Dean to improve your courses and teaching?
   - Analyze your growth as a teacher since coming to UP.
   - Provide verifiable examples to support your self-evaluation.

   Scholarship
   - Describe your scholarship – e.g., area of specialization, methods, etc.
   - Explain how your scholarship conforms to Departmental or School statements concerning accepted scholarly practices in its discipline.
   - Explain how your scholarship contributes to your expertise and to the advancement of your field.
   - Describe the manner of external review of your scholarship.
   - If your scholarship is conducted with colleagues, discuss your contributions to it.
   - Describe any ways your scholarship informs your teaching.

- When applicable, describe how you have responded to feedback about scholarship in evaluations from your Dean or Chair.

Service

- Discuss your service contributions to the University, your department or school, your profession, and the wider community. Describe any leadership roles among these.

Conclusion

- Discuss why you are right for UP and why UP is right for you.

Additional information helpful to the Committee

- If you have experienced difficulties with colleagues, administration, classes or individual students, the Committee suggests that you discuss the situation in a professional manner in the appropriate section(s) above.

5. Current professional files are an integral part of the review. Student evaluations, internal and external peer reviews of scholarship, and peer reviews of teaching are very important to the Committee. Peer reviews of one's teaching may include critiques of syllabi and other course material, classroom visitation, or a review of one's student evaluation summaries. Faculty members are encouraged to begin immediately to build a file of these evaluations. Your annual self-evaluations, accompanied by the corresponding Dean's or Chair's letter, give the Committee an indication of how you respond to critique, suggestions, and recommendations.

6. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship, it is usually the most difficult part of this review process for the Committee. Make a significant effort to *explain what your scholarship is and how you have had an external review of it* (e.g. through blind review, funded grants or reviews of artistic works.) Letters from independent experts from outside UP are expected.

7. The University has no expectation of 'community service' *per se*. To be considered relevant to tenure or promotion decisions, you must explain how your service to the community relates to your work as a teacher and/or scholar.

8. It is important to provide documentation to explain your teaching, scholarship, professional and University/community contributions in sufficient detail. While a thorough review requires that this documentation be complete, it should be concise and clearly organized. Excessive material may detract from the overall strength of the file.

9. Senior members of your Department (CAS) or School are required to write letters of evaluation. However, we recommend that you write to each person asking them to do so. A candidate's case is enhanced when the file is made available *in a timely manner* to those writing the letters. This file should included updated Academic Vita, a summary of the past three years' student evaluations, and a draft of the Narrative.

10. You may also request letters from UP colleagues outside your academic unit. These letters should focus on specific examples of their direct interaction with you, whether this relates to teaching, scholarship, or service.

Document C

Recommendations on the Evaluation of Applicants for Tenure or Promotion

1. Letters from Deans and Department Chairs should provide a *balanced* evaluation of the applicant, and make a clear, *reasoned* recommendation. If there are conflicts or apparent weaknesses, please help the Committee to interpret these. Merely writing a 'glowing' tribute will be of little benefit to the applicant. Offer *specific examples* of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, service, and other accomplishments. Articulate your criteria for good teaching, and how it is measured. Explain how you interpret course evaluation data. All this will provide the Committee with tangible evidence with which to make evaluations.

2. All senior members of an academic unit (CAS) or School are required to submit a letter of evaluation for the applicant's file. This includes those serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure. These letters should provide a clearly reasoned and balanced evaluation of the applicant. Letters should include a clear recommendation for the outcome of the review. They should offer specific examples pertaining to the applicant's teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality. Letters are addressed to the Committee, and are ordinarily sent through the Dean's office. However, they may be sent directly to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Dean will inform senior faculty that letters are due. The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure will inform the Provost and Deans of any unexcused failure to submit a letter of evaluation.

3. Applicants should provide senior faculty with files that include Academic Vita, draft of Narrative, and summaries of the student evaluations for the past three years.

