

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 Physics.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Faculty in the Department of Physics submit annual statements of professional activity which are evaluated and rated by an elected, 5-person Personnel Committee (PC). These ratings are converted to a numerical scale where 5 out of 10 is the average. The Department Head (DH) reviews these ratings and they form the basis for the determination of merit raises, if any. Untenured faculty are provided with an annual written performance evaluation by the DH that takes the PC's ratings into account. In evaluating faculty members for promotion and the granting of tenure, the Department of Physics puts primary emphasis on the individual's performance in scholarly research but also evaluates carefully the person's performance in teaching and service, both of which are also considered to be important components of a well-balanced professional portfolio.

For evaluations of teaching the department follows the university requirement that each assistant professor will have at least one peer teaching evaluation during each of the three years preceding the promotion/tenure review, and that associate professors will have peer teaching evaluations conducted for at least one course every other year.

At the mid-point of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, an untenured faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The PC and the DH independently evaluate that three-year period of performance. Subject to the approval of 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. In the case of a less than fully satisfactory review, the DH will appoint a senior faculty member to serve as an advisor in areas where the faculty member needs some improvement. The

candidate will undergo another contract renewal review again, one year later, to determine whether the deficiency has been remedied. 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.

Associate professors also undergo reviews every third year after tenure; these are conducted by the DH, with the assistance of a 3-person elected Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC). These reviews evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards promotion to full professor and offer an opportunity to address any issues that might prevent a timely promotion.

ii. Review Period

An assistant professor is normally considered for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. In general, consideration of promotion from associate professor to full professor will occur during the sixth year after the initial promotion to associate professor (with tenure). Promotion to full professor cases will be evaluated by the combined full professor membership of both the elected PC and the elected PTRC. If that evaluation is favorable the DH will move ahead to solicit external letters for that case. If the evaluation is unfavorable, the DH will discuss the situation with the candidate and the evaluation committee and take the appropriate next step. If the outcome is a normal sixth-year post-tenure review, this will be conducted by the PTRC which will have access to the evaluation committee's report.

A review earlier than within the sixth year 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. In cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon in the offer letter, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full 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 DH 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 a tenure or promotion case is to be considered, the DH will consult with those department faculty who are most knowledgeable about the specific tenure or promotion case in order to prepare a list of external referees who will be asked to evaluate the research record of the candidate. In addition, the DH may also consult with members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated to supplement that list. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the DH. These processes must be independent. External reviewers are selected from comparable or more highly regarded institutions, occasionally, in our case, including non-academic institutions such as national laboratories. . Ideally, they should be at an academic rank above or at least comparable to the candidate's. The majority of the submitted letters must come from the DH's list of recommended reviewers. There must be at least five external letters in the submitted file. External reviewers are 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 scholarship, teaching or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. The DH and the candidate will discuss what input the institute should have. Normally, the DH will ask the center or institute director to make a written recommendation on the case, based on input from the tenured faculty in the institute.

v. Candidate's Statement

The candidate for tenure or promotion is required to prepare a personal statement, along the recommended university guidelines, in the spring term prior to the tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. 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 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 other departmental colleagues that have already gone through this process.

vi. Dossier

A complete dossier should include the following elements:

- (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae;
- (2) letters from external reviewers;
- (3) letters from internal reviewers, including one from the candidate's research center/institute director (when appropriate);
- (4) copies (or web links to copies) of all significant publications;
- (5) a signed and dated candidate's statement;
- (6) a list of courses taught by term with enrollments and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the registrar;
- (7) syllabi and other course materials;
- (8) a list of all Ph.D., M.A./M.S., and undergraduate honors theses supervised, with an indication of whether the candidate was the primary advisor or a committee member;
- (9) signed student evaluations and comments;
- (10) peer teaching evaluations;
- (11) biographical sketches of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship (e.g., collaborations, mentorship arrangements, etc.) between the candidate and any of the reviewers;
- (12) a signed waiver indicating the degree to which the candidate has retained access to their file (this will be shared with referees)

vii. Departmental Colloquium

Candidates for tenure or/and promotion to full or associate professor, will normally be required to give a departmental colloquium, shortly before the departmental evaluation of their case, which will highlight their research accomplishments and future directions. The DH should ensure that any relevant center/institute directors are informed about the candidate's colloquium.

