

**School of Planning, Public Policy and Management**

**Criteria for the Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty for Retention, Tenure and Promotion**

**Policy Revision Approved by PPPM Faculty: June 8, 2018**

**Final Revision Approved by the Office of the Provost: July 26, 2018**

**Introduction**

The School of Planning, Public Policy and Management (PPPM) is concerned with creating and disseminating knowledge, educating graduate and undergraduate students, and improving the human condition through teaching, research, and applied practice. The school's concerns are the issues of the day and the emerging problems of tomorrow. Its approach is action-oriented, interdisciplinary, and solution-focused. PPPM faculty members have interests and expertise in a broad range of planning, policy, and management areas.

The School of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon is home to three master's degree programs and an undergraduate program. The master of community and regional planning is accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board and the master of public administration is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. There is no accrediting body or procedure applicable to the master of nonprofit management as of 2015, but may be one in the future.

The School of PPPM endorses the general university criteria of excellence in 1) teaching; 2) research; and 3) service. This document interprets and extends these criteria to assist PPPM faculty in understanding what evidence of achievement is important to the school and the university. Further, this document provides guidance to those outside PPPM responsible for making promotion and tenure recommendations and decisions.

PPPM faculty members will be evaluated for promotion and tenure based on their achievements in teaching, scholarship, administrative and professional service, and public service. The statement must also include discussion of the candidate's contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. Note that in PPPM, we place a particular emphasis on service to the broader public as part of our service commitment. This document describes the school's criteria for evaluating the above areas for promotion and tenure. Although we list the criteria for evaluation separately, the school believes that they are interrelated and mutually supporting activities. For instance, public service activities can lead to important research opportunities, students learn when involved with faculty research or public service activities, etc.

While the school recognizes that during any particular time an individual may be more productive in one area compared to others, the goal is for each faculty member to provide a balanced contribution to

teaching, scholarship, administrative and professional service, and public service. For tenure track faculty, as a guide for the allocation of time and resources in attaining tenure, these areas are roughly weighted as follows: teaching (40%), research and scholarship (40%), and administrative, professional and public service (20%). For tenured faculty, the service component may be of greater importance.

This document applies to the tenure-track and tenured 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. PPPM faculty members who are not tenure-related are not covered by this document.

## A. Criteria for Evaluation

1. **Teaching.** Teaching that meets or exceeds expectations is defined by evidence that students are engaged in the learning process and are gaining knowledge and skills. Such teaching stimulates student interest and motivates students to perform high-quality work. Meeting expectations in teaching includes the ability to teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels where the teacher is intellectually engaged in the content of their teaching and are skilled in teaching techniques. Classroom teaching that meets expectations includes keeping course materials current, clearly defining educational objectives and evaluation criteria for students, and using sound pedagogical approaches. Teaching activities extend beyond the classroom and include academic advising, the supervision of student research, the supervision of student field work, and mentoring.

Evidence for the effectiveness of teaching includes:

- reports from peer reviewers (classroom observers)
- student evaluations (letters, written comments, and ratings)
- the quantity, quality and breadth of student research that the faculty member supervises
- the quality of syllabi and teaching materials
- the accomplishments of students once they leave the University
- measures of student learning and/or achievement
- availability for formal and informal student advising by being present and engaged in school activities and daily workflow
- assisting students with external projects
- high-quality, applied, real-world projects

2. **Research and Scholarship.** Research and scholarship are defined as creating and disseminating new knowledge in the fields of planning, public policy, and management. High quality scholarship makes a significant contribution to the knowledge base that informs policy, practice, teaching, and/or research in the field. Faculty members are expected to produce a body of work that reflects a defined and coherent research focus. Normal expectations for a faculty member are to produce, on average, one to two refereed journal articles per year while at the University of Oregon and to have in the range of 6-10 journal articles when reviewed for tenure and promotion. There is a further expectation that at least

some of these articles will be published in the most highly regarded peer-reviewed journals in the field.

Other evidence for the quality of research includes:

- peer-reviewed books
- the number of times the faculty member's work is cited by other researchers grant awards
- grant awards, including externally funded research and curricular projects
- special awards and recognition
- invited book chapters

As PPPM is home to applied disciplines, the dissemination of research and our public role in providing commentary and analysis are other indicators of scholarly impact and significance. While refereed publications tend to be the primary avenue for demonstrating research quality, impact and significance may be demonstrated by activities such as:

- presentations at key professional and or academic meetings, including main conferences in the disciplines of planning, public policy/administration, and nonprofit management, as appropriate to the main degree program which the faculty member serves
- invited presentations
- book reviews, commentaries, or editorials in professional publications

### 3. Service.

- a. **Administrative and Professional Service.** Administrative service is the contribution faculty members make to the governance of the university, the school, the college and centers, institutes, and other institutionally recognized initiatives. PPPM's size and breadth of programming, and the highly applied nature of its degree programs, necessitates tenure-track faculty to be actively engaged and present in the day-to-day activities of running the school and its academic programs. This includes service on standing committees (e.g., the curriculum committee) as well as appointed, elected, and special ad hoc committees. For untenured faculty members, the expectation for administrative service is modest. Assistant professors are typically expected to serve on one school committee and one college or university committee per year. After tenure the expectations for administrative service increase. Faculty members at all ranks should demonstrate efforts to make PPPM an inclusive and equitable place for fellow faculty members, staff members, students, and visitors.

