

**TTF REVIEW, PROMOTION and POST TENURE REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES
KNIGHT CAMPUS FOR ACCELERATING SCIENTIFIC IMPACT**

Draft updated and approved by faculty vote April 29, 2021
Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost June 11, 2021

PREAMBLE

This document provides guidance for processes related to tenure track faculty promotion and tenure within the Knight Campus. This policy is limited to tenure related appointments and includes the requirement to provide for appropriate and equitable representation of faculty. The terms of this policy presume majority appointment within the Knight Campus – for those whose joint appointment is majority outside the Knight campus, an MOU between the relevant appointing units must be in place at the time of appointment. This document conforms to the Collective Bargaining Agreement with United Academics in existence at the time the document was formulated. This policy also applies to all represented and unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies between this document and the CBA or a university policy, university policy or the CBA language applies, to the extent applicable.

This policy will be reviewed in AY26 and revised, if necessary, for implementation in fall 2026.

KNIGHT CAMPUS SPECIFIC CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

1. GENERAL REVIEW CRITERIA

This section describes the Knight Campus-specific review criteria as mandated by Article 20 of the CBA. Relative weights are found in the pre tenure and the post tenure sections respectively. These criteria shall be used for pre and post tenure reviews, including those reviews that occur outside of a review for tenure and/or promotion.

Knight Campus judges all appointments and promotion to tenure related academic ranks on accomplishments in the following three criteria: research and innovation/entrepreneurship; teaching and training; and service. We expect Knight Campus faculty to have national and international research credentials at the highest level, to demonstrate excellence in instruction and mentoring for graduate and undergraduate scholars, to engage in positive and professional interactions with their colleagues and students and to make distinguished contributions to the Knight Campus, University and the field through service. The Knight Campus recognizes that standardized criteria will not apply to all faculty and thus the process is designed to draw on a broad range of factors that provide evidence of excellence in the candidate's respective field.

1. a. Research and Innovation/entrepreneurship

Development of a mature, sustainable program of independent scholarly research or applied engineering is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of promotion in the Knight Campus. The impact of this program needs to be attributable in specific ways to the individual researcher, but we recognize that projects with large societal impact will often require collaborative efforts and the Knight Campus strives to value individual contribution both as output of single labs and also as contributions to larger team efforts.

Tenure track faculty are expected to pursue an active program of research or engineering, scholarship and innovation/entrepreneurship activity appropriate to their professional qualifications, expertise, and professional interests; and to disseminate the fruits of this effort. Impact in research or engineering and innovation/entrepreneurship can be evaluated through a variety of factors, and the evaluation of impact will be adapted to the specific focus of the TTF faculty member.

Factors can include, but are not limited to the quality (as measured by the peer review process) and number of scientific publications; publication citations; journal impact evaluations (not necessarily tied to published “journal impact ratings”); a sustainable research or engineering program as evidenced by a record of external research funding; devices, software and methods developed and in use in other labs, invited talks at peer and aspirational institutions; outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, and participation in invited conferences and presentations; authorship of important research-related books in the field; and innovation/entrepreneurship metrics such as, but not limited to, licensing/royalties, patents, collaboration with nonprofits, start-up generation, industrial collaborations clinical or field trials, service on advisory boards, and potential for societal impact of engineered products.

For promotion to full professor, candidates are also expected to have an established national and international reputation in their field of inquiry; a demonstrated record of mentoring and supporting successful PhD students; and research leadership roles in their field, as evidenced, for example, by leadership of multi-site sponsored projects, review panels, significant journal or professional society boards, service on company boards, and leadership in companies making products with societal impact, or similar. In order to meet expectations in post-tenure reviews, a faculty member needs to maintain a national and international reputation in their field; continue to successfully mentor and support PhD students; and continue to take leadership roles in their field.

1. b. Teaching and Training

The Knight campus prioritizes mentored, immersive education with training content, format, and duration based on robust learning outcomes and evidence-based pedagogy. Innovation/Entrepreneurship is expected to be thematically and practically included in Knight Campus coursework.