4. A faculty member's development is an important factor for the Committee. The sequence of annual self-evaluations accompanied by the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations provides valuable information on how an applicant has responded to suggestions and critiques. It gives data on the applicant's commitment to professional goals and to consistent progress. It is critical that the applicant receives yearly written evaluations from the Dean or Chair. A third-year (or half-way-to-tenure) review is mandated for all those on tenure track.

5. Student evaluations are required by the Committee. Deans and Chairs should advise faculty members to build a file of these evaluations over several years before the time when they expect to be considered for promotion or tenure.

6. Files must be complete. It is the faculty member's responsibility to submit the required material. Deans are responsible for checking that the files are complete. Incomplete files will be returned to the Dean for completion with a letter to the Provost indicating the action. Deadlines for applications are strictly adhered to without exception.

7. More than one year is normally required to develop stronger credentials for scholarship if an applicant has been denied promotion to the rank of Professor.

Document D

Periodic Review: Timeline, Details, and Suggestions

Preceding April	The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure notifies the faculty member and his/her Dean of the Periodic Review.
Fall semester	Candidate prepares materials for the file and submits them to the Dean at a time required by the Dean.
January 31	Deadline for receipt of documentation by the Committee on Rank and Tenure from the Dean's office.
April	The Committee on Rank and Tenure communicates the results of its evaluations to faculty members.

1. Tenured faculty members are ordinarily reviewed by the Committee on Rank and Tenure every eight years. The rules and procedures governing Periodic Review are stated in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section G.
2. If a faculty member is applying for promotion the same year as periodic review, the same file may be used for both reviews. However, the letters from senior faculty members should address the candidate's qualifications for both promotion and periodic review.
3. Review Criteria:
   a. Tenured faculty members are reviewed no sooner than eight years after being reviewed for tenure or promoted to Professor, and every eight years subsequently. They will be notified in the preceding April.
   b. Delays of review are given to faculty members who have been evaluated recently or who are on special status (e.g., sabbatical leave) or serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
   c. Those within two years of retirement are excused from the review if a written notice of intent to retire (including the expected date) is submitted to the Provost (with copies to their Dean and the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure).
4. While one's complete academic and professional record is important, the documents prepared for the review should place emphasis on the most recent three years.
5. Evaluation Criteria:

   The Committee judges whether the faculty member continues to manifest the qualities upon which the original grant of tenure was based. While we look for continued professional growth, faculty are not held to new standards. The minimum credentials will not ordinarily change from when one was granted tenure (e.g., those tenured without a doctorate are not ordinarily expected to earn one in order to retain tenure).

6. Documentation:

   a. A current Academic Vita (see Document B)

   b. A Narrative letter of self-evaluation that contains a thoughtful, reflective analysis of one's growth in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and personal attributes according to the criteria outlined in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Sections C and F. Consult the suggestions concerning the Narrative in Document B of this Guide. Due to its diverse nature, scholarship is usually the most difficult part of this review process for the Committee. Make a significant effort to explain what your scholarship is and how it has had external review, for example through blind review, funded grants, and reviews of artistic works.

   c. Evidence of continuing teaching effectiveness will be a very important consideration in the evaluation of tenured faculty. Therefore, provide a concise summary of your student evaluations of the past three years. Give your analysis of their trends and patterns, your interpretation of their comments and numerical results, and your use of them to improve your teaching. Include a copy of the course evaluation form. Do not include copies of your student course evaluations although the Committee may request them.

   d. The three most recent annual self evaluations, and the written responses from the Department Chair or Dean.

   e. All senior members of a Department (CAS) or School are required to submit letters of evaluation for an applicant's file. This includes those serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Dean will inform them that letters are due. The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure will inform the Provost and Deans of any unexcused failure to submit a letter of evaluation. Letters from senior colleagues are addressed to the Committee, and are ordinarily sent through the Dean's office. However, they may be sent directly to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

7. Tenured faculty members will be reviewed during Spring semester. The deadline for receipt of documentation by the Committee on Rank and Tenure is January 31. The Committee will communicate its decision to faculty members in April.