viii. Personnel Committee Evaluation and Report

During the fall term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure file must be submitted, the PC will be charged with submitting a written report to the DH containing the initial evaluation of the candidate's case for promotion. This report must conclude with a recommendation regarding tenure and promotion.

ix. Department Meeting and Vote

The Department will hold a meeting, generally in mid- to late October, to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Attendance of this meeting is restricted to tenured faculty in tenure cases, and to faculty who hold at least the rank the candidate is being considered for in cases that involve promotion only. Emeriti and senior instructors within the Department of Physics who fulfill these requirements are welcome to be part of the discussion and to act as consultants, but they are not to partake in the formal vote. 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 for assistant professors or promotion for associate professors. The DH tallies the votes and informs the voting members of the final vote. The anonymity of the individual votes is maintained and the department will archive the signed ballots in a sealed envelope.

x. Department Head's Review

After the departmental vote, the DH writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process and a discussion of any field-specific evaluation criteria, including the importance of books versus journal articles, the extent of co-authorship, the significance of the order of names on publications, etc. The DH is also free to offer an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The DH's statement, the PC report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the overall dossier which is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) prior to the required deadline.

xi. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The access of candidates to material in their own file is governed by state law and university policy. A complete description can be found on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>.

xii. College and University Procedures

These procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>.

II. Guidelines

a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Physics. 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 Physics judges all promotion and tenure cases on the basis of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The research programs of our department have national and international impact and competitiveness. Our teaching program provides excellent instruction to our undergraduate and graduate students and it also involves innovative course development. Faculty in the Department of Physics are expected to make distinguished contributions in service to the department, the university, and the external scientific community.

b. Research

As a research intensive department, we place great emphasis on the scientific research of the faculty member, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>, except in cases where the nature and intent of the appointment precludes major research activities. The quality (as measured by the peer review process) and number of scientific publications are of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. Publications, including journal articles, book chapters, and books, must have been accepted for publication to count for promotion. External funding and graduate student support are normally an expected part of the tenure and promotion portfolio of the candidate. External evidence of national and international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, invited talks, and participation in conferences and workshops are among the factors considered. Strong accomplishments in the area of research are a necessary condition for a positive recommendation at all levels of the promotion process within the department. 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 a promotion to full professor, continued professional development and leadership in the field are expected. Some experience in successfully mentoring Ph.D. students is normally expected for successful promotion to associate and full professor. In both cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.

c. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is another integral aspect of the evaluation for promotion and tenure. The department expects all faculty to spend a significant fraction of their time on teaching-related activities, and to strive for excellence in this area.

Teaching is evaluated on the basis of material provided by the candidate (syllabi, web pages, exams, and any other relevant material), student evaluations, and peer evaluations. All faculty are normally expected to be able to teach effectively at all levels and across our curriculum, though individual aspects such as research specialty are taken into account, particularly in courses taught at the graduate level. Other important elements of the candidate's teaching portfolio include a) individual instruction of undergraduate students in terms of thesis supervision, specialized research, or reading courses, b) the development of new, innovative courses that help broaden the undergraduate and graduate physics curriculum, and c) authoring and publication of new textbooks and other course media, for example, electronic tools, simulations, and demonstrations, that support and augment course work.

d. Service

The degree to which service is considered depends on the rank of the candidate, although a certain amount of service is expected from all candidates. For tenure consideration, usually with promotion to associate professor, substantial service activity within the department is expected and service activity at the university level is encouraged though not required. For promotion to full professor, extensive service within the department and the university, as well as within the candidate's scientific community, is expected. Other scientific activities not directly related to the faculty member's research and teaching activities, such as public science outreach and public lectures, are also considered under service.