

## Outline of P&T Procedures and Guidelines for the Department of Geological Sciences

Approved in faculty meeting of January 10, 2011

### I. Introduction

The Department of Geological Sciences strives to further the University's objectives to provide educational opportunities of high quality, to discover and disseminate knowledge through research, and to provide the State of Oregon and the broader scientific community those services that are appropriate for a university. Our primary means of achieving these objectives is by hiring the best faculty we can and holding them to very high standards. Our evaluation procedures for recommending faculty promotion and the award of tenure consider an individual's achievements and contributions in the three traditional areas of research, teaching, and service. Faculty members being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure are expected to demonstrate excellence in both teaching and research and contribute a modest amount of service, generally within the Department. Excellence in one dimension alone will not in itself be sufficient to guarantee tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members being considered for promotion to Full Professor are expected to demonstrate significant leadership capabilities through service, both within and outside the University, in addition to maintaining strong teaching and research credentials.

### II. Procedures

#### a. Preamble

This portion describes the specific promotion and tenure procedures for the Department of Geological Sciences. These procedures are consistent with the University's general procedures that are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

#### b. Compendium of Procedures

##### i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. 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 promotion and tenure 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, particularly for individuals with credit for prior service or contracts with less than full time equivalency. From that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In all 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 been offered credit for prior service at the time of hire choose not to use it, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be given secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Primary consideration will focus on work completed during the six full time (equivalent) years of service at the University of Oregon. However, the faculty member should be aware of the fact that the review process starts at the end of the fifth full time (equivalent) years of service. The University has formal 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. Additional leaves without pay may "stop the clock" if agreed to by the Candidate, Department Head, and the University and are negotiated on a case-by-case basis. 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. Faculty considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>.

### iii. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure or promotion case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the Department and, when appropriate, members of other UO (or in special cases, external) departments, research institutes or centers 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 academic institutions, but individuals from National Labs, the US Geological Survey, and similar research-oriented nonacademic institutions may also be included when appropriate. Ideally, external reviewers should be at the rank being sought in the promotion or higher, have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record, and be prominent in their field. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, research collaborators, co-PIs on grants, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers unless they are deemed to be the most suitable person to address unique questions about a particular candidate. 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 if they are willing to participate in the review process in early Summer and, if willing, are requested 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 or conducts multi-disciplinary science that involves other departments.

### v. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement by mid-summer prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments (focusing on the period under review),

current activities, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The 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 more senior colleagues.

vi. Dossier

A complete dossier is prepared by the Department Head, with the aid of the candidate and departmental office manager in the summer to early fall for review. In addition to the letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, the dossier should include: (1) a signed and dated waiver indicating the level of access to the file that the candidate will have (see below, section x); (2) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae; (3) copies of all significant publications; (4) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (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./M.S., 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) external reviewer biographies and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers; and (11) letters from the outside and, if appropriate, inside referees.

vii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure or promotion case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of faculty at the rank being sought by the candidate or higher to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of faculty members at the appropriate level in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the Department Head may select committee members from appropriate 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 must be completed sufficiently in advance of the deadline for submission of the dossier to the College for the Department Head and faculty of appropriate rank to have time to review the dossier prior to the Department meeting. It is generally made available in the Department office for review. In our Department, Associate and Full Professors and Senior Instructors vote in tenure cases, but only Full Professors and Senior Instructors 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 are tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the voting members of the Department are 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 a personal opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the Department vote. The Department Head's statement, the promotion and tenure committee report, and the recorded vote are then 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

As noted earlier, the candidate must submit a signed waiver letter 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. Letter writers will be informed of the level of access retained by the candidate. 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 elected faculty members 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, discusses the case, 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 advisory 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 elected 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. This vote is advisory to the Provost.
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 1<sup>st</sup> (or before May 1<sup>st</sup> if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15<sup>th</sup>.

### III. Guidelines

#### a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Geological Sciences. They provide a specific departmental context within the general University framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion. The Department of Geological Sciences considers excellence in research and teaching to be essential for establishing a career and achieving tenure, and thus weighs them more heavily in promotion to Associate Professor than service; a rough guideline of 40/40/20 should be a candidate's goal. At the senior level, i.e. promotion to Full Professor and subsequent post tenure reviews, significant leadership-level service is considered as important as teaching and research and may substitute to some degree for activities in the other two categories; in fact, exceptional service either within the University (such as Senate President or Associate Dean) or outside (such as Editor for a major scientific journal or President of a professional organization like GSA or AGU) is encouraged and may require a reduction of teaching or research to be negotiated with the Department Head or Dean.

#### b. Research

Faculty members in the Department of Geological Sciences are expected to establish a high quality research program and generate new knowledge in their sub-disciplines, consistent with expectations outlined on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Thus, development of a coherent program of independent, scholarly research is an absolute requirement for being recommended for promotion and the granting of tenure. The following indicators are the primary means by which scholarship is evaluated in the Department of Geological Sciences.