Professional service refers to the contributions that faculty members make to the governance of the professional societies to which they belong and to the larger profession. Examples of professional service include:

- serving as a peer reviewer for a journal
- serving on a journal editorial board
- reviewing grant proposals
- doing site visits for professional program accreditation

- serving on committees

**b. Public Service.** Public service refers to the application of professional skills and knowledge to benefit communities and organizations. High-quality public service advances knowledge and innovative practice, and should be documented. Examples include:

- work with a community organization or planning agency to address a pressing problem or issue
- collaboration with a civic agency as a partner in planning, implementation, or evaluation of a program
- training of citizens or professionals in order to build capacity
- development and dissemination of professional knowledge in ways that make it more understandable and accessible to professionals and citizens
- assistance to community groups, such as data analysis, problem solving, program evaluation, or needs assessment
- serving on public boards and advisory committees
- newspaper editorials, guest columns, or media interviews that disseminate knowledge to non-academic audiences
- writing and disseminating research reports for external audiences (policy makers, practitioners)

## **B. Preparation for Review**

Preparation for tenure and promotion reviews shall begin in the spring prior to the year in which the review will take place. Preparation for annual and reappointment reviews shall begin at the start of the academic year.

1. The school head will make public the names of those to be reviewed.
2. Requisite materials to be supplied by faculty prior to evaluation are fully described on the Office of Academic Affairs website. These items include:
  - a) A *curriculum vitae*, including a summary of education, experience, honors, public and University service, and a bibliography; signed and dated in upper right corner;
  - b) A personal statement outlining the faculty member's scholarly and pedagogical accomplishments, goals, and plans, signed and dated in upper right corner;
  - c) Copies of all publications and other writings, including those accepted for publication, working papers, grant proposals currently under review, and reports of service, separated into peer-reviewed and non peer-reviewed publications.
3. The school will work with the candidate to help compile course evaluations, peer evaluations, list of

student theses or terminal projects when faculty member served as committee chair or member, and syllabi.

### **C. Annual Review of Non-Tenured Faculty**

The goal of the annual review of non-tenured faculty is to facilitate faculty development and progress toward promotion and tenure according to the criteria specified under A.

1. This review will be the responsibility of the school head and will provide the faculty member with a frank appraisal of accomplishments and identify areas of work needing additional attention.
2. 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.
3. The school head's evaluation will be prepared in writing and the evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member. The faculty member will acknowledge this discussion has occurred by signing the review. The faculty member has the right to review all material in her or his file unless she or he waives that right in writing.
4. The faculty member has the right and responsibility to submit a written reply to any aspect of the evaluation that she or he believes to be inaccurate. That reply will be included without further comment in the materials forwarded to the Dean.
5. The annual review will take place in the spring term of each academic year and be completed by June 15.

### **D. Review of Non-tenured Faculty Being Considered for Reappointment**

The reappointment review is important for both the faculty member and the school. It should provide concrete and specific feedback that can be used both to assess whether a contract should be renewed and progress that is being made toward achieving standards for promotion and tenure.

1. The review of a non-tenured faculty member being considered for reappointment to an additional fixed-term contract will be conducted by a committee composed of three tenured PPPM faculty members, who are not the school head. Under special circumstances and with the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, the school head may appoint committee members from an instructional unit other than PPPM or faculty from another university. The committee will be appointed by the school head. The faculty member under review will be consulted regarding the

composition of the committee and has the right to veto one of the committee members suggested by the school head.

2. The chair of the committee will be selected by the committee members.
3. The evaluation and recommendations of the committee will be submitted in writing to the school head, along with all supporting letters and documents and a summary of the committee's vote. The school head will meet with the chair of the committee to discuss the recommendations.
4. The chair of the committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the committee's findings and recommendations. If the faculty member disagrees with the findings and recommendations she or he has the right to respond in writing and this response will be submitted with the committee's report.
5. The committee's findings and recommendations, the materials on which they are based, and any additional statement by the faculty member will be reviewed by the tenured faculty in the school and discussion at a meeting. This body will vote on those recommendations by signed ballot. (Faculty members who are eligible to vote but are not present at the meeting may also submit their vote by signed ballot.)
6. The school head will summarize the recommendations of the committee and the vote of the faculty in a letter to the dean and provide a copy of the letter to the faculty member.
7. When a faculty member disagrees with the decision of the voting faculty, she or he has the right to make a written appeal to the school head. Whenever such an appeal is submitted it will be the school head's responsibility to reconsider the work of the committee and the decision of the voting faculty, collect additional information, and write a separate opinion.
8. The faculty member has the right to appeal all recommendations with which she or he disagrees to the dean. Such appeals will be in writing and will be forwarded to the dean without further comment.
9. Reviews for reappointment to fixed-term contracts shall be completed in accordance with university time schedules for such reviews.

