

# BYLAWS of the CONSTITUTION OF SOUTHERN OREGON UNIVERSITY FACULTY

---

5.220

## **A. Faculty Performance Expectations**

Professional faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching and service (see section 5.224 and 5.226). Professorial faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching, scholarship and service (see sections 5.224-5.226).

All faculty members should be making progress toward performing at the preferred level in each of the areas applicable to their appointment. The preferred level describes the average or typical performance level for a faculty member making good progress toward final promotion. The exceptional level would characterize and recognize faculty who demonstrated significant achievements, well beyond the preferred level. The acceptable level describes the minimum performance expected for continued employment. Note: unacceptable performance is defined as below an acceptable level and may require a plan for correction (see 5.370).

The bylaws sections 5.224-5.226 describe the university expectations in each area. In addition, tables list characteristics in each area for acceptable, preferred, and exceptional performance. Departments articulate their expectations for faculty in their discipline(s) by additions or clarifications to the University characteristics in the tables for teaching and service. Departments articulate their expectations for scholarship in a discipline-specific scholarship table. See section 5.227 for more information regarding the goals and review process for departmental expectations.

5.221

### **1. Promotion and Tenure Criteria**

All faculty members must have the educational background required and have completed the required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion or the required years of service prior to the date of awarding of tenure or a three-year extendable appointment (see section 5.223).

In addition, the faculty member's performance portfolio must be reviewed and demonstrate that there are sufficient contributions in each of the areas appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Faculty must meet or exceed the acceptable performance level in each area applicable to their appointment. The number of areas required to exceed the acceptable level gradually increases (see table below) until all areas must be at the preferred level for final promotion (Senior Instructor 2 or Full Professor). Note: exceptional performance is not expected, nor required for promotion to any rank, however faculty members may elect to replace preferred performance in two areas with acceptable performance in one area and exceptional performance in the other.

1

2

3

<b>Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements</b>			
	<b>Min Acceptable</b>	<b>Min Preferred</b>	<b>Min Exceptional</b>
<b>SR Instructor 1</b> <b>(3 year extendable appt.)</b>	1	1	
<b>SR Instructor 2</b>		2 — OR —	
<b>Associate</b>	1 2	1 2	1
<b>Tenure</b>		— OR —	
	2		1
<b>Professor</b>		3 — OR —	
	1	1	1

5.222

2. Evaluations and Preparing for Promotion or Tenure

All faculty evaluations provide feedback on a faculty member's performance in the areas applicable to their appointment. In areas where a faculty member's performance is not yet meeting the preferred performance level, the evaluation process shall include recommendations for improvement or a discussion of goals. If a faculty member's performance in an area is not meeting the acceptable performance level, a colleague evaluation may be scheduled by the department chair within one calendar year to provide the faculty member with additional feedback and a more detailed plan for improvement (see section 5.361). See section 5.300 for more information on faculty evaluations.

A colleague evaluation will review the faculty member's performance in each of the areas applicable to his/her appointment and indicate whether s/he meets the acceptable, preferred, or exceptional performance level. The most recent colleague evaluation report shall be included as part of any promotion or tenure application and must be dated no earlier than two calendar years prior to the date of the application. Faculty receiving annual evaluations (see section 5.350) shall add the most recent annual evaluation to the colleague evaluation when that colleague evaluation is more than 1 year old (dated more than one calendar year prior to application deadline). Alternatively, the Department Chair may schedule a new colleague evaluation to replace the older colleague evaluation. The Department Chair will schedule a new colleague evaluation at the faculty member's request, provided such a request is made on or before October 1 (of the fall term preceding the application). See section 5.380 for information on conducting colleague evaluations.

A department may facilitate the external review of a faculty member's scholarship and include that review in the faculty member's performance portfolio provided the chair and faculty member agree that this would be helpful to internal reviewers evaluating the faculty member's application. It may be completed in conjunction with the included colleague evaluation or subsequent to that colleague evaluation, but prior to the submission deadline for the promotion application.