8. The Dean's office will send the complete file to the Committee. This file will include a binder with candidate's current Academic Vita, Narrative, summary of prior three years' teaching evaluations with Dean or Chair's evaluation, and a list of those from whom letters were requested. Unlike when applying for tenure or promotion, external letters are neither required nor expected, but you may request them if you wish. The Dean's office will also submit two plastic folders containing copies of confidential letters, Academic Vita, and Narrative.

9. The procedures following the Committee's decision are stated in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section G:
   If the Committee's judgment is positive, the candidate, the respective Dean, The Provost, and the President are so informed. If the Committee's judgment is negative:

   a. A conference is held between the faculty member, the dean and a member of the

Committee. If the faculty member accepts the opinion of the Committee, a program is agreed upon whereby,

1) the faculty member undertakes a program to correct the deficiencies which have been brought to his/her attention, and
2) the University commits itself to aid the faculty member in this program.

b. If the faculty member objects to the findings of the Committee, he/she may request a review of the findings by a Committee consisting of the Provost, a member of the Rank and Tenure Committee chosen by the Chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee and a tenured member of the faculty chosen by the faculty. The findings of the Committee will be final.

c. When a tenured faculty member is on a program of improvement, reports are made to the Rank and Tenure Committee each year concerning his/her progress by the faculty member, his/her department chair and the dean. The Committee determines if sufficient progress is being made and communicates this judgment to the faculty member. After two successive positive reviews, the faculty member is relieved of the annual review and is again in the status of all tenured faculty members, namely that of a major evaluation.

d. When a faculty member is on a program of improvement and two subsequent negative judgments are made by the Committee upon his/her progress, the Committee recommends to the Provost that the next notification of salary letter contain a statement that the following academic year will be terminal if the problem is not corrected within six months.

The Committee emphasize that negative judgments have been very rare.

10. At the conclusion of the review, all materials will be returned to the applicant, except the confidential letters, which will be shredded by the Chair of Rank and Tenure.

Document E

Tenure and Promotions
Candidate's checklist to ensure the file is complete

Volume I (Main Volume)

( ) Current Academic Vita

( ) Narrative letter of self-evaluation

( ) For those applying for tenure, the Dean's evaluation of the applicant's third-year review or half-way-to tenure review

( ) For those applying for tenure, the applicant's two most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations. For promotions of tenured faculty, the three most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations

( ) List of senior faculty members requested to write letters, and outside reviewers who were requested to write letters

( ) Concise summary of student evaluations and an analysis of their trends and patterns, an interpretation of their comments and numerical results, and a description of their use in improving teaching

Volume IIa (Student Evaluations)

( ) Evaluation form; all original student evaluations for all courses for the last three years

Volume IIb (All other supporting materials)

( ) Copies of all scholarly works, previous three years course syllabi; any applicable internal and external critiques

General

( ) Has someone else reviewed the file?

( ) Is your material prepared in a way that will communicate effectively with colleagues from other disciplines?

( ) Is there a Table of Contents, and are there tab identifications?

Document F

Tenure and Promotions
Dean's checklist to ensure the candidate's file is complete

Candidate:_____

The candidate's file should be organized as follows. A copy of this page, signed by the Dean, will serve as a Letter of Transmittal to the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

Volume I (Main Volume)
( ) Current Academic Vita

( ) Narrative letter of self-evaluation

( ) For those applying for tenure, the Dean's evaluation of the applicant's third-year review or half-way-to-tenure review

( ) For those applying for tenure, the applicant's two most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations. For promotions of tenured faculty, the three most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations

( ) List of all senior faculty members who were required to write letters, and outside reviewers requested to write letters (N.B. Not the confidential letters themselves)

( ) Concise summary of student evaluations and an analysis of their trends and patterns, an interpretation of their comments and numerical results, and a description of their use in improving teaching

Volume IIa (Student Evaluations)
( ) Evaluation form; all original student evaluations for all courses for the last three years

