

**Department of Sociology  
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 Sociology are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

The first section of this document summarizes procedures in the Department of Sociology governing promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure and promotion. Procedures for promotion to Full Professor are the same unless otherwise specified. The second section of this document, entitled "Guidelines," outlines general criteria for promotions.

B. Department-Specific Procedures

i. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted 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 way. 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, service, and contributions to equity and inclusion (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who lack prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review, involving a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members of the Department. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. A fully satisfactory review, indicating

that the faculty member is on track towards tenure and promotion, 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 tenure and promotion 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 tenure and promotion 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.

iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

a. External Reviewers

The department head will prepare a list of qualified external reviewers with input from the review committee, other faculty members in the department, and, as appropriate, members of any other department, program, or research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated. Subsequently and independently, the department head will ask the candidate to submit a list of potential external referees. The candidate is not required to proffer a list of potential reviewers. The candidate may also indicate potentially objectionable reviewers. The department head will recruit external reviewers from these lists and provide them with the candidate's signed and dated curriculum vitae, signed and dated personal statement, and scholarship portfolio, as well as the department's criteria for promotion and tenure.

External reviewers should generally occupy positions in comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, coauthors, 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. 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, in consultation with the candidate, appoint a three-person promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. For promotion to Full Professor, the committee will comprise Full Professors only. If there is an insufficient number of faculty of appropriate rank 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 Divisional Dean.

This committee is charged with:

1. advising the Department Head on the selection of external reviewers (see item iii above),
2. ensuring the completeness of the candidate's dossier,
3. submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion, and

4. recommending a decision to the Department based on their evaluation.

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 quantitative student evaluation scores, qualitative students' 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.

- d. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department Head will call a meeting in mid-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), following procedures outlined in the department's Internal Governance Policy. In the Sociology department, all tenure-related faculty may vote in tenure and promotion cases.

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Office Manager, 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 by the Office Manager in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost.

The Department Head does not vote at this stage.

- e. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes their own opinion in a separate statement, which may include a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles, extent of coauthorship, significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The Department Head's opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure may or may not agree with the department vote.

## II. Guidelines

### A. Preamble

These guidelines outline the general criteria governing tenure and promotion decisions in the UO Department of Sociology. They provide a specific departmental context within the general University framework for decisions governing promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure and governing promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

### B. General Criteria Governing Particular Promotions and Reviews

To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the Sociology Department requires that a candidate's record, taken as a whole, demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and service. The proportional weights given to each of these elements are as follows: 50% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 10% service.

- i. Research

Excellence in research is required. A crucial aspect of the departmental assessment of a candidate's research is the evaluations and recommendations of the external reviewers. The

department will evaluate a candidate's research using the following criteria: (1) its quality (the importance of the issues being addressed, and the findings and conclusions reached); (2) its impact (the reception the candidate's scholarship has been given by relevant academic and scientific communities); and (3) its quantity (the amount of published scholarly output.) Among indicators of quality and impact are the citation record, the status and readership within sociology, a sub-discipline or neighboring professions of the journals in which the material has been published, or of the presses by which books have been published.

The department considers all refereed publication outlets (article, book chapter, or book manuscript) to be valuable scholarly contributions, but also recognizes that certain non-refereed publications can be demonstrated by the candidate to be equivalent in quality to those published in the prestigious refereed outlets. The department also recognizes that it is often quite difficult, if not impossible, to discern whether book chapters are truly subject to "blind" review, and therefore may rely upon other indicators of quality in such instances.

The University requires such a manuscript to be "forthcoming" or "in production" (also called "in press") in order to count toward a faculty's publication record for promotion. "Forthcoming" means that the manuscript is complete (i.e., no revisions required) and has been accepted by a publisher for publication. "In production" means that is ready to be printed, i.e., the author has reviewed page proofs, returned them to the publisher, and no further editing of any kind is needed by the author. Each "forthcoming" or "in production" publication should have letter to this effect from the editor of the publishing house, the journal editor, or the person compiling the volume of essays.

External grant funding is also considered quite meritorious, but is not required for promotion and/or tenure. Conference attendance and other professional activities are valued for their professional regard and their contribution to subsequent research publications.

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.

## ii. Teaching

All dimensions of teaching are important, and multiple, convergent evaluations are essential in order to assess excellent performance in teaching. Excellence in teaching may be defined as the process by which instructors' attributes and teaching techniques motivate students to learn in ways that substantially and positively influence how they think, act, and feel. Excellent teachers possess subject-matter expertise, use appropriate pedagogical techniques, communicate effectively, are student centered, and assess students systematically.

The indicators of quality of teaching, in no particular order, include:

1. Quantitative summaries of class evaluations. The department requires that all classes be evaluated every term, and the record should therefore reflect all classes taught by a candidate during the relevant period.

2. Qualitative student evaluations. The department must maintain all non-anonymous class evaluations for all classes.
3. Course materials and assignments. The department pays attention to factors such as the clarity and fairness of class requirements and any evidence that the class reflects current scholarship relevant to the subject matter in question. The department may evaluate the fairness of examinations, and the quality of a professor's grading.
4. Peer Reviews. 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 member with the rank of associate or full professor 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 member with the rank of full professor every other year until promotion to full professor.
5. Number of students taught. Size *can* be an indicator of a professor's having developed a following among students.
6. Evidence of graduate teaching and mentoring—for example, numbers of thesis and dissertation committee memberships as well as general availability for mentoring graduate students. The committee may solicit graduate and undergraduate student input.
7. Evidence of undergraduate advising and mentoring.

In general, the department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of high quality teaching, and the committee should attempt to be as inclusive of such indicators as possible in its evaluation of the teaching record.

iii. 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. Junior faculty, in particular, should consult with the Head and senior faculty when considering service outside the 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
- 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.

#### C. Promotion to Full Professor

Eligibility for promotion to Full Professor requires a candidate’s record, taken as a whole, to demonstrate outstanding achievement in research, teaching, and service.

Specifically, for promotion to Full Professor, an Associate Professor must show a research record significantly beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor; an outstanding record of teaching both in the classroom and in mentorship; and a substantial record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department. The proportional weights given to each of these elements are as follows: 40% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 20% service.

Other facets of a scholarly career that may influence a promotion-to-full decision may include elected and appointed positions in professional associations or at the University, invited talks, editorial activities, institutional peer reviews, mentees’ successes, and related activities that signal high academic and professional reputation in the nation, the world, or both.

As indicated previously, the procedures for conducting faculty reviews for promotion to Full Professor follow the same patterns as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The department recognizes that the arc of academic productivity varies across the life cycle and seeks to award it properly, but such variation should follow promotion to Full Professor. Post-tenure reviews apply the same criteria as for the previous promotion, with the exception that it is not ordinarily necessary to solicit assessments of scholarship from external reviewers. Further, documentation must illustrate that these continuing academic contributions are of outstanding quality. For example, the results of one’s administrative work might show effective, enduring institution building. Innovative curricula resulting from efforts to upgrade instruction with new

technologies could be published in appropriate books or journals, adopted by appropriate national or international institutions, or receive recognition with local, national, or international instructional awards.

### 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 Sociology 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.

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: April 19, 2017

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.