

Department of Computer and Information Science
Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Computer and Information Science are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

I. Department-specific Policies and Procedures

Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal/Third Year Review

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the department head, usually in mid-April. These reviews are based on the candidate's dossier, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

The annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. The results of the process can be as follows:

- i. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year.
- ii. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract.
- iii. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not

extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure review period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the Director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

Personnel Committee Review and Report

Prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the standing departmental Personnel Committee will review the candidate's case. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees' assessment of the candidate's work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is made available in the department office for review by tenured faculty of appropriate rank before a department meeting.

Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to Full Professor). Both Associate and Full Professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only Full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. When all votes have been registered, the votes are tallied by the Office Manager and the voting members of the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Office Manager in case they are requested by the Dean or Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

Department Head Review and Statement

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, indicating any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote.

II. Guidelines

Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Computer and Information Science. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 50 : 40 : 10, respectively for untenured faculty members and 40 : 40 : 20 for tenured faculty members.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

Promotion to a tenured faculty position as Associate Professor in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Oregon requires an excellent record of research and teaching together with a satisfactory record of institutional and academic service. We consider three aspects of a candidate's performance when evaluating that person for promotion and tenure:

- Impact of scholarly research activity;
- Quality of teaching;
- Effectiveness of institutional and academic service.

These aspects are weighted 50:40:10 for research:teaching:service, respectively for untenured faculty members.

Research (50%)

Development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute, necessary requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure. Successful candidates are expected to have:

- established a strong publication record in leading scholarly journals and conference/workshop proceedings. Acceptance rates for conferences or workshops serve as an indicator of publication significance. Other forms of research dissemination, such as software systems, will be recognized, if they are widely cited as having made an important contribution.
- demonstrated an ability to obtain grant funding support (as PI) for research;
- initiated a significant body of ongoing work and defined a reasonable program for future research.

The Department recognizes that a set of standardized criteria for scholarly achievement that can be applied equally to all faculty members does not exist. Every effort will be made to consider all relevant factors involved in each individual case. The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on the candidate's research field.

Evaluation of this impact will in part be based upon statements made by external referees, who are leading experts in the candidate's area of research. Both the quantity and quality of citations may also be used to evaluate research impact.

Additional evidence of research impact may be provided by:

- invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions;
- invitations to serve on journal editorial boards or conference program committees;
- participation in the organization of major professional conferences and workshops.

Teaching (40%)

The Department of Computer and Information Science takes seriously its educational mission and its students: both undergraduate and graduate, as well as major and non-major. Demonstration of effective teaching is a necessary condition for tenure in the Department of Computer and Information Science. A candidate for promotion will have taught several terms of required courses in the undergraduate major program as part of their teaching record.

The Department expects to see signs of effective teaching. Among these are the following:

- Providing an educational experience for the students that goes beyond the routine;
- Providing students with intellectual challenges that reflect high expectations and teaching so as to encourage students to meet them;
- Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students. There are several ways that the Department assesses quality and effectiveness of teaching:

- *Peer evaluations.* Each year a member of the Tenured Faculty should visit at least one class of each untenured faculty member. The visitor will review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of the performance.
- *Student evaluations.* Every untenured faculty member should collect numerical and written student evaluations for each course taught. Consistent patterns in numerical or written evaluations will be considered to provide a reliable picture of the quality of teaching, as perceived by students.
- *Documentation of other contributions.* There are many ways a faculty member can contribute to the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department. These include participation in new curriculum development, the use of innovative teaching strategies, and conducting one-on-one teaching opportunities, such as directing reading courses and senior theses.
- *Research supervision and mentorship.* Supervision and advising of graduate and undergraduate students working on thesis and undergraduate research projects.

Service (10%)

Faculty members play an important role in the governance of the Department and the University. A candidate is expected to have demonstrated an active interest in Departmental activities, participating with enthusiasm and fulfilling any work assignments in a timely manner. Although Assistant Professors will generally carry a lighter service load while establishing their research and teaching records, we do look for the potential of substantial and creative contributions in the future. While not required, service on a University-wide committee is a positive indication.

Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels within the framework of acceptable performance. Nevertheless, we expect all of our faculty to share in the governance of the Department and to perform effectively the duties asked of them.