Volume IIb (All other supporting materials)
( ) Copies of all scholarly works, previous three years' course syllabi, non-confidential internal and external critique

Two Separate Plastic Folders each containing:
( ) Narrative, Academic Vita, confidential letters from Dean, Chair, faculty members, and external evaluators

Dean's Review:_____ Date:_____

Document F1

Periodic Review
Dean's checklist to ensure the candidate's file is complete

Candidate:_____

The candidate's file should be organized as follows. A copy of this page, signed by the Dean, will serve as a Letter of Transmittal to the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

A binder containing:
( ) Current Academic Vita

( ) Narrative letter of self-evaluation

( ) The three most recent annual self-evaluations and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluations

( ) Analysis of last three years' teaching evaluations

( ) List of all senior faculty members required to write letters (N.B. Not the confidential letters themselves)

( ) List of outside reviewers who were requested to write letters

Two separate plastic folders each containing:
( ) Narrative letter, Academic Vita, and all confidential letters

Dean's Review:_____ Date:_____

Document G

Standards in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Standards for Promotion and Tenure: Candidates for tenure and for promotion must demonstrate high achievement and promise in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. In order to strengthen the academic quality of the University, high achievement and promise shall be judged in comparison to one's peers in rank, and relative to the expectations for the rank toward which the candidate is applying.

Standards by Rank: High achievement and promise in all three categories are necessary conditions for tenure and promotion. No candidate will be tenured or promoted if judged to have attained less than high accomplishment and promise in all three areas. Teaching and scholarship are considered to be more important than service. This statement of relative significance in no way minimizes the value and significance of service. A balance in all three areas is necessary for a positive outcome. A candidate who finds that an accomplishment is relevant in more than one category is advised to present that work in whichever category seems most appropriate and to cross-reference that work in the other relevant category.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: It is the University's practice in granting tenure to also confer promotion to Associate Professor, unless the candidate already holds this rank. This means that tenure is linked to senior rank, and so Assistant Professors applying for tenure must also meet the qualifications for senior rank. For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the University places emphasis on verifiable teaching effectiveness in both upper and lower division courses, and on scholarly activity which demonstrates that the candidate has successfully initiated and pursued a sustained program of scholarly work, i.e., a verifiable habit of scholarship. Candidates should demonstrate achievement and promise which evaluators judge to be at least equivalent to that of the group of those candidates who were tenured and promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in the University over the previous few years. Evaluators shall place particular emphasis on the <u>quality</u> of work accomplished since joining the faculty of the University of Portland. Assistant professors, during their probationary years, are well advised to focus on building demonstrable success in teaching and scholarship, while focusing their academic service contributions on departmental, school and program needs.

Promotion to Professor: Candidates who seek promotion to Professor should have advanced qualitatively, not just quantitatively, in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service beyond the levels when last promoted. Candidates should have distinguished themselves in teaching and scholarship, and should have served the University, their department, college or school, and their profession. See Document G1 for further details.

Document G1

The Rank of Professor

The rank of Professor is reserved for distinguished leaders in teaching, scholarship, and service and who thereby serve as role models for the faculty.

Distinguished Teaching
Professors have a mature vision of themselves as teachers, and can articulate what marks their teaching as exemplary. Distinguished teaching is shown through a continued dedication to refining one's approach to teaching. New methods, strategies and means are evidence of a strong desire to continue to improve as a teacher. Professors demonstrate a commitment to students and their learning. They think critically and systematically about their teaching. They are respected for their teaching expertise and may be used as a resource on teaching by their colleagues. In other words, Professors should serve as mentors to other teachers. This can be through active mentoring of faculty at the University of Portland, advising faculty at other institutions, presenting and/or publishing on issues in pedagogy, through active involvement in programs to improve teaching at the University of Portland, and/or through informal advising of other faculty on pedagogical issues.