1

2

3

5.223

3. Educational Background and Experience

5.223 (a)

a. Senior Instructor

Faculty members applying for promotion to Senior Instructor must (1) have at least an appropriate Master's degree for the discipline taught or its equivalent and (2) have completed at least the equivalent of five academic years of full-time college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the Instructor level or above (see section 5.240). Faculty with permanent part-time appointments who clearly meet all promotion criteria except the years of experience may be considered for promotion if they have completed at least seven academic years of college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the instructor level or above.

5.223 (b)

b. Three-year Extendable Appointments

Upon promotion to Senior Instructor, a faculty member with at least three years of service is automatically awarded a three-year extendable appointment. Faculty members promoted to Senior Instructor prior to completing three years of service will remain on one-year, renewable appointments and may apply for a three-year extendable appointment upon completion of three years of service.

5.223 (c)

c. Associate Professor

Faculty members applying for promotion to Associate Professor must (1) have an appropriate terminal degree for the discipline taught (see section 5.230) and (2) have completed at least the equivalent of five academic years of full-time college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the assistant professor level or above (see section 5.240). Faculty with permanent part-time appointments who clearly meet all promotion criteria except the years of experience may be considered for promotion if they have completed at least seven academic years of college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the assistant professor level or above.

5.223 (d)

d. Tenure

Faculty members applying for tenure must (1) have an appropriate terminal degree for the discipline taught (see section 5.230) and (2) have completed at least the equivalent of five academic years of full-time teaching at Southern Oregon University at a professorial rank. Faculty with full-time appointments may apply for tenure during their fifth year of service and no later than during their sixth year of service. Faculty with permanent part-time appointments may apply during the year they complete the equivalent of five years of full-time service and no later than during the year in which they complete the equivalent of six years of full-time service. If approved, tenure is awarded beginning the following year.

Should a professorial faculty member not be awarded tenure prior to their seventh year of consecutive full-time service in a single department, that faculty member must be placed on a one-year terminal appointment for the seventh year.

There may be exceptional individuals whose abilities warrant waiving the seven-year limitation. In such exceptional cases, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Department Personnel Committee, may recommend the faculty member be continued on one-year, renewable appointments that specify both the length and purpose for the exception. In no case may the faculty member be continued beyond the equivalent of ten years of full-time service on fixed term appointments.



5.223 (e)

e. Professor

Faculty members applying for promotion to Professor must (1) have an appropriate terminal degree for the discipline taught (see section 5.230) and (2) have at least the equivalent of six academic years of full-time college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the associate professor level or above (see section 5.240). Faculty with permanent part-time appointments who clearly meet all promotion criteria except the years of experience may be considered for promotion if they have completed at least eight academic years of college teaching in the appropriate discipline at the associate professor level or above.

There may be rare situations where individuals are able to accumulate a significant portfolio of achievements that merits waiving the educational background and/or experience criteria above. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and Provost, shall place a notation to this effect in the individual's personnel file. The notation must be signed by the faculty member and approved by the Department Chair, Dean and Provost. This notation will be made available to the individual for inclusion with any application for promotion or tenure.

5.224

4. Teaching Expectations

Faculty should demonstrate a deep-seated commitment to excellent teaching.

5.224 (a)

a. Evidence of Good Teaching

A commitment to excellent teaching is demonstrated by continuous reflection and self-improvement, innovative and engaging teaching methods, and a demonstrable commitment to providing students with meaningful educational experiences both in and out of the classroom.

A commitment to excellent teaching entails paying attention to the effectiveness of curriculum and academic programs, engagement in curricular discussions and healthy debate in an environment of academic freedom. It is often reflected in designing and updating courses to meet changing learning objectives, working with colleagues to improve how courses work together to meet programmatic learning outcomes, and participation in curricular and program design and delivery at the departmental or institutional levels.

A commitment to excellent teaching reaches beyond the classroom and is evidenced by mentoring and providing individualized learning situations, such as reading and conference coursework, capstones, honors projects, community-based learning projects, practicums, undergraduate research projects, and developmental advising regarding graduate studies or career goals.

A commitment to excellent teaching is a commitment to your colleagues growth as teachers, as well as your own. This can be demonstrated through seeking and sharing effective techniques for fostering student learning with your colleagues.

A commitment to excellent teaching also is demonstrated in cooperating as a program faculty to accommodate departmental loading needs and demonstrating an ability to recruit and retain students in departmental programs.





