

Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure: Department of Computer and Information Science (January 12, 2011)

The purpose of this document is to describe the procedures and guidelines of the Department of Computer and Information Science regarding promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure and to Full Professor.

Procedures

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 Computer and Information Science.

Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

The Department Head will review each Assistant Professor annually. 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 fashion. In 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 a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. The results of the process can be as follows:

- (i) 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.
- (ii) 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.
- (iii) 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 review period. 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 if the faculty member has been able to remedy shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

Tenure Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. 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. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary 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 Department Head who may also consult with the Dean and the Provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. 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. Generally, 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 department's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

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.

Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. 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 be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, 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 tenured colleagues.

Dossier

In addition to the letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, including one from a candidate's research institute/center director, the dossier should include: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae; (2) copies of all significant publications; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) a list of courses taught by term and year with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the registrar; (5) syllabi and other course materials; (6) a list of all Ph.D., M.A./M.S., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (7) signed student comments; (8) peer evaluations; (9) external reviewer biographies and a description of any relationship between the candidate and the reviewers; and (10) a signed waiver indicating the degree to which the candidate has retained access to their file (this will be shared with external and internal referees).

Personnel Committee Review and Report

Prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the standing departmental Personnel Committee will review the candidate's case. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. 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 numerical student evaluation scores, 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 made available in the department office for review by tenured faculty of appropriate rank before a department meeting.

Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department will hold a meeting in mid- to late 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). Both Associate and Full Professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only Full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. When all votes have been registered, the votes are tallied by the Office Manager and the voting members of 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 by the Office Manager in case they are requested by the Dean or Provost. The Department Head does vote.

Department Head Review and Statement

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, indicating any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The Department Head's statement, the Personnel Committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed dossier is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for Full Professor cases.

Degree of Candidate Access to the File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the Dean's review after the meeting with the Dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

College and University Procedures

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on the committee, that member is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the Dean.
2. After the file leaves the DAC, the Dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the Dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the

candidate is invited to the Dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the Dean indicates 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 position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, that member is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost's office. The Provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the Provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The Provost's decision regarding promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the Provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

Guidelines

The following guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Computer and Information Science. 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.

A. Promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

Promotion to a tenured faculty position as Associate Professor in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Oregon requires an excellent record of research and teaching together with a satisfactory record of institutional and academic service. We consider three aspects of a candidate's performance when evaluating that person for promotion and tenure:

- Impact of scholarly research activity;
- Quality of teaching;
- Effectiveness of institutional and academic service.

1. Scholarly Research Activity

Development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute, necessary requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure. Successful candidates are expected to have:

- established a strong publication record in leading scholarly journals and conference/workshop proceedings. Acceptance rates for conferences or workshops serve as an indicator of publication significance. Other forms of research dissemination, such as software systems, will be recognized, if they are widely cited as having made an important contribution.
- demonstrated an ability to obtain grant funding support for research;
- initiated a significant body of ongoing work and defined a reasonable program for future research.

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

- advising successful research projects with Masters and Ph.D. students;
- invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions;
- invitations to serve on journal editorial boards or conference program committees;
- participation in the organization of major professional conferences and workshops.

The Department recognizes that a set of standardized criteria for scholarly achievement that can be applied equally to all faculty members does not exist. Every effort will be made to consider all relevant factors involved in each individual case. The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on the candidate's research field. Evaluation of this impact will in part be based upon statements made by external referees, who are leading experts in the candidate's area of research. Citations of a candidate's work may also be used to evaluate research impact.

2. Teaching

The Department of Computer and