At a minimum, teaching is evaluated according to the standards established in the 2019 and 2020 MOUs between the university and United Academics (see “Course Evaluations” and “Course Evaluations Amendment” here <https://hr.uoregon.edu/employee-labor-relations/employee-groups-cbas/united-academics>). In addition, excellence in teaching and training is required and is assessed in a number of ways including but not limited to: peer evaluation; student evaluations; use of evidence-based teaching methodologies; participation in training for improved teaching skills; supervision of graduate students and their theses; research supervision and mentoring of undergraduates; supervision and mentoring of post-doctoral scholars and fellows; the development and implementation of innovative courses that broaden the curriculum offerings at the UO; and authoring and publication of new textbooks or textbook chapters, and other course media such as electronic tools, massive open online courses or platforms that support and augment coursework and knowledge generation.

For promotion to full professor, a strong record of teaching, training, mentoring and supporting graduate students and innovative graduate education is emphasized. Further, active participation in curriculum development and professional development discussions and decision making constitute strong additions to a faculty member’s teaching portfolio. In order to meet expectations in post tenure review, a faculty member must continue to maintain a strong record of training, mentoring and supporting graduate students.

1. c. Service

Knight Campus faculty are expected to engage in service to support each other, their students and the broader community. We value continual improvement and review; therefore, the faculty will be actively involved in unit reflection and best practice study. As an engine of innovation/entrepreneurship, the Knight Campus will evolve through faculty engaged in change management. As programs and processes show promise in the unit, Knight Campus faculty will bring this insight and experience to the larger UO community.

Service is assessed on programmatic, administrative and other scientific activities not directly related to the individual’s own research and teaching, such as committee and task force membership, search committee activity, mentoring of junior faculty in research or teaching, contributing to a positive and professional work atmosphere and engagement in relevant philanthropic events. Public science outreach and public/general audience lectures are considered under service.

For tenure consideration from assistant to associate professor within the Knight Campus service activity within the Knight Campus is expected.

For promotion to full professor, significant service within the Knight Campus, the University and the candidate’s scientific community are expected. In order to meet expectations in post-tenure reviews, a faculty member needs to continue to demonstrate service leadership roles to the Knight Campus, University and the scientific community.

2. PRE-TENURE PROMOTION REVIEW PROCEDURES AND PROCESS

As a guide to differential emphases of the three criteria noted above, the tenure decision for Knight Campus faculty will be reflected in a relative weighting of 60%, 30%, and 10% for research and innovation, teaching/mentoring, and service, respectively.

2. a. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by a Personnel Committee (defined in section 2.b.ii) and the Knight Campus Director. The assistant professor will provide the Director with a report which should include the following: an updated CV, a brief narrative description of progress in research and innovation, teaching and service in the past year, and a brief summary of goals for the next year. These annual reviews evaluate the faculty member's progress towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The Knight Campus Tenure Track Faculty Professional Responsibilities Policy provides guidance on workload expectations and ratio of emphasis between the three major task areas. The timetable for submitting the report and discussions will be set by the Director and clearly communicated each year.

At or near 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 evaluation for a contract renewal. The contract renewal process is a thorough review that involves a presentation on research and innovation to the university faculty (by the end of winter term of the third year), Personnel Committee report, a vote of tenured members of the Leadership Committee (as defined by the internal governance policy), and a review by the Executive Director. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension, usually up through the tenure and promotion year. However, if the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are unlikely, 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 end of the contract period and prior to promotion and tenure review to determine if the faculty member has remedied the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

2. b. Procedures for reviewing pre-tenure faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure

2. b. i. Establishment of a review

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion to associate professor during the sixth year of employment. 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. An unfavorable review will either lead to issuance of a non-renewable contract for the following year or a non-renewable contract for the duration of the originally offered contract, whichever is longer.

Typically, the Executive Director will meet with the faculty member no later than the winter term of the individual's fifth year, and will request compilation of the candidate's tenure materials. Individuals requesting accelerated review must discuss the merits of this action mindful of the timeline and expectations of the review process.

2. b. ii The Personnel Committee.

One of the charges of the Personnel Committee is evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. The evaluation process may only include those members of the Personnel Committee who are of the same or higher rank and tenure related. The Executive Director may invite tenure related faculty of similar or higher rank from other, relevant science departments to be members of the evaluative group. Individuals who have a personal relationship with a candidate must recuse themselves from any discussion or action related to the case. The Personnel Committee's membership is publicly known.

Personnel Committee members may, on occasion, need to be available to do evaluative work in the summer or off the regular cycle of promotions. Individual members are responsible for working with the Executive Director if there is a conflict, to allow the process to continue in their absence.