## 5.224 (b)

### b. Professional Development Activities related to Teaching

This includes all the activities a faculty member undertakes to improve his/her instruction. Activities may include participating in conferences, workshops, or other organized forums, as well as self-study, either individually or with a group of colleagues. Activities tend to focus on new course content, current instructional practices or new pedagogies, emerging technology or other instructional tools, and using campus systems related to instructional activities, communication or record keeping.

## 5.224 (c)

### c. Teaching Performance Levels

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<b>Student evaluations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness "very good" or higher (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <b>Classroom Instruction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Professional development activities that impacted instruction</li> <li>○ Work with colleagues that impacted instruction</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of effective practices, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reflection and self-improvement</li> <li>○ Engaging teaching methods</li> <li>○ Providing meaningful classroom experiences</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Curricular Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses</li> <li>○ Effectively builds on students prior learning</li> <li>○ Effectively addresses dept'l learning outcomes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Departmental Needs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs</li> </ul>	<b>Student evaluations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate instructor's teaching effectiveness at or near "outstanding" (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <b>Classroom Instruction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column)</li> <li>• Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues</li> </ul> <b>Curricular Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery</li> </ul> <b>Mentoring</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively involved in some student mentoring activities</li> </ul> <b>Departmental Needs</b> (see acceptable column)	<b>Student evaluations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate the instructor's teaching effectiveness well into the "outstanding" category (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <b>Classroom Instruction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor</li> <li>• Models excellent teaching</li> <li>• Demonstrates attention and responsiveness to student needs</li> </ul> <b>Curricular Development</b> (see preferred column) <b>Mentoring</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students)</li> <li>• Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.)</li> </ul> <b>Departmental Needs</b> (see acceptable column)

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]



## 5. Scholarship Expectations

Professional development centers on a faculty member receiving new information or gaining new understanding. In contrast, scholarly activity centers on pursuing *and* sharing new knowledge or insight.

Scholarly activity may vary over a faculty member's career and be demonstrated in a variety of ways. However, common to all should be:

- Originality —creating new knowledge, insight or artistic works
- Meaningfulness — contributing to the profession or the public good
- Review — affirmation of meaningful contribution by appropriate peers
- Dissemination — sharing work beyond the University

## 5.225 (a)

## a. Types of Scholarship

Southern Oregon University has a long tradition of encouraging faculty to be teacher-scholars and giving them the freedom to demonstrate their scholarly activity in a wide variety of ways. As a result, the University readily embraced the four types of scholarship developed in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff's *Scholarship Assessed* (1997).

Typical examples of scholarly achievements organized by scholarship type are:

Type of Scholarship	Purpose	Achievement
Discovery	Building New Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of original research</li> <li>• Presentation of original research at regional, national, or international conferences</li> <li>• Creative or artistic works</li> <li>• Innovative new software or patents</li> </ul>
Integration	Interpreting Knowledge in Multidisciplinary Ways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication or presentation that presents new understanding or insight by evaluating issue from multiple perspectives</li> <li>• Publication or presentation that presents new connections or linkages between previously unrelated knowledge</li> <li>• Publication or presentation that places specialized knowledge into a larger context</li> </ul>
Application	Applying Knowledge for Public Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External funding obtained for a need in the public or private sector</li> <li>• Innovative practical solution or outcome developed (normally as a consultant to an agency, business, or industry)</li> <li>• Practitioners in the field adopt resources or techniques developed</li> <li>• Original performances or exhibitions</li> </ul>
Teaching and Learning	Conveying Knowledge to Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication or presentation of original instructional material</li> <li>• Publication of Textbook</li> <li>• Publication or presentation of original curriculum</li> <li>• Publication or presentation of ways to incorporate original knowledge or technology into existing curriculum</li> <li>• Publication or presentation of ways to assess instructional materials or pedagogies for effectiveness</li> <li>• Publication or presentation of new approach to examining issues or controversies related to current instruction</li> </ul>



## 5.225 (b)

### b. Achievements and Measures

Scholarly activity is demonstrated through various achievements, most frequently:

- Artistic Performances
- Books
- Encyclopedia entries
- Gallery Exhibits
- Grants
- Invited book chapters
- Journal Articles
- Monographs
- Patents
- Presentations
- Published poems, plays, recordings, stories, and similar creative works
- Software Development

Scholarly activity is measured against the following criteria:

#### (1) Originality

To demonstrate scholarly activity is *original*, achievements must contain content developed by the faculty member. See the table above for specific examples within each of the major types of scholarship. The use of the words 'original' and 'new' in this table denotes content developed by the faculty member.

