

*Dear Colleague,*

*Tenure and promotion are important to the University of Portland. Each spring, candidates for tenure and promotion prepare and submit their petitions for a review process. In the course of this process, several individuals and groups add their recommendations to the file, 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 candidate's file and forwards a recommendation to the President. The President of the University makes the final decision.*

*Key documents regarding procedures, policies, standards, criteria, and values have been collected here for guiding candidates and evaluators in this important process. The goal of this collection of material is to clarify the process and expectations.*

*This Guide, like the University, is an evolving entity, and its content is the result of the work of many individuals. If you have any questions about tenure and/or promotion, please do not hesitate to ask.*

*The Committee on Rank and Tenure  
April 2009*

## Introduction

The University of Portland Academic Administration Manual (Article II, Section C through Section F) located in the *Faculty Handbook* governs promotion and tenure. The primary purposes of the promotion and tenure process within the University are to strengthen the academic quality of the University as a learning community and to assure scholarly integrity and academic freedom of inquiry. These guidelines seek to clarify that process. In order to sustain an orderly and equitable process of building and reviewing the candidate's file, sections of these guidelines discuss procedures and possible sources of evidence. The goal of this process is a full and fair-minded evaluation of the candidate's worthiness for promotion and tenure. All faculty members should obtain a copy of the *Faculty Handbook* and familiarize themselves the relevant portions on promotion and tenure.

A primary role of the Committee on Rank and Tenure is to help ensure that the evaluation of faculty meets high standards with respect to the four criteria outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. Section titled Academic Administration Manual:

- 1) Teaching includes instructing, assisting students and curriculum development. The University of Portland is committed to excellence in teaching.
- 2) Scholarship is critical both to the contribution of knowledge and to the enrichment of teaching. The University of Portland is committed to excellence in scholarship, and since the form and nature of scholarly contributions vary greatly by discipline, an important element in evaluation of scholarly work of a candidate for tenure or promotion is the judgment of others in the field, especially those experts outside the University of Portland.
- 3) University and community involvement (Service) is activity other than teaching or scholarship that fosters or advances the mission and goals of the University, school, department, and profession. Service may consist of the fulfillment of formal responsibilities, either individually or with others.
- 4) Personal attributes are those qualities of character and personality that allow faculty members to contribute to the objectives of the University.

Because scholarship differs in some respects among academic disciplines, Schools and Departments shall publish their respective clarifications of the criteria for scholarship. The Committee makes every effort to apply these standards in a just and consistent manner from year to year. Therefore, the Committee on Rank and Tenure is organized to represent many disciplines within the University and to provide continuity over time. Its seven members are ordinarily appointed on a three-year rotating basis.

The review process for rank and tenure is a very important and serious matter for faculty members. As a result, faculty members who expect to be eligible for consideration for promotion and/or tenure during the coming academic year are encouraged to update their professional files. Faculty members who will be reviewed in later years 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.**

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

Document A: Time-Line for the Rank and Tenure Process	Page 5
Document B: Documentation Requirements for Faculty Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure	Page 7
Document C: Recommendations to Department Chairs and Academic Deans Regarding the Evaluation of Faculty Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion	Page 15
Document D: Suggestions for Tenured Faculty Preparing for Periodic Review	Page 17
Document E: Candidate Checklist to Ensure the Candidate's file is Complete	Page 20
Document F: Checklist for Deans to Ensure file Completeness	Page 21
Document F1: Checklist for Dean to Ensure File Completeness (Review)	Page 22
Document G: Standards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	Page 23
Document G1: The Rank of Professor	Page 25

Document H: Guidelines Concerning the Relative  
Significance of Scholarship

Page 26

Document I: Guidelines for the Establishment  
of Lectureships

Page 27

Further information on promotion and tenure is provided in the Academic Administration Manual of the University found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure Document A**

### **Time-Line for the Rank and Tenure Process**

The following dates are provided to assist those involved in the Rank and Tenure process.

