

P&T Procedures and Guidelines – Department of Geography
Adopted May 05, 2011

I. Procedures

a. Preamble

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website

<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

Below are specific procedures for the Department of Geography.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head, in consultation with the department personnel committee. These 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. 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.

ii. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In all other cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the department head who may also consult with the dean and the provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

iii. 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 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. 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. Generally, 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. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department’s list of recommended external referees overlaps with

the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

iv. 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.

v. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

vi. Dossier

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate's dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, "forthcoming" or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications; "forthcoming" work may also be included (an unpublished work may be described on the c.v. as "forthcoming" if it has been accepted and is in production; there must be written affirmation [may be

email] from the editor of a press for a book, an editor of a journal for an article, and a book editor for a book chapter, as to the full acceptance of a contribution and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

vii. 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 will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head 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 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 generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In the Department of Geography, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

viii. 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). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the department head or head of the personnel committee, and 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 department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost.

ix. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head 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 vote. The department head'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 generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

x. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the dean's review after the meeting with the dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

xi. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the

candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the dean.

2. After the file leaves the DAC, the dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the provost's office. The provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

II. Guidelines

a. Preamble

Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure in the Department of Geography at the University of Oregon is contingent upon the establishment of a significant and progressive research program, a strong teaching record, and satisfactory departmental and institutional service. Subsequent promotion to the rank of professor

is dependent on the maturation of those research and teaching programs and also requires contributions to the maintenance and governance of the department and university, and when appropriate, to the discipline.

The department's requirements are generally similar to University and College of Arts and Sciences requirements and recognize that the diversity of scholarly activity within the discipline makes it difficult to propose a specific list of requirements for junior faculty that, when completed, would assure promotion and tenure.

This document outlines the guidelines for promotion and tenure within the department and describes how the departmental requirements are related to the general UO requirements for advancement. In addition, a description is provided of the relationship between the variety of scholarly activities pursued by geographers and the criteria used by the university for the evaluation of scholarship.

b. Research

Geography is, by its nature, interdisciplinary and composed of several major subdisciplines as well as more-focused specialties. Each subdiscipline and specialty has a potentially distinct set of scholarly products and aspirations. Consequently, individual geographers may produce bodies of scholarly work that differ substantially one from another. At the UO, individual faculty members have research and teaching interests that fall in the major subdisciplinary units of physical geography, human geography, geographic information science, and geographic education.

- *Physical geography* emphasizes the spatial and temporal variations of the physical elements and processes that make up the environment: climate, water, landforms, soils, animals and plants, and human impacts. Physical geographers typically publish in specialty journals, the majority of which are outside of the discipline, and rarely are junior faculty members the authors of books or monographs. Research in physical geography typically involves the substantial use of field, laboratory, and data-analytical methods, and when appropriate, requires external research support. Peer-reviewed articles in important journals or edited volumes are widely viewed by physical geographers as the appropriate method for distributing new information.
- *Human geography* emphasizes the temporal and spatial character of human activities and their underlying social and cultural processes, the relationship of people to place, the landscapes produced by human activity, and the impacts of humans on the physical environment. Scholarly output for human geographers can range from the production of a book or monograph to peer-reviewed journal articles to some combination of the two. Research in human geography typically involves either field work or work with textual sources, but methodological or theoretical contributions are appropriate as well. In some cases, external

funding may be required to support research activities. Human geographers writing journal articles often publish much of their work in disciplinary journals, but extra-disciplinary publication is acceptable and encouraged, where appropriate.

- *Geographic information science* is the subfield of the discipline that embraces the nature, representation, acquisition, management, display, and analysis of geospatial data. Because of the emerging nature of this part of the discipline, development of teaching materials and advancement of curricular matters in GIScience are also of academic importance. Scholarly output may include the presentation of theoretical and methodological advancements in geographic techniques, and publication of maps or compilations of maps in paper or as on-line atlases. External funding may be necessary to support these activities. Although a number of publication formats are recognized (chapters in edited volumes, on-line journals, CD-ROMs, and books), peer-reviewed articles in journals both within geography and in related disciplines are generally recognized as the primary medium for reporting the results of research.
- *Geographic education* is a subfield of the discipline that emphasizes the application of educational theory to classroom practice. Research focuses on understanding and improving the processes of learning and teaching geography at all levels of instruction. Scholarly output in geographic education may include peer-reviewed journal articles and monographs, but also textbooks and original materials that support instruction, such as electronic media and curricular packages. External support may be required to help implement innovative educational programs and learning activities.

A standard form of scholarly output that is common to all subdisciplines and specialties within geography is the single- or lead-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume. Single or lead-authored books or monographs that present the author's original research are also a form of scholarly output in geography. These types of publication are highly valued within the discipline and are also a measure of achievement that can be recognized by colleagues in other disciplines within the university. Consequently, such forms should be a component of the evidence of scholarly work presented by a faculty member at the time of evaluation for promotion and tenure.

A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and "in production" in order for it to count towards promotion. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. The associate provost 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. 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 fully towards promotion.

