

## Environmental Studies Program

### Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

#### PROCEDURES

I. 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 Environmental Studies Program are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

II. Environmental Studies Policies and Procedures

Preamble: Environmental Studies follows the policies and procedures of the College and University as established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. This section explains aspects of the process that are particular to Environmental Studies or clarifies how the CBA policy is followed. Since Environmental Studies faculty typically have split appoints with another unit, below there is a distinction made between the “primary home,” meaning the one with the majority FTE appointment, and the “secondary home,” meaning the one with the minority FTE appointment. When Environmental Studies is the secondary home, the P&T process is administered by the primary home. Environmental Studies administers cases for faculty members with a primary home in Environmental Studies. In all cases, the Environmental Studies Director will consult with the Head of the other unit to ensure consistency in application of policy and to ensure standards are appropriate for the candidate based on the candidate’s areas of scholarly focus.

a. Annual Reviews

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. The review is based on the candidate’s annual report, 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.

b. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members of both the candidate's primary and secondary homes. Each of these units then votes on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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. 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. 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 and promotion 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 the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

c. Review for Promotion and Tenure

i. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head or program director of the primary tenure home department/program will consult with members of the faculty in both the primary and secondary home units and, when appropriate, members of any UO 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.

ii. Internal Reviewers

The candidate's primary tenure home unit 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 required for candidates with a partial appointment in the Environmental Studies Program. This review is

prepared by the Director of the Environmental Studies Program in consultation with tenured Environmental Studies core faculty.

iii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head or program director of the primary tenure home unit in consultation with the head/director of the secondary home unit will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. This committee shall contain at least one core environmental studies faculty member. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department/program to constitute a personnel committee, the head/director should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the primary and secondary home units 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, an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service and contributions to equity and inclusion. The candidate's contributions to graduate advising as major advisor should be included in the description of service to the Environmental Studies Program unless it has been explicitly counted as teaching credit. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department/program regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department/program office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department/program meeting. In most departments/programs, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor. The Environmental Studies tenured core faculty will meet separately from the tenure home department faculty and vote. All tenured and tenure track faculty in Environmental Studies are eligible to vote on hiring and promotion and tenure issues related to cases of their own rank or lower. However, assistant or associate faculty may choose to not participate in consideration of promotion to the rank they currently hold.

iv. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the program will hold a meeting in early in Fall term to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. If Environmental Studies is the primary home, this meeting will happen after

the meeting of the faculty of the secondary home so that their input can be taken into consideration by Environmental Studies faculty. The head of the secondary home will write a letter for the candidate's file summarizing the discussion of the faculty, evaluating the candidate's record, and make a recommendation regarding P&T. Voting members of Environmental Studies 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). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the program director, and the core faculty 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 program director or program manager in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The program director does not vote.

v. Tenure Home Unit Head's/Director's Review

After Environmental Studies Program faculty and faculty from the partner unit vote, the head/director of the primary tenure home unit writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including 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/program vote. The unit head's/director's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is November 1.

## GUIDELINES

a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Environmental Studies Program. They provide a specific context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. Faculty with joint appointments in Environmental Studies and another department are expected to contribute to research, teaching, and service in both units. While the sum of those efforts should not exceed that expected of faculty in the department most closely associated with the candidate's research focus, the kind of research, teaching, and service expected in Environmental Studies and the partner department may vary. In general, assistant professors should focus more energy on research and teaching and less on service than associate or full

professors. For Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate with tenure, the proportional weights for evaluation of performance are 50% research, 40% teaching, and 10% service. For Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor, the proportional weights for evaluation of performance are 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Expectations for contributions to each of these areas for the portion of work done for the Environmental Studies program are described below.

b. Research

Excellence in research is required, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>.

For candidates with a split appointment with another unit, the guidelines described by the partner department will be used to assess what is meant by excellence in the field with respect to the role of books, publications, grant funding and participation in professional activities. However, while the quality of the candidate's research should be held to the same high standard of other faculty in the partner department, the scope of the candidate's work may be broader, and interdisciplinary research will be valued no less than research done wholly within the candidate's field. In fact, Environmental Studies places particular value on interdisciplinary research and collaboration across diverse fields, so work of this nature that may not fit with the standard expectations in traditional disciplines will receive special consideration in Environmental Studies.

For candidates with a sole appointment in Environmental Studies, just as with those with joint appointments, interdisciplinary research and collaboration receive special recognition, and the standards of what constitutes excellence in research will be guided by what is expected in the field that is most closely associated with the candidate's work.