#### (2) Meaningfulness

To demonstrate scholarly activity is *meaningful*, achievements must contribute to the profession or the public good. Contributing to the profession may include, but is not limited to, looking at how work is cited or used by other scholars. Contributions may also be measured by how they build new knowledge within the discipline, integrate disciplinary knowledge into a multidisciplinary context, apply disciplinary knowledge in new ways to meet needs in the public or private sector, or convey disciplinary knowledge in new and creative ways to others.

#### (3) Review

To demonstrate scholarly activity has been *reviewed*, achievements must undergo some form of review by appropriate peers. This includes, but is not limited to, the traditional refereed or juried (peer-review) process. The review measure may also be met by other forms of peer review, such as conference program committees, panel chairs, granting agencies, editorial boards, publishers, museums, galleries, or others *where* submissions undergo some form of evaluation (as opposed to routine or automatic acceptance). This review standard may also be met when faculty members are contacted and invited to work on a particular type of activity (such as invited book chapter, invited keynote, consultant, etc.).

#### (4) Dissemination

To demonstrate scholarly activity is *disseminated*, achievements must be shared with professionals outside the University. Dissemination is normally expected to be at least in a multi-state region (such as Northwest or Pacific Coast), if not national, *except* in the area of scholarship of application, where the recipient of the work may not have a multi-state presence. However there may be cases where a local or statewide dissemination has sufficient impact to be considered equivalent to multi-state or national dissemination.

## 5.225 (c)

### c. Professional Development related to Scholarship

This encompasses the learning a faculty member engages in to further his/her scholarly activity. It is typically a mix of self-study, individually or with select colleagues;



conference or workshop participation; and learning about new technology, tools, or research methods.

5.225 (d)

d. Scholarship Performance Levels

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area. The characteristics developed by departments refer to an accumulation of evidence across a 5-year timespan (or the full-time equivalent). In such a timespan, a faculty member normally accumulates 3-5 achievements demonstrating scholarly activity, including at least one publication or one creative/artistic work of similar significance. *[When evaluating faculty performance in this area during any portion of a 5-year evaluation period (such as annual evaluation or mid-cycle review), consider both the faculty member's progress-to-date and any anticipated publications, presentations, and/or grant applications during the remainder of the 5-year timespan.]*

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<b>Originality</b> •	<b>Originality</b> •	<b>Originality</b> •
<b>Meaningfulness</b> •	<b>Meaningfulness</b> •	<b>Meaningfulness</b> •
<b>Review</b> •	<b>Review</b> •	<b>Review</b> •
<b>Dissemination</b> •	<b>Dissemination</b> •	<b>Dissemination</b> •

[Department Expectations take the form of bullets under any or all of the existing headings above.]

5.226

6. Service Expectations

Service takes on many forms, both as an individual and in committees, meeting needs within a program or department, school or college, at the university level, or within the profession. Each faculty member has talents and expertise that lends itself to different types of endeavors, which will vary throughout a career. That variety and commitment by the faculty to advancing the educational endeavor is essential to the institution's success.

5.226 (a)

a. Effective Service

Effective service is not only demonstrated by the different individual tasks and committee work engaged in, but also by how one carries out these duties and the accomplishments that result. An "active" participant is an effective contributor to such accomplishments, whether individually or in collaboration with others. "Active" committees are those that meet regularly and produce documentable accomplishments in keeping with their charge.

A good work ethic is highly valued and demonstrated by actions like: a willingness to assume and carry out a reasonable share of the department and University work, reliably following through on assignments, taking part in governance and decision-making, and effectively advising students.