- April 1:** Deadline for the Provost to inform faculty members scheduled for tenure consideration in the following academic year. Copies of that notification shall be sent to the respective Academic Deans, Department Chairs (where applicable), and Committee on Rank and Tenure.
- April 1:** Faculty members anticipating eligibility for tenure or advancement in rank should begin to prepare their materials. (See Document B: "Suggestions for Faculty Members Applying for Rank and/or Tenure.") (Tenured faculty: see Document D.)
- 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: "Recommendations to Department Chairs and Academic Deans Regarding the Evaluation of Faculty Members Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion.")
- June 15:** Deadline for all faculty members to submit their files, with supporting data, to their Academic Dean. Deadline for Department Chairs and senior faculty to submit their evaluations to the Academic Deans.
- Sept. 1:** Deadline for all materials to be received by the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The materials should include *two* copies of narrative letter, academic vita, and letters of recommendation.
- Dec. 15:** The Committee on Rank and Tenure submits its recommendations to the Provost. The Provost gives a recommendation to the President.
- Jan 31:** The President communicates his decisions to the applicants on approximately this date

**TIMELINE**

**April 1**

**Provost Informs Candidate, Dean,  
Chairs and Committee on Rank and  
Tenure**



**April 1**

**Candidate should begin preparation of  
materials and request evaluation  
letters from Chair, senior faculty and  
external reviewers**



**May 1**

**Department Chair and senior faculty  
begin preparing evaluations**



**June 15**

**Deadline for applicant to submit file to  
Academic Dean, and  
  
Deadline for Chairs and senior faculty  
to submit evaluations to Academic  
Dean**



**Sept. 1**

**Deadline for Deans to submit  
all material to Chair of Rank and  
Tenure Committee**



**Dec. 15**

**Committee on Rank and Tenure  
submits recommendation to  
Provost**



**About Jan. 31**

**President communicates decision to  
applicant through the Dean**

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure Document B**

### **Documentation Requirements for Faculty Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure**

For either promotion and/or tenure the Committee on Rank and Tenure will review the following documentation:

- a. An up-to-date Academic Vita containing the following items:
  - Name
  - Academic appointment (include institution, period, rank, tenured or tenure track),
  - Education
  - Administrative positions
  - Professional experience
  - Consulting
  - Scholarly Work (include full reference information)
    - Grants
    - Publications
    - Presentations
    - Research
  - Service
    - University
    - School or College/Department
    - Professional Community
  - Awards and Honors
  - Professional memberships
  - Professional meetings attended
- b. A narrative self-evaluation letter commenting on teaching, scholarship, University and community involvement, and personal attributes according to the criteria outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* in the section titled Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section C through Section F.
- c. The applicant's mid-tenure evaluation provided by the Dean.
- d. The applicant's annual self-evaluation and the corresponding Dean's or Chair's evaluation for the prior three academic years.
- e. A letter of evaluation from the Dean regarding the merit of the application for promotion and/or tenure. For faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, a letter of evaluation from the Department Chair.
- f. Required letters of evaluation from all faculty members at the rank of Associate

Professor and Professor in the department or school. Experience has shown that a candidate's case is enhanced when his/her file is made available to those writing the letters. This file should include updated Academic Vita, a summary of the student evaluations from the past three years, and the candidate's narrative or a draft of the narrative. Include a listing of individuals from whom letters were requested.

- g. All student evaluations for all courses taught within the last three years (include a copy of the evaluation form).
- h. A concise summary and a thorough analysis of these student evaluations and a statement of the criteria used in the analysis.
- i. Course syllabi and other course material related to teaching within the past three years.
- j. Other letters of evaluation which comment on one or more of the following: teaching, scholarship, University and community involvement, and personal attributes according to the criteria outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* entitled Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section C "Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion" through Section F "Procedures and Qualifications for Tenure." These letters may come from:
  - University of Portland faculty in other schools and departments
  - Former students
  - Experts and colleagues in the candidate's scholarship area external to the University
- k. Materials such as reprints of major articles, reviews of performance, etc., documenting the scope and quality of the scholarly/professional work.

## Suggestions for Faculty Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure

1. All faculty members are strongly advised to read in the *Faculty Handbook* the section pertaining to faculty rights and responsibilities, particularly those sections dealing with matters of promotion and tenure. (See Academic Administration Manual, II: The Faculty, Sections A through H.)
2. All faculty members are urged to communicate with their respective Department Chair and/or Dean in the spring of each year to discuss annual evaluations and questions of promotion and tenure.
3. Narrative: Your narrative brings your teaching, scholarship and service alive for the members of the Rank and Tenure Committee. It is the foundational document the Committee uses to understand you as a faculty member. The following suggestions are offered for you to consider in writing directly to the Committee. 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 and the nature of your courses. Discuss your philosophy of teaching/learning in a way that makes your thinking tangible for the Committee. Describe the rationale of your teaching approach with students.
- Explain how you exemplify being a reflective teacher. For example, how do you use student, colleague, and Chair or Dean feedback to change your courses and teaching?
- Analyze your growth as a teacher since coming to UP.
- Provide examples to support your self-evaluation, especially ones that can be verified in your supporting materials.