There are various forms of academic service the Department will consider during the tenure review process. These include, but are not limited to: peer reviewer of journal articles or conference papers, grant application reviewing, and service on Masters and PhD committees. Some of these service activities may be seen as scholarly achievements, as well, depending on the nature and scope of work.

III. Post-Tenure Review

Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-

tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Computer and Information Science expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/VO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

Promotion to Full Professor from Associate Professor

Promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Oregon requires a record of leadership in the areas of research, teaching and service.

Research Activity

Continued development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an important factor for promotion. It is expected that the candidate is well-established and recognized to be a leader in their field of specialization. A profound, consistent research portfolio that includes significant instances of original accomplishments that are widely disseminated, cited and used, as well as a consistent record of grants for research is expected. Evidence of research recognition would include several of the following (or equivalents):

- invited addresses at important professional meetings;
- invitations to visit and present colloquia at other major institutions or research centers;
- membership on or chairing journal editorial boards or conference program committees;
- membership on influential national or international research committees;
- awards recognizing academic, research work.

The Department recognizes that a set of standardized criteria for scholarly achievement that can be applied equally to all faculty members does not exist. Every effort will be made to consider all relevant factors involved in each individual case. The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on the candidate's research field.

Evaluation of this impact will in part be based upon statements made by external referees, who are leading experts in the candidate's area of research. Both the quantity and quality of citations may also be used to evaluate research impact.

Teaching

The Department of Computer and Information Science takes seriously its educational mission and its students: both undergraduate and graduate, as well as major and non-major.

Demonstration of effective teaching is an important consideration for promotion in the Department of Computer and Information Science.

There are several ways that the Department assesses quality and effectiveness of teaching:

- *Peer evaluations.* Every other year a member of the Tenured Faculty shall visit at least one class of each Associate Professor. The visitor will review

all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of performance.

- *Student evaluations.* Every Associate Professor should collect numerical and written student evaluations for each course taught. Consistent comments in written evaluations can provide a reliable picture of the quality of teaching, as perceived by students.
- *Curricular contributions.* It is expected that the candidate has been an innovator in their own courses and has made contributions to the departmental curriculum as a whole.
- *Graduate student advising.* The candidate is expected to have had substantial direct interaction with and to have supervised successful graduate students, including doctoral students.
- *Other indications.* Awards or grants for teaching or curriculum development, design and teaching of University freshman seminars or participation in FIGs; authoring a successful textbook can be recognized as indicating a dedication to effective teaching.

Institutional and Academic Service

Faculty members play an important role in the governance of the Department and the University. The candidate is expected to have played an active role in departmental activities and to have initiated significant contributions. Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels within the framework of acceptable performance.

Nevertheless, we expect our entire senior faculty to share in the governance of the Department and to provide occasional leadership on tasks of importance to the Department. As a leader in their discipline, it is expected that the candidate will also have had the opportunity for visible service to the profession. At the University level, the candidate will have served effectively on University-wide faculty committees, representing the Department while serving the broader academic community of the University.

Flexible Application of Criteria

There is more flexibility in applying the above criteria to a candidate's case for promotion to Full Professor. Faculty legislation, adopted in 1999, revised the policy for post tenure review. It recognizes that faculty should be evaluated and rewarded for excellence in teaching, research and service, but that the emphasis in each of the three areas may change throughout a faculty member's career; thus, while the 40 : 40 :20 weighting for research:teaching:service serves as the default, the relative weighting may change for an individual faculty member as their career emphasis changes. It is important that faculty members establish agreement on the relative importance of promotion criteria as their careers develop, well prior to promotion consideration. The relevant legislative section is as follows:

"The nationally recognized criteria for obtaining indefinite tenure place approximately equal emphasis on demonstrated excellence in teaching and research, and considerably less emphasis on service. As tenured faculty progress through their careers, however, some may redirect their energies. Some may, for example, devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and University service than they did as assistant professors. Consequently, expectations for, and the goals of, individual faculty members may also change. For the purpose of post-tenure review, the fundamental criterion is demonstrated excellence in meeting the expectations and goals established jointly by the faculty member and his or her department or program."