Equally important is encouraging an atmosphere where healthy and productive debate is embraced in an environment of academic freedom, where ideas are examined and challenged, and well thought out decisions result. Support of such an atmosphere may be demonstrated by tolerating contradicting viewpoints while engaging constructively with others in the solution of problems in the common interest of the department and University, showing flexibility and adaptability as needed to move forward, assuming responsibility for one's own actions and holding reasonable expectations of others, and being respectful in the midst of disagreement.

5.226 (b)

b. Professional Development related to Service

This primarily focuses on efforts to gather information to further a particular individual task or committee charge. Information may be gained from conferences, workshops, or other organized instructional forums, but also may involve work individually or in small groups researching policy or practices, contacting colleagues on campus or at other institutions, gathering documents from other institutions, etc.

5.226 (c)

c. Service Performance Levels

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<b>Departmental Service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active participant in dept'l work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advising students in dept'l programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities</li> <li>Effective contributor on his/her fair share of dept'l committees</li> <li>Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of individual dept'l tasks</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>University/Professional Service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee.</li> </ul>	<b>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</b>  <b>University/Professional Service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University service on active committees (at least one committee every year under review, more if committee(s) is not very active). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee.</li> <li>Effective partner in accomplishing assignments</li> </ul> <b>Leadership</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some documentable accomplishment in a leadership role at the departmental, institutional or professional level during period under review (department chair, program coordinator, faculty program director, chair active committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.)</li> </ul>	<b>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</b>  <b>University/Professional Service (see preferred column)</b>  <b>Leadership</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognized as a faculty leader on campus</li> <li>Served in multiple leadership roles</li> <li>Significant accomplishments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple committees or taskforces, as a program director, as a department chair, or other significant leadership responsibilities resulting in multiple documentable achievements that furthered the institutional mission)</li> </ul>



[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

5.227

7. Departmental Expectations (5.227)

5.227 (a)

a. Goal of Departmental Expectations

Departmental expectations for faculty performance are articulated by adding discipline-specific characteristics to the performance tables for teaching, scholarship, and service (see 5.224-5.226). The combination of institutional and discipline-specific characteristics should provide clear direction to faculty members regarding performance expectations in their discipline at Southern Oregon University.

Institution-wide characteristics are included in the teaching and service tables. Departments may add characteristics under any or all of the headings as well as add characteristics under any or all of the institutional bullets. Due to the differences between disciplines, programs, and departments, no institution-wide characteristics are included in the scholarship table. Departments shall create appropriate bullets under each heading to describe expectations in their discipline(s). In addition, Departments may add footnotes or commentary following any or all of the tables to clarify departmental expectations and/or measures.

5.227 (b)

b. Periodic Review of Departmental Expectations

Departmental expectations shall be reviewed periodically, subsequent to any substantive change in department policy and at least once every five years. Initial proposals and subsequent changes are not effective until approved. Should the departmental expectations involve substantive changes, a plan for phasing in the changes shall be included with the proposed changes.

5.227 (c)

c. Review Process

- (1) The Provost will publish a timeline for review of departmental expectations that concludes prior to the next promotion and tenure cycle.
- (2) Departments will develop scholarship characteristics in keeping with the expectations described in section 5.225. Departments may also add to the institutional characteristics for teaching (see section 5.224) and service (see section 5.226) to clarify expectations for their faculty.
- (3) Initial proposals and subsequent changes shall be submitted through the Dean to the Faculty Personnel Committee.
- (4) The Faculty Personnel Committee shall review departmental expectations to assure the consistent and equitable application of promotion and tenure criteria across campus (see sections 5.224-5.226). While departmental expectations may vary significantly from one discipline to another, every effort should be made to avoid any one department setting significantly higher or lower overall standards for their faculty than other departments across campus.



- (5) When departmental expectations involve substantive changes, the Faculty Personnel Committee will review the phase-in plan to assure it provides faculty with sufficient time to adapt to these changes.
- (6) The Faculty Personnel Committee will meet with the Department Chair (or designee) as needed to clarify departmental expectations and/or phase-in plans prior to making a recommendation to Faculty Senate.
- (7) Upon the recommendation of Faculty Personnel Committee and the approval of Faculty Senate, departmental expectations shall be forwarded to the Provost for final approval.
- (8) Once approved, the departmental expectations shall be published with the institutional performance tables (sections 5.224-5.226) and readily available to all faculty.