##### i. Impact on the Discipline

The primary criterion for evaluating a faculty member's scholarship is how significantly the research has impacted his or her discipline. Evidence of the faculty member's impact consists primarily of evaluation by leaders in the discipline external to the University of Oregon. Additional evidence includes (1) evaluation of the number, breadth, and depth of publications in highly ranked, refereed publications, (2) the faculty member's receipt of competitive, peer reviewed research grants, and (3) invitations to present results of research at scholarly meetings, discipline-specific workshops, and other universities. Other data, such as awards from professional or scholarly organizations, and citations of the candidate's work by others, may also be considered.

ii. Productivity

Faculty members are expected to develop a sustained record of contributions to the advancement of knowledge through regular publication of research results. The primary venue for publication of scholarship in our field is as scientific articles in established, peer-reviewed journals. The Department does not establish a minimum number of publications for promotion and/or tenure. Instead we rely upon external evaluations to judge a faculty member's productivity and the quality of his or her contributions relative to the norm in the sub-discipline. Additional criteria considered are the number and size of grant proposals written and awarded, the number of abstracts of research accepted for professional conferences, the number of monographs, books and book chapters published, and the number of invited scholarly presentations made. In order for a manuscript to count towards promotion it must be "in press" (or "in print", "forthcoming", "in production" or a similar category appropriate to the venue that indicates that all work by the author, including revisions, is completed) by the time the candidate meets with the Dean (see College and University procedures above).

iii. Progression

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly agenda through a program of research that is developmental and advances a field of inquiry. From this perspective, research questions are expected to demonstrate a logical and significant advancement. Perceptions from nationally recognized experts regarding the path and scope of a faculty member's research are generally used to document the faculty member's research progression. Evidence from the faculty member's personal statement is also used to determine the coherence and progression of the research agenda. We recognize that a faculty member could decide to shift the emphasis of his or her research from one direction to another during the review period if, for example, a project was completed, an experimental method failed, a working hypothesis was disproven, or simply because his or her

interests evolved. Under circumstances such as these, the candidate's explanation of the change in direction in his or her statement will be of particular importance, as will be the views of outside experts on the appropriateness and wisdom of the shift in direction.

c. Teaching

As with research, faculty members in the Department of Geological Sciences must demonstrate excellence in their teaching. We view teaching to be a complex enterprise with many components that vary in relative importance for different faculty members and sub-disciplines. Teaching encompasses much more than just the hours that faculty members spend in the classroom. Teaching also involves scholarship associated with one's field, planning both lectures and outside learning experiences, advising students and supervising the research of both undergraduate and graduate students. Our procedures for evaluating teaching can be categorized into the following four general indicators.

i. Effectiveness of Instructional Delivery Methods

Faculty members in the Department of Geological Sciences are expected to teach an average of three to four courses per academic year, with the expectation that all faculty also have significant and active research programs and graduate students to supervise. Evidence of a faculty member's effective delivery shall be gained from, but is not limited to, student and peer evaluations.

Student evaluations, both narrative and numerical, are required to assess a faculty member's pedagogical ability to (a) create a positive learning environment, (b) engage and challenge students, and (c) provide intellectual leadership. The Department of Geological Sciences uses a version of the on-line course evaluation form that contains University-wide questions and narrative statements, plus four additional questions relating to the instructor's effectiveness in challenging and interesting the student, knowledge of the subject, and quality of the assigned readings.

Instructional delivery methods are also evaluated through peer evaluations of teaching that are conducted at least once in each of the three years preceding promotion for assistant professors and at least once every other year for associate professors. These evaluations include a classroom visit as well as review of teaching materials such as class packets, syllabi, problem sets, internet resources etc. Such reviews strive to rigorously evaluate the following:

- The intellectual content of the material taught, including relevancy, breadth and depth.
- The instructor's grasp of the material; ability to present course content clearly and logically, to place specific material within thematic contexts and to demonstrate the significance and relevancy of the course content.
- The instructor's ability to engage and challenge students and to teach critical thinking and questioning skills.
- The instructor's ability to provide intellectual inspiration and leadership and to awaken new interests.
- The instructor's use of innovative approaches to teaching, and where appropriate, the use of instructional technology or other activities to enhance the learning process.
- The quality of teaching materials, including syllabi, lecture notes, handouts, laboratory exercises, homework problems and exams. These materials may be presented in the form of a teaching portfolio.

ii. Quality of Curriculum/Course Design

Faculty members are expected to develop high quality curricula and courses. Evidence of the faculty member's curriculum or course design is gained from, but is not limited to, peer evaluations and institutional or community recognition. The former should address the intellectual content of the material taught and the range and variety of course offerings, including new course design. Examples of the latter would include institutional teaching awards, competitive teaching assignments such as freshman seminars and FIGs, and utilization of instructional materials by other faculty or members of the professional community.

iii. Quality of Evaluation/Assessment of Student Learning

Faculty members are expected to implement high quality evaluation/assessment methods and tools to determine student learning. Evidence for such evaluation shall include both student and peer evaluations.