2. b. iii. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the promotion case is to be considered, the Personnel Committee will consult with members of the Leadership Committee and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center or academic department with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare for the Knight Campus Director a recommended list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research and innovation record of the candidate. The candidate will also be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Executive Director. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, outside reviewers should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. 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. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the Personnel Committee's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the committee's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as committee-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

2. b. iv. Internal Reviewers

The Personnel Committee 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 (see below).

2. b. v. University-wide Seminar

Candidates for promotion are expected to present a seminar on research and innovation to the University, usually in October or November of their review year.

2. b. vi. Institute/Center Evaluation and Vote

If the candidate is a full member of a research center/institute, a letter conveying the institute/center's evaluation of the candidate for promotion and the result of any vote will be communicated to the Personnel Committee and included in the candidate's dossier.

2. b. vii. Joint Appointment

If a candidate's appointment is joint, an MOU between the relevant appointing units will specify expectations for promotion and tenure review and how the processes will be handled between the units.

2. b. viii. The Personnel Committee Report

The Personnel Committee submits a written report to the Executive Director evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an 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 candidate's statement on teaching, numerical student teaching evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of unit, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation regarding tenure. Prior to the Leadership Committee Meeting, the Personnel Committee report is made available in the Knight Campus office for review only by faculty of the same rank (or higher) than for which the candidate is being considered. The report should not include information that is not relevant to the promotion criteria listed above or allegations that have not been properly vetted through the appropriate channels, such as the university's research misconduct or prohibited discrimination policies.

2 .b. ix. Meeting and Vote

Ideally, the Leadership Committee will hold a meeting in mid-to-late October to consider the tenure recommendation for the candidate. Members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, committee members who are tenured faculty, and who do not hold ad hoc administrative appointments on the committee, vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure. Voting members are also asked to provide a brief statement providing the reason for their vote. Voting members who cannot attend the meeting may submit their vote to the Knight Campus administrator via email. When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied in confidence by the Knight Campus administrator, and the

Executive Director will be informed of the final vote tally. The Executive Director will inform the Leadership Committee and the Personnel Committee of the results. The anonymity of individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a sealed envelope by the unit administrator in case they are requested by the Provost. The Executive Director does not vote, but may give her/his considered opinions during the discussion.

2. b. x. Knight Campus Director's Review

After the vote, the Executive Director prepares a separate written evaluation of the candidate's performance and suitability for tenure and/or promotion. The statement includes a description of the process and the result of the vote, including any unique characteristics of the profession or research subfield (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, typical numbers of publications by subfield, etc.). The Executive Director's statement also offers a recommendation regarding the case for tenure and/or promotion that may or may not agree with the vote. The Executive Director's statement, the Personnel Committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is the basis for a discussion between the Executive Director and the candidate.

2. b. xi. Meeting with candidate

Once the Executive Director has written the letter evaluating the case and making a recommendation in support or not in support of tenure, the candidate is invited to a meeting with the Executive Director. In the meeting, the Executive Director indicates the result of the vote, 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 recommendation made on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the meeting will take place in the months of January, February, or March. The timelines for discussion, review, response and formal meetings are specified in Article 20 sections 16 and 20.

3. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES AND PROCESS

3. a. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process lies with the Executive Director or delegate. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the Executive Director or delegate 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 Executive Director or delegate will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The Executive Director or delegate 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.

The file will be reviewed first by the Personnel Committee, which will provide a written report

that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the Executive Director or delegate. 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 Executive Director or delegate 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 Executive Director or delegate. 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.

3. 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 and innovation, teaching and training, and service, the Knight Campus expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship and innovation activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/VO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who the Provost or designee determines are unsatisfactory in research and innovation, teaching and training or service in that area. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member and the Executive Director or delegate. Ideally, there will be agreement regarding the development plan, but if that is not possible, a plan receiving the Executive Director'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.

3. c. Promotion to Full Professor

The criteria and processes for promotion to full professor are similar to those for tenure. See Article 20 of the CBA for university-wide guidelines.

In terms of criteria for promotion to full professor, excellence in research and innovation remains the most important, absolute criterion. The emphases on the three domains of performance on this level are reflected in a relative weighting of 50%, 30%, and 20% for research and innovation, teaching, and service for the promotion decision.