

Department of Mathematics

Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

I. Procedures

A. 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 Mathematics are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

In this document, "Personnel Committee" refers to the committee consisting of all tenured members of the department. In cases of promotion to Full Professor, the Personnel Committee is replaced with the Senior Personnel Committee which is the committee consisting of all Full Professors in the department, even if not explicitly indicated.

Otherwise the procedures for promotion to Full Professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, except where specific differences are spelled out.

B. Department-specific Procedures

i. Annual Reviews

Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed annually in the Spring by the Department. 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. Following a review by the Head, the Head will prepare a written evaluation. A copy of this will be provided to the faculty member and within one week they will meet the Department Head to discuss the evaluation. The discussion should include a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the previous year's

progress and should include suggestions for possible improvements. Research, teaching and service, together with their relative importance to the Department, should be discussed. In addition, the timetable for tenure should be reviewed, as well as the kinds of records that the faculty member should be keeping to demonstrate accomplishments.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

Whenever an untenured faculty member requires a renewal of contract the annual review will be replaced by a Midterm Review. This usually takes place in the middle of the tenure and promotion period, so in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure. The process for this review will be the same as for the annual review, with the addition that the faculty member's documents will be reviewed and commented on by the Personnel Committee. That committee will then vote on a contract extension. 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 normally expected year for the promotion and tenure decision if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at that point. 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 whether the record merits renewing the faculty member's contract.

iii. Review for Promotion and Review

a. External Reviewers

The Department Head, in consultation with appropriate faculty, identifies at least five experts from other institutions from whom to solicit letters evaluating the work of the candidate. The candidate is not informed of the names of the external reviewers but is given the opportunity to independently request that requests be sent to specific individuals for review. When the file goes forward, it will be noted that the candidate requested these latter reviewers.

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. For promotion to Associate Professor, some referees may also be associate professors at highly regarded institutions. Because of the international nature of mathematics, it is common for many reviewers to be from institutions outside of the United States. 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.

b. 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.

c. Sample Publications

The Department Head requests the candidate to provide a copy of each of three of the candidate's scholarly articles. These may include unpublished articles. These articles will be included in the packet sent to external reviewers, either physically or electronically. It is expected that reviewers will be able to access other articles appearing on the candidate's vita either through their library or electronically.

d. Personnel Committee Meeting and Vote

The Department Head appoints a member of the Personnel Committee to act as reporter for the Personnel Committee meeting. The Personnel Committee holds a meeting early in fall term to consider promotion and tenure recommendation (or promotion for a candidate who already has tenure) for the candidate. After a thorough review and discussion of the case, the Personnel Committee (excluding the Department Head) votes by secret, signed ballot whether or not to recommend promotion with tenure (or promotion for candidates who already have tenure).

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the Department Head and 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 in the candidate's personnel file in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The appointed reporter prepares a report summarizing the discussion and evaluation by the Personnel Committee.

e. Department Head's Review

The Department Head then prepares the final tenure file for submission to the Dean of the College. This file will include, in addition to the material in the preliminary file, a summary of the Personnel Committee vote, a report from

the Committee, and a careful and thorough evaluation of the case by the Department Head.

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Mathematics. Promotion in the Department of Mathematics at the University of Oregon depends on superior scholarly activity, excellence in teaching, and satisfactory institutional and academic service.

In this section we refer to promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure as simply “tenure.” Everything here applies equally to tenure for a faculty member who is already an Associate Professor.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement indicates three areas of competence on which the institution judges faculty.

- Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship;
- Effective, stimulating teaching;
- On-going, responsible service and leadership.

Within individual departments these components may carry different weights. The proportional weights for the three components for the Department of Mathematics are 55-35-10.

The following lists these in their relative importance within the Department of Mathematics and discusses for each the criteria used in the evaluation of the faculty.

B. Research (55%)

Development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of tenure in the Department of Mathematics. Successful candidates are expected to have:

- A series of quality publications that are judged to be significant by peers at the University of Oregon and experts from other major institutions;
- A body of work in progress and a reasonable program for future work.

Although the following are not required of candidates for tenure, the case can be strengthened by:

- Advising Ph.D. students successfully to their degree;
- Invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions;
- Invitations to serve on journal editorial boards;
- Research grants from external sources;
- Participation in and/or organization of major professional conferences and workshops;
- Other scholarly activity.

The Department recognizes that standardized criteria cannot exist that will apply equally to all faculty members. Every effort will be made to consider all of the various factors involved in each individual case.

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, candidates are expected to also have

- an established international reputation in mathematical research
- Successful Ph.D. students.
- Invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions.
- Invitations to participate in major professional conferences and workshops.

The standard units of research in mathematics are articles published in refereed journals (or sometimes other refereed venues), although there are exceptions such as refereed scholarly monographs containing substantial original research.

The merit of a single article can vary considerably. Considerations such as venue of publication, influence on the field, opinions of reviewers, citations and length may be among those used to measure quality.

C. Teaching (35%)

The Department of Mathematics takes very seriously its obligation to its students, undergraduate and graduate, major and non-major. Thus, a good teaching record is a necessary condition for tenure in the Department of Mathematics.

Evaluating teaching performance is not an exact process. Nevertheless, the Department looks for several signs of good, effective teaching. Among these are the following:

- Providing an educational experience for the students beyond the routine;
- Having appropriately high expectations and teaching at a level to encourage meeting them;
- Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students.

There are several ways that the Department assesses quality of teaching.

- *Peer evaluation.* Each year a member of the Department's Teaching Effectiveness Committee will visit at least one class of each untenured faculty member. The visitor will also review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of the performance, covering all aspects of the effectiveness of the class. University regulations require that a peer evaluation of teaching be done in each of the three years preceding promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor, and every other year for associate professors until their promotion to full professor.
- *Student evaluations.* Written evaluations (in the context of numerical evaluations) often provide a very reliable picture of the quality of the teaching as perceived by the students.
- *Documentation of other contributions to the teaching mission.* There are many ways a faculty member can contribute to the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department. These include participation in curriculum development, effective work on textbook committees, advising groups like the Putnam Exam team, the use of innovative teaching strategies, one-on-one teaching such as directing reading courses and advising senior theses, and expository seminar talks such as the Basic Notions Seminar

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor have the same teaching expectations as those above, and in addition are expected to be substantively involved in the Department's graduate program. By Academic Affairs policy, each associate professor must have one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor.

D. Service (10%)

An important criterion for promotion and tenure is institutional service including Department, College, and University committees on curriculum, personnel, and policies. The faculty plays an important role in the governance of the University, and the University expects participation of its members.

The Department similarly expects such service at the departmental level. This is not meant to imply that each faculty member must contribute in some fixed proportion to institutional service or that faculty must equally share responsibilities. Untenured faculty, in particular, will generally have lighter service responsibilities than tenured faculty.

Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels from time to time 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 many other forms of scholarly and academic service the Department will consider during the tenure process. These include, but are not limited to: service on editorial boards, service as a peer reviewer of journal articles, grant applications and so forth, service on Masters and PhD committees, mathematical translations, and expository writing.

The service criteria for candidates for promotion to Full Professor are the same, with the exception that the expected level of responsibility for Departmental and University service and governance is substantially higher than for tenure. Candidates for promotion are generally expected to have demonstrated significant leadership in some aspect of the Department's undergraduate and/or graduate program. This may include course development, curriculum planning, or leadership of appropriate committees within the Department

III. 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 Department of Mathematics 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/UO 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.