#### **E. Review of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure**

The material below outlines the process within PPPM that is used to prepare a file for submission to the College of Design Faculty Personnel Committee and dean. Complete details on University procedures for review for promotion and tenure may be found on the Office of Academic Affairs website.

1. The review committee for a faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion will consist of three tenured faculty members from PPPM or one member may be from another instructional unit of the university. With the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, a person from the larger professional community may be added to the committee. The committee will be appointed by the school head. The school head will inform the faculty member regarding the composition of the committee. The faculty member has the right to veto one of the committee members suggested by the school head.
2. The chair of the committee will be selected by the committee members.
3. The committee will solicit letters from experts in the faculty member's field of scholarly expertise who are external to the university. The faculty member may provide a list of suggested reviewers, from which one or two may be selected. In all cases, the majority of reviewers must be selected by the school committee, not the candidate.
4. The committee will review all of the material submitted by the candidate and external review letters solicited by the committee. The committee will write a report that summarizes and evaluates this material and presents its own recommendation regarding the faculty member's promotion and tenure. The evaluation and recommendation of the committee will be submitted in writing to the school head, along with all supporting letters and documents and a breakdown of the committee's vote. The school head will meet with the chair of the committee to discuss the recommendations.
5. The committee's findings and recommendations, the materials on which they are based, and any additional statement by the faculty member will be reviewed by the tenured faculty in the school and discussed at a meeting of the tenured faculty. This body will vote on those recommendations by signed ballot. (Faculty members who are eligible to vote but are not present at the meeting may also submit their vote by signed ballot.)
6. The school head shall prepare his or her own evaluation of the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. This report will summarize the findings of the school review committee and the comments of the external reviewers, the school faculty, and others. This summary of the materials presented in the case shall consider teaching, research, and service separately and should cite appropriate evidence from the file. The school head's report must also clearly state the school head's own evaluation of performance in each area, including strengths and weaknesses of the case for each area. The report should conclude with a direct and specific recommendation regarding disposition of the case.
7. Reviews for promotion and tenure shall be completed in accordance with University time schedules for such reviews.

**F. Post-Tenure Review of Faculty**

The university provides for a comprehensive post-tenure review of its faculty every three years to encourage, to reward, and to support the continuous development of tenured members of the faculty, and through the process of peer review to identify faculty members who merit special recognition or need special assistance. The university specifies that two levels of regular, developmental review are required of all tenured faculty: a substantive review at the three-year point after a prior major review or after promotion and a major review every six years after a prior major review or after being promoted or receiving tenure. The major six-year review will be the same as the review for reappointment described in D above with the following exceptions:

1. The review committee will consist of at least two tenured members of the PPPM faculty, one of whom will chair the committee, and may include one tenured member of another instructional unit of the university. In cases where the school cannot provide an adequate number of tenured or senior faculty, the school Head or Dean will appoint an appropriate committee. With the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, a professional from outside the university and/or a pre-tenure faculty member may be added to the committee.
2. A development plan is required for faculty who do not meet expectations in one or more area (i.e. research, teaching, and service). The plan will address the areas where expectations have not been met and will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the school 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. The plan should include benchmarks for improvement such that successfully meeting the expectations of the plan will also count as meeting expectations in that area for the next review. Note that if the improvement marked by the plan does not yet meet the expectations for the area, then the plan (or a revised one) will be required. Also note that progress toward meeting the goals of a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.
3. In the case of a promotion to Full Professor, the process will follow the University Procedures for review and promotion. The school Head and/or Dean will work with the school to appoint an appropriate committee and design a process that is suitable for the candidate being considered.

For promotion to full professor, candidates are expected to have produced a body of research (refereed journal articles, books, grant funding, etc.) that shows national or international prominence in their fields. Candidates must also at least meet the teaching expectations defined above in section A (above). Consistent with Article 20, section 22 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, candidates for promotion to full professor must have engaged in significant service demonstrating leadership and commitment both within and outside the candidate's unit. This service often takes the role of directing a degree program, directing a large project providing



important benefits to the school and/or university, serving as school head, serving in another important leadership role in the school, serving in an important leadership role in the university, or serving in an important leadership role in the external profession.

Faculty considered for any post-tenure reviews will consider the work of the faculty member in light of the balance of activities established in the tenure-track professional responsibilities policy (usually 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service).

For 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews and 6<sup>th</sup> year post-tenure reviews where faculty members are not considered for promotion will recognize that the focus of a faculty member's professional activities may shift over time. The nationally recognized criteria for obtaining indefinite tenure place approximately equal emphasis on demonstrated excellence in teaching and research, and considerably less emphasis on service. As tenured faculty progress through their careers, however, some may redirect their energies. Some may, for example, devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and University service than they did as assistant professors. Consequently, the expectations for, and the goals of, individual faculty members may also change. If that is the case and if the shift in balance is consistent with the unit and college's needs, a different balance of activities may be established by a written agreement between the faculty member and the unit and approved by the appropriate dean.