Distinguished Scholarship
Professors have a mature vision of themselves as scholars. While specific criteria for scholarship are delineated by departments and schools, the University considers a habit of scholarship that has qualitatively advanced beyond the level when last promoted and which distinguishes one in one's area(s) of expertise to be necessary for advancement to the rank of Professor. Professors must have an established reputation among scholars in their field and (where appropriate) a notable contribution in public service, government or industry. Letters from experts in one's scholarly area outside the University are necessary for promotion. Professors are leaders as scholars, in so far as they serve as role models for other faculty, mentor other faculty, and/or are called upon to serve in various capacities because of their scholarly expertise.

Distinguished Service
Professors must demonstrate leadership through service. This can take many forms. For example one can chair a department or a committee, or one may proactively seek out ways in which one can best serve the University. A long list of committee assignments alone is insufficient for promotion. Professors must make significant contributions to the committees on which they serve. In addition, they may be leaders in serving their community or their profession. Leadership in academic service is sufficient to satisfy the service requirement for promotion to Professor. Typically it will be necessary as well as sufficient. However, if one counts outside service to the exclusion of the University service, then one is obliged to explain the relevance of this community service to promotion.

Document H

Guidelines Concerning the Relative Significance of Scholarship

In order to maintain and increase academic quality and reputation, faculty members must demonstrate the 'habit of scholarship.' Each department and school is mandated to publish and to make available to the administration, the Committee on Rank and Tenure, and all faculty members, statements concerning accepted scholarly practices in their disciplines. Candidates should consult their discipline's documents, as they are used by evaluators who are probably not in the candidate's field. The Committee uses the following guidelines to evaluate scholarship.

1. The guiding principle is that quality is the significant factor. Solid evidence is necessary in order for evaluators to judge quality. The University neither sets nor accepts any purely quantitative thresholds. Quantity cannot substitute for quality.

2. Works that appear in their final, published form are given more weight than pre-publication or unpublished works.

3. Refereed, juried, or peer-reviewed work is given more weight than non-refereed work. In general, work which is accepted as a result of highly competitive blind peer review processes is given greater weight than work which has undergone only minimal peer review.

4. Repetitive publication of essentially the same work is given less weight than the publication of further developed work or new work.

5. No greater or lesser significance is attached to single author works as compared to multiple author works. Disciplines differ with regard to the possibility, desirability, or necessity of collaboration on scholarly projects. The important consideration in evaluating multiple-author projects is the quality and importance of the candidate's contribution to the project.

Document I

Guidelines for the Establishment of Lectureships

The request for the establishment of a lectureship must be initiated by the academic unit in which it will be placed. The request must demonstrate the need for instructional personnel whose qualifications lie outside those described for regular faculty (Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section C.4) or whose duties will be limited to a range incompatible with the expectations made of regular faculty. Ways in which lectureships differ from regular faculty positions must be specified. Lecturers will not be expected to play a major role in University governance.

These differences or limitations might take a variety of forms, such as:

1. Where instruction is limited to the introductory level. Such a limited assignment might be appropriate if:
   a. enrollments at the introductory level are such that the University anticipates continuing need for full-time staff at this level without opportunity to teach at higher levels;
   b. the University curriculum requires courses at the introductory level but none at any advanced level.

2. Where instruction is limited to specialized forms such as laboratory instruction or field supervision.

3. Where instruction requires expertise in areas in which practice and experience, and not necessarily an advanced degree, are appropriate preparation.

4. Where the relationship to the University, although expressed in a full-time contract, implies an independence from an immediate supervisor, as for an artist-in-residence.

5. Where the appointee, while capable of offering instruction and conducting research at the university level, has gained recognition and established credentials outside the academy, as, for example, a retired executive, or in any case where the rank of the appointee must be differentiated from the progressive ranks of regular faculty.

The proposal for the establishment of a lectureship should not be linked to the appointment of a specific individual. The qualifications expected for appointment should be carefully spelled out. In authorizing such positions, the Committee on Rank and Tenure will review the criteria submitted by the academic unit to determine whether the lectureship differs from Regular Faculty positions. The Committee will not consider enrollment or finances. The lectureship must be approved by the Committee before being forwarded to the Provost and the President for their approval.