### Scholarship

- Describe your scholarship and how it is conducted.
- Explain how your scholarship conforms with Departmental or School statements concerning accepted scholarly practices in its disciplines.
- 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 the work.
- 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 each of the following: your department or school, the University and your profession.
- Describe your leadership or other roles.

#### Conclusion

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

#### Additional information helpful to the committee

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

4. 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 the candidate's student evaluation summaries. Faculty members are encouraged to begin immediately to build a file of these evaluations. 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 your scholarship. The annual self-evaluations accompanied by the corresponding Dean's or Chair's annual written evaluation give an indication of one's response to critique, suggestions, and recommendations.
5. Suggestions for the preparation of the Application File: To assist the Committee in making an accurate evaluation, it is important that candidates provide documentation to explain their teaching, scholarship, professional and University/community contributions in sufficient detail. A thorough review requires that the documentation contained in the application file be complete. However, to be most helpful to the Committee on Rank and Tenure and the applicant, it should be concise and clearly organized. Excessive material may detract from the overall strength of the file.
6. Senior faculty in your School or Department are required to write evaluation letters. It is to your benefit to send a letter of request to each faculty member asking them to write for your review.
7. An applicant may also request letters from faculty outside their academic unit. Such faculty should focus on specific examples of their direct interaction with the applicant, whether this relates to teaching, scholarship, or service.
8. **DEADLINES FOR APPLICATIONS ARE STRICTLY ADHERED TO WITHOUT EXCEPTION.** Submitted materials are to be divided in the following manner:
  - Volume I. (Main Volume) This volume shall contain only documents deemed most important in the judgment of the applicant to fulfill the application process. All

materials in this volume shall be carefully and clearly organized following items a – d, & h outlined in Document B (page 7 & 8).

- Volume II. This volume shall contain all supporting materials, including a copy of the evaluation form, 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 (item g, page 8)
  - Volume IIb. Other Supporting Materials (items i - k, pp. 8)
- The Dean shall provide two separate folders containing the following items: the *first* folder will contain items e & f, page 7 & 8 and all confidential letters that were sent directly to the Dean; the *second* folder will contain copies of the contents of the first folder (items e, and f, and confidential letters) and a copy of the academic vita, item a, page 7.

## **Judgments on promotion and tenure take into account the criteria from the *Faculty Handbook, Academic Administration Manual***

- A. Article II, Section C.2.b. In part it reads:

The rank of Associate Professor is considered senior rank and presumes high achievement; a member of the faculty may remain indefinitely at this rank.

- B. Regarding the application for promotion, see Article II, Section D.2. In part it reads: All promotions in rank are made by the President upon the recommendations of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

### 1). Regular Faculty

The formal procedure for determining recommendations for promotion is initiated by the candidate's immediate academic supervisor. Thus, in the College of Arts and Sciences, the recommendation would be initiated by the Department Chair and forwarded to the Dean. In the other Schools of the University, the Dean of the School would initiate the procedure.

The faculty member has the right to initiate his/her own recommendation for promotion if his/her academic supervisor does not initiate the action.

Every year, by September 1, the Deans of the College and Schools shall forward to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure of the Academic Senate written recommendations with supportive data on the candidates they are proposing for advancement in rank. This supportive data must clearly evidence the general and special qualifications outlined in Section C for the rank recommended.

The Committee on Rank and Tenure shall submit its recommendations, along with all supportive materials to the Provost, who will present them, along with his own recommendations, to the President. The President shall communicate directly to each faculty member his decision concerning the recommendations of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

- C. Regarding the application for tenure, see Article II, Section F.2.a. In part it reads: Six years of service as a full-time faculty member on regular appointment in an accredited college or university, four years of which must be at the University of Portland.

1). Faculty without prior full-time service (or with less than one year of prior service) at another accredited college or university will be evaluated for tenure during their sixth year of service at the University of Portland. In extraordinary circumstances, the faculty member may request of the President a delay in evaluation for tenure of up to two years.

2). Faculty with one year of prior full-time service at another accredited college or

university will be evaluated for tenure during their fifth year of service at the University of Portland. Faculty with two or more years of prior full-time service will be evaluated during their fourth year of service at the University of Portland. In extraordinary circumstances, the faculty member may request of the President a delay in evaluation for tenure of up to two years.