iv. Quality, Impact, and Quantity of Advising and Mentoring

Faculty members are expected to provide high quality advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research or other participatory learning experiences. The faculty member should help the student to develop research skills, including design of research questions and implementation in the form of data collection, analysis and completion in the form of a written document, and should assist in the timely completion of degree requirements. Evidence of the quality and impact of advising and mentoring may include a tabulation of thesis or

dissertation supervision, written evaluations from peer and external evaluators regarding student research, written testimony from current and former students, and evidence of student success after degree completion. An assessment is also made of the number of students that have benefited from a faculty member's advising and mentoring.

d. Service

Faculty members in the Department of Geological Sciences are expected to contribute to sustaining and enhancing the learning communities in which they work through service activities. We view this as a developmental process, beginning with minimal departmental service responsibilities in the early years of the probationary period, and increasing in importance following the granting of tenure. Untenured faculty members are expected to participate in departmental governance and share in committee work, although assessment of service contributions plays a relatively minor role in the department's evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of indefinite tenure. In contrast, the evaluation for promotion to Full Professor involves a clear demonstration of leadership in either administrative or service activities. Furthermore, this increased level of commitment to professional service should extend beyond the department to the College, University and/or professional (external) level. Evaluation of service is classified into two broad categories, internal and external:

i. Internal Service Indicators

a) Committee: Evidence of participation on committees (departmental, institute or center, college, university) as a member or chair that requires significant effort and contributes to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, institute or center, college, or university.

b) Administration: Evidence of performance of administrative or program development duties that requires substantial effort and contributes significantly to the mission, goals and objectives to the department, institute or center, College, or University.

ii. External Service Indicators

a) Service Contribution: Evidence of service contributions at the state, regional, national or international level include activities such as participating in scientific organizations (e.g., advisory panel or executive officer of agencies such as NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory panel, executive officer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).

b) Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by an association organization, agency or journal regarding service contributions.

e. Post Tenure Review and the Dynamics of Professional Careers

Faculty legislation, adopted in 1999, revised policy and procedure for post tenure review. Indirectly, this policy also speaks to promotion to full professor. It specifically 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.

UO faculty legislation requires the institution to perform periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members every three years. Any faculty member within three years of retirement or on the tenure reduction program (formally known as the 600-hour program) may choose not to undergo review. *This choice is made by the faculty member and it is important to note in this regard that a successful 6<sup>th</sup> year post-tenure review carries a salary increase that a faculty member will forgo should they opt out of the review.* The purpose of post-tenure reviews is to encourage, reward and support the continuous development of tenured faculty and to identify those who merit special recognition or need special assistance. For additional information regarding the UO Post Tenure Review policy statement see the CAS Post Tenure Review Schedule and Salary Increase guidelines and the CAS Policy for Post Tenure Review of Administrators at: [https://casweb.uoregon.edu/homeadmin/admin\\_E.htm](https://casweb.uoregon.edu/homeadmin/admin_E.htm) Follow the link to "All CAS Policies and Guidelines" and then to "Post Tenure Review". The deadline for submission of all Post Tenure Reviews to the CAS Dean's Office is mid April.

f. Evaluation and Promotion of Instructors

During the year in which an instructor will have completed 18 terms (at least 9 of which were at the UO) of an appointment of at least 0.50 FTE per term, a thorough review is conducted by the department to determine whether to recommend to the College of Arts and Sciences promotion and continuation of the appointment at the rank of senior instructor. Pursuant to OAR 580-020-0005 (2) (c) senior instructor rank may be used for the appointment or promotion of staff members who have special skills or experience needed in the instructional programs of the institution, but who would not normally be appointed or promoted to professorial ranks. Promotion to the rank of senior instructor will not be made effective before the end of the third 1.0 FTE year of service at the UO. Current UO regulations governing non-tenure track faculty promotion to the rank of senior instructor specify that this promotion will not carry indefinite tenure.

Annual reviews of tenure-track Instructors, as well as the 6th year promotion review (at 1.0 FTE, otherwise 18 terms), follow the same procedure as for Assistant Professors. The promotion and tenure review should be every bit as rigorous as for Assistant Professors, although review will be based on duties and responsibilities specific to the Candidate. The primary criterion for promotion to senior instructor and the granting of tenure is demonstrated excellence in teaching. A record of teaching effectiveness that is less than outstanding is not likely to result in recommendation for promotion. The expectations for teaching and the evaluative indicators, described above, hold for instructors as well as for professorial faculty. The Department of Geological Sciences expects instructors to also be engaged in scholarship. Such scholarship may include traditional research leading to publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals, or it may be scholarship related to the craft of teaching and involve publication of articles, books, or teaching material (e.g. lab manuals, textbooks, visual media, etc.) involving earth science education. It is also expected that instructors will be involved in departmental service.

If, based on the 6th year review, the department recommends not to promote an instructor, timely notice and a terminal appointment must be issued. Following promotion to senior instructor, the faculty member thereafter will be given at least two-year appointments.