The following indicators are the primary ways in which scholarship is evaluated. The quality (as measured by the peer review process, the publication venue, and the significance as judged by internal and external reviewers) of scientific publications is of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. We rely upon external evaluations to help judge a faculty member's productivity and the quality of their contributions relative to the norm in the sub-discipline. External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research in the candidate's sub-discipline is crucial; however, the Department does recognize that the average funding available in different sub-disciplines of chemistry varies. External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered. For tenure cases, we expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of

professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue. For promotion to full professor, continued professional development and leadership in the field are expected. In all cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.

A book manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production” in order for it to count towards promotion. The University defines “in production” as the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to count towards a faculty’s publications. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions or editing of any kind. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication (or equivalent evidence) is required. Generally, it is expected that the book should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the dean in order for the publications to count towards promotion.

c. Teaching

Excellence in teaching in Environmental Studies includes an ability and willingness to teach at a variety of levels from large lower division undergraduate courses to upper division undergraduate courses, to graduate core classes. Ability and willingness to teach in these areas does not require that a person teach in all of those areas in a given year, but that based on the needs of the program and the skills of the individual faculty member, teaching in all of those areas are possible.

Evidence of excellence in teaching in the classroom will be judged by a convergence of data including: peer teaching evaluations conducted by faculty, quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations, and records and course documents compiled by the faculty member including things such as syllabi, exams, course website, assignments, activities and personal statements reflecting on teaching goals and philosophies.

The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor. The Environmental Studies Program has established guidelines for Peer Reviews of Teaching.

Mentoring graduate students by serving on graduate student dissertation, thesis or project committees is a vital aspect of service in Environmental Studies and is expected of all assistant, associate and full professors with full or partial appointments in Environmental Studies. Serving as a major advisor for graduate students requires considerable time and effort and should be recognized and rewarded accordingly.

Although there is a robust advising program in Environmental Studies that gives undergraduate students guidance on requirements for the program's majors, all faculty are expected to be available to provide undergraduates with advice about career or graduate school options in normal office hour availability. In cases where mentoring goes beyond office hour visits, such as advising an honor's thesis or supporting a student on a research project, those contributions should be explicitly identified.

d. Service

While service to the department, college, university, profession, and community are essential activities for faculty members, Environmental Studies encourages its assistant professors to confine their service mainly to the Environmental Studies Program and their primary tenure home department until achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

For untenured faculty, our expectations for satisfactory service include:

- A moderated but real degree of participation on program committees (e.g., search committees, graduate admissions, graduate affairs, seminars), which usually should preclude chairing such committees or a significant number of such assignments in the pre-tenure years.
- Participation in campus committees or in building linkages to other academic units which support the interdisciplinary mission of Environmental Studies. In the pre-tenure years, this service should position the faculty member as a contributor to wider campus intellectual communities, but should not entail burdensome or time-intensive appointments.
- Participation in professional activities, including, for example, organizing panels at conferences, serving on grant review committees, participation in professional workshops, advising local, regional, and national governmental agencies, meeting with media, and undertaking editorial or review service, but not necessarily at the level of elected or appointed office on disciplinary committees or editorial boards. As with university service, these activities should help situate the faculty member as an important contributor to wider academic and non-academic communities, and help build a national and international reputation, but should not require time-intensive or significant leadership positions.



Tenured faculty are expected to assume an active role or leadership positions in the governance of Environmental Studies, in linking Environmental Studies to other campus units, in academic and professional communities beyond the UO campus, and in wider forms of community service. Expectations include:

- Active participation and leadership in program governance (including but not limited to significant contributions to and leadership on appointed committees).
  - Significant participation or leadership roles in campus committees or in building linkages to other academic units which support the interdisciplinary mission of Environmental Studies. In post-tenure years, faculty should play an active role in campus life related to environmental issues, and should help build linkages between Environmental Studies and the rest of campus.
  - Significant service to the discipline, including but not limited to participation in the organization of regional or national meetings, editorial board service, serving on grant review committees, or holding elected or appointed office in a professional organization. After tenure, such service should position the faculty member as a leader in relevant intellectual and professional communities.
  - Contributions to the local and global community represent important forms of service in Environmental Studies and are expected of senior faculty. Such service activities might include public addresses, interviews with media, presentations in schools, consulting, assistance to governments and non-governmental organizations, expert testimony, among many other activities which will vary depending on the professional expertise of the faculty member.
- e. Institutional Equity and Inclusion
- Faculty members are expected to be sensitive to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of their job performance. The candidate should include in the P&T statement a clear section addressing contributions to institutional equity and inclusion, including how consideration of these issues are incorporated in the teaching, research, service, and interactions with co-workers and students. The expectation for promotion is that the candidate demonstrates a sincere commitment to furthering institutional equity and inclusion.

## POST-TENURE REVIEW

### a. 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.

b. 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 Environmental Studies Program 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/UCO 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.