3). Tenure is effective upon receipt of the letter of notification from the President of the University.

- D. The Committee will hold in confidence all materials related to Rank and Tenure. Letters are addressed to the Committee, however they are ordinarily sent through the Dean's office. Letters may be sent directly to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
- E. The Dean sends the completed file to the Committee. The file contains items enumerated a – k on pp. 7-8. Following the President's decision, all materials will be returned to the applicant with the exception of letters addressed to the Committee on Rank and Tenure or to the Dean. These letters will be retained in a separate confidential file in the President's office for three years before being destroyed.
- F. The qualifications and criteria for considering the granting of advancement in rank and/or tenure can be found in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II.
- G. The Committee on Rank and Tenure is guided by the following modified criteria (from the Academic Administration Manual found in the *Faculty Handbook*) in making its recommendations to the Provost:

Members of the Full-time Teaching and Research Faculty should be excellent teachers and exemplary leaders of their students. They must be experts in their disciplines and demonstrate the scholarly way of life.

1). Teaching and Scholarship:

Teaching and Scholarship, considered as the central tasks of the faculty, are not opposed to each other, even though they may be carried out by different actions. Teaching can be kept creative by means of scholarship; scholarship can gain impetus and direction from the demands of teaching.

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.

## Committee on Rank and Tenure Document C

### Recommendations to Department Chairs, Academic Deans, and Senior Faculty Regarding the Evaluation of Faculty Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion

#### Academic Deans and Department Chairs

The following recommendations have been developed to assist in the faculty review process. These recommendations will facilitate the Committee in its deliberations and provide the best case on behalf of the faculty members.

1. Academic Deans and Department Chairs prepare written letters of recommendation. Letters should include a clear, *reasoned* recommendation.
2. Provide a *balanced* evaluation of the applicant. 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. Letters should conclude with a specific recommendation for each decision to be made on behalf of the faculty member.
3. When writing letters of recommendation, please offer *specific examples* of your faculty member's teaching, scholarship, service, and other accomplishments. This will provide the Committee on Rank and Tenure with tangible evidence with which to make evaluations. Deans/Chairs are encouraged to articulate how they measure and define teaching and how course evaluation data is interpreted.
4. The progress of a faculty member's development is an important factor for the Committee. The sequence of annual written self-evaluations accompanied by the corresponding Dean's or Chair's annual written evaluation 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 Deans ensure that the faculty receives yearly responses.**
5. Student evaluations are required by the Committee. Chairs and Deans 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. Summaries should be provided to all those writing letters for the faculty member.
6. Peer evaluations (internal and external to the University) are useful to the work of the Committee. The methods and processes for peer evaluations are decided within the College and the Schools. Chairs and Deans should assist faculty with participating in a meaningful evaluation process.
7. Chairs and/or Dean will guide faculty in preparing for promotion and tenure review;

therefore, Chairs and Deans are encouraged to participate in the annual workshop conducted by the Committee on Rank and Tenure and to facilitate the participation of faculty in these workshops.

8. The Dean will inform senior faculty of candidates for rank and tenure in their academic unit. All senior faculty in a department or school are required to submit, ordinarily via the Dean, letters of evaluation for an applicant's file. This includes faculty who are serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Chairman of the Committee on Rank and Tenure will forward to the Provost and Deans any unexcused failure to submit a letter of evaluation. This expectation extends across disciplines or specialties within the departments and schools. Academic units are encouraged to develop evaluation procedures that will assist and support applicants in their preparation for review. Note that good letters for faculty are based on a full evaluation. Faculty should provide letter writers and members of their department files that include Academic Vita, the narration or a draft of the narration, and summaries of the student evaluations for the past three years.
9. **Deadlines for applications are strictly adhered to without exception.**
10. **Files must be complete.** It is the faculty member's responsibility to submit the required material. Deans are responsible for ensuring that evaluations and materials are completed. Incomplete files will be returned to the Dean for completion with a letter to the Provost indicating the action.
11. More than one year is normally required to develop stronger credentials for scholarship if an applicant has been denied senior rank.

## **Senior Faculty**

All senior members of an academic unit (in the case of the College of Arts and Sciences) or School are required to submit a letter of evaluation for the applicant's file. These letters should provide a clearly reasoned and balanced evaluation of the applicant. The letter 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. These will provide the Committee and administrators with tangible evidence with which to make evaluations.