The general criterion for evaluation of the research program is the production of original research that is recognized as significant by a scholar’s peers. There are several other more specific criteria that are also important. The UO criteria that are most relevant to evaluation within the Department of Geography are:

- publications of significance and quality; and
- research in progress and substantially planned work.

Of secondary importance, and mainly for the evaluation of promotion from associate to full professor, are:

- participation in conferences, conventions, seminars and professional meetings; holding office and serving on committees of relevant professional organizations; serving on the editorial boards of relevant journals; acting as a reviewer of peer-reviewed articles and grant proposals within one’s area of expertise; and
- recognized evidence of scholarship, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the re-publication of work.

The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor with indefinite tenure is the establishment of a significant research *program*, distinct from unrelated research *projects*. Scholarly contributions are evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field (for example, work that opens new lines of investigation), and future promise. The work needs to be programmatic or progressive. Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion would be a series of publications or a monograph that illustrates the development of a coherent research theme or themes. This theme would be recognized as significant by peers and external referees and would tend to be identified with the faculty member being evaluated if continued over time. The specific aspects of the scholarly work that peers and referees may regard as significant will of course vary from scholar to scholar but could include the development of a perspective or approach that represents an advancement from that used in dissertation work, and through citation can be seen to be contributing to the overall advancement of the field.

For promotion from associate to full professor, maturation of the research program is required. Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion could include a continued stream of publications, a second monograph, or other longer scholarly work, that builds on the work begun prior to promotion to Associate Professor, or that represents the development of a secondary research focus. The research program should be recognizable by peers and referees as being identified with the scholar.

At all levels, a strong indicator of perceived quality of the research program is provided by externally funded research support. However, not all specialties within geography require external funding, and the resources available are not equally distributed across the discipline. Consequently, we do not have an explicit requirement for external funding of research, but recognize its desirability *where appropriate*.

c. Teaching

All faculty are expected to maintain strong and continuously developing teaching programs, that include course offerings across different levels from introductory to upper-division to seminars, and the supervision of graduate-student research. The UO criteria most relevant for evaluating the teaching program include:

- classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation;
- supervision of student research; and
- academic advising, consultation, and informal teaching.

In addition, faculty members are encouraged to make contributions to the definition of educational objectives and the development of teaching and evaluative materials that reflect current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory. However, we recognize that there is considerable variability across the discipline in the availability of resources and in the development of educational theory.

All faculty are expected to contribute both to the core of the department's curriculum, as well as to the parts of it that are related to a faculty member's specific research focus. In addition, all faculty are expected to make contributions (as appropriate relative to committee assignments) to student advising at all levels. For promotion from assistant to associate professor, we expect faculty members to have adopted or developed a small number of courses in a particular specialty or theme (in addition to helping support the core curriculum) and to be actively advising graduate students. At all ranks, we consider it mandatory that courses continuously evolve in terms of the materials that are presented and the methods appropriate for presenting them.

In assessing teaching performance, peer evaluations are of considerable importance. Consideration will also be given to numerical and written student evaluations, but it is recognized that different types and levels of courses are likely to be evaluated differentially. In assessing teaching, strong performance or improvement over time is viewed particularly positively. 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.

d. Service

The general criterion used in evaluations of the service contribution of faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure is the satisfactory participation in departmental maintenance, university governance, and academic infrastructure building. The specific level of service activities is determined by the rank of the faculty member. The specific UO criteria we emphasize include participation in:

- departmental administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities;
- college or school administration and committees or activities; and
- university or state system administration and committees or activities.

Where appropriate, a faculty member may also be credited with providing:

- academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university; or
- academic service on behalf of public bodies.

We expect faculty members to make appropriate contributions to the maintenance and development of their academic communities. In common with many other departments and programs, our intention is to limit the service loads of junior faculty as much as possible. However, the department's role in several interdepartmental programs on campus sometimes makes it difficult to control demands placed on faculty members from sources outside of our department.

The specific criteria we use to determine whether satisfactory service contributions have been made is based on consideration of typical profiles of faculty at different ranks. For promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure, satisfactory performance would include:

- participation on departmental committees (e.g., search committees, graduate admissions, undergraduate advising), but probably not administrating ("chairing") such committees in the first few years;
- participation on committees of university interdepartmental committees where appropriate; and

- participation in professional activities, including, for example, the organization of sessions at meetings and the completion of editorial and review service, but not necessarily at the level of elective or appointed office on disciplinary committees or editorial boards.

For promotion from associate to full professor, satisfactory performance would include:

- administration of a major departmental committee, such as a search, graduate admissions, personnel committee, or service as the graduate or undergraduate advisor;
- participation in general university governance, with some form of elective office (e.g., University Senate or Graduate Council) being desirable, or participation in the administration of an interdepartmental program; and
 - i. administration of a major departmental committee, such as a search, graduate admissions, personnel committee, or service as the graduate or undergraduate advisor;
 - ii. participation in general university governance, with some form of elective office (e.g., University Senate or Graduate Council) being desirable, or participation in the administration of an interdepartmental program; and
 - iii. significant service to the discipline, including the organization of regional or national meetings, editorial board service, or holding elective or appointed office in a professional organization.