## Committee on Rank and Tenure Document D

### Suggestions for Tenured Faculty Preparing for Periodic Review

1. Tenured faculty members are ordinarily reviewed every eight years. The primary aim of this review of faculty members is to provide an opportunity for a careful, in-depth periodic self-evaluation. The Committee is ready to serve as a resource to assist the faculty member. It is suggested that those coming up for periodic review attend the annual Rank and Tenure Workshop. If a faculty member is applying for promotion the same year as tenure review, the same file may be used for both reviews. However, the supporting letters should address the candidate's qualifications for both promotion and periodic tenure review.
2. Review Criteria:
  - a. Tenured faculty members are reviewed no sooner than eight years after being reviewed for tenure or promoted to Professor rank. Faculty members will be notified in the Spring semester prior to their review of tenure.
  - b. Delays of review have been given to faculty members who have been evaluated recently or who are on special status (e.g., sabbatical leave) or who are currently serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
  - c. Individuals within two years of retirement are excused from the review provided a written notice of intent to retire (including the expected date) is submitted to the Provost (with copies to the appropriate Dean and to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure).
3. While a faculty member's complete academic and professional record is important, the documents prepared for the review of tenure should place emphasis on the most recent three years.
4. Evaluation Criteria:

Continued teaching effectiveness is of primary importance. Performance in the area of scholarship and University and community service is expected to be satisfactory. The qualifications upon which the original grant of tenure was based are interpreted to be dynamic; this implies continued professional growth, **not** new standards. The minimum credentials will not ordinarily change from when one was granted tenure (e.g., tenured faculty members without a doctorate are not ordinarily expected to earn one in order to retain tenure).

5. Documentation:
  - a. A current Academic Vita (Follow the guidelines in Document B)
  - b. A comprehensive narrative letter of self-evaluation that contains a thoughtful, reflective analysis of one's professional growth in the areas of teaching, scholarship, University and community involvement, and personal attributes according to the criteria outlined in the Academic Administration Manual, Article II, Section C "Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion" and Section F "Tenure." 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 external review of your scholarship. Refereed papers, funded grants, and reviews of artistic works are examples of "external review."
  - c. Self-evaluations and the responses from the Dean or Chair for the previous three years.
  - d. Letters of evaluation from the Department Chair (where applicable) and Dean are included.
  - e. The Dean will inform senior faculty of candidates for Periodic Review in their academic unit. All senior faculty in a department or school are required to submit, ordinarily via the Dean, letters of evaluation for an applicant's file. This includes faculty who are serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Chairman of the Committee on Rank and Tenure will forward to the Provost and Deans any unexcused failure to submit a letter of evaluation.
  - f. Evidence of continuing teaching effectiveness will be a very important consideration in the evaluation of tenured faculty. Therefore, provide a detailed summary and a thoughtful analysis of your last three years' teaching evaluations in a separate document. Do not include copies of your student course evaluations although the Committee may request them.
6. 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 the results of its evaluations to faculty members in April.
7. The Committee will hold in confidence all materials related to Rank and Tenure. Letters are addressed to the Committee; however, they are **ordinarily** sent through the Dean's office. Letters may be sent directly to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
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, list of all others who were required

to write evaluations, list of all outside reviewers who were requested to write evaluations, and list all other who were requested to write letters. The Dean's office will also submit two plastic folders (supplied by Provost's office) containing copies of letters, academic vita, and narrative

9. At the conclusion of the review, all materials will be returned to the applicant, with the exception of letters addressed to the Committee on Rank and Tenure or to the Dean. These letters will be destroyed by the Chair of Rank and Tenure.

### **Time-Line Periodic Review**

The following dates are provided to assist those involved in the Periodic Review process.

**Spring Semester:** The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure will notify the faculty member and his or her Dean of the Periodic Review.

**Fall Semester:** Candidate will prepare materials for the file and turn them into 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 will communicate the results of its evaluations to faculty members in April.

**Committee on Rank and Tenure  
Document E  
(Tenure and Promotion)  
Candidate's checklist to ensure the file is complete.**

- ( ) Volume I (Main Volume)**
  - ( ) Current Academic Vita**
  - ( ) Narrative letter on teaching, scholarship, service, personal attributes**
  - ( ) Dean's mid-tenure evaluation**
  - ( ) Prior three years' annual self-evaluations, with Dean's or Chair's evaluation**
  - ( ) List of all senior faculty who were requested to write evaluations**
  - ( ) List of all outside reviewers who were requested to write evaluations**
  - ( ) Concise, complete detailed summary and thorough analysis of student evaluations.**
- ( ) 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**
  - ( ) Have you included all items required by these guidelines?**
  - ( ) Is all redundant material eliminated?**
  - ( ) 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 tabs to assist the Committee in locating specific items?**

**Committee on Rank and Tenure  
Document F  
(Tenure and Promotion)**

**Dean's checklist to ensure the candidate's file is complete. Candidate\_\_\_\_\_**

The candidate's file should be organized as follows, and should contain the indicated materials. 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 on teaching, scholarship, service, personal attributes**
  - Dean's mid-tenure evaluation**
  - Prior three years annual evaluations, with Dean's or Chair's evaluation**
  - List of all senior faculty who were required to write evaluations**
  - List of all outside reviewers who were requested to write evaluations**
  - Concise, complete detailed summary and thorough analysis of student evaluations**
- 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 critiques**
- Two Separate Plastic Folders each containing**
  - All confidential letters from Dean, Chair, faculty, external evaluators, narrative letter, and Academic Vita**

Dean's Review : \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee on Rank and Tenure  
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, and should contain the indicated materials. 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 on teaching, scholarship, service, personal attributes**
  - ( ) Summary of prior three years' annual self-evaluations, with Dean's or Chair's evaluation**
  - ( ) List of all senior faculty who were required to write evaluations**
  - ( ) List of all outside reviewers who were requested to write evaluations**
  
- ( ) Two separate plastic folders each containing**
  - ( ) All confidential letters from Dean, Chair, faculty, external evaluators, narrative letter, and Academic Vita**

**Dean's Review:\_\_\_\_\_**

**Date:\_\_\_\_\_**

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure Document G**

### **Standards in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

G1 Standards for Promotion and Tenure. University of Portland 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.

G2 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. The areas of 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. Tenure protects academic freedom and creates obligations with regard to continued employment, while promotion to senior rank is more closely associated with a faculty member's stature in the profession and the overall reputation of the University at the regional and national level. Different amounts of emphasis are warranted in arriving at a holistic judgment about an individual's petition for promotion.

A candidate who finds that a given 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.

G2.1 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: It is a practice of the University in granting tenure to a candidate to also confer promotion to Associate Professor, unless the candidate already holds senior rank. In effect, this practice means that tenure is linked to senior rank, and those candidates at the rank of Assistant Professor 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 quality 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.

G2.2 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 in proportion to their abilities and experience. Candidates for promotion to Professor are advised to pursue those levels of quality and achievement, which bring ever greater stature to the academic reputation of the University of Portland.

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure Document G1**

### **The Rank of Professor**

The rank of Professor is reserved for those who are, to varying degrees, distinguished leaders in teaching, scholarship, and service and thereby serve as role models for the rest of the faculty. Professors are concerned for the welfare of the entire University, not just a department or school.

#### **Distinguished Teaching**

Professors have a mature vision of themselves as teachers. Professors are able to articulate what distinguishes their teaching as exemplary. Distinguished teaching is demonstrated through a continued dedication to honing and 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 also 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 other faculty members 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. Professors are able to articulate the coherence of their body of scholarship and position in the panoply of scholarship in the discipline. 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 or notable contribution in public service, government or industry. Testimony from experts in one's scholarly area outside the University is necessary to be promoted to the rank of Professor. 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. Leadership in service 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 to the rank of Professor. 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.

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure Document H**

### **General Guidelines Concerning the Relative Significance of Scholarship**

In order to maintain and increase academic quality and reputation, University of Portland faculty must demonstrate "the habit of scholarship." Scholarship is difficult to define. In general, any activity which contributes to greater human understanding and knowledge can be considered "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, statements concerning accepted scholarly practices in their disciplines. Candidates should consult their discipline's guidelines, as these documents are used as a basis by evaluators who may not be working 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 that is accepted as a result of more 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) A series of works produced as a result of an understandable program of scholarly inquiry or theme is given more weight than a collection of unrelated works.
- 6) 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. In almost every discipline there is a verifiable trend towards multiple authorship of journal articles and the undertaking of larger, more complex, more collaborative projects. The important consideration in evaluating multiple-author projects is the quality and importance of the candidate's contribution to the project. At the same time, the paradigm of the solitary scholar working alone and successfully is as valid as ever.

## **Committee on Rank and Tenure 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 the lectureship will be placed. The request must demonstrate the special 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 analogous to those recited here:

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.



*Classroom scene in early 1950's after University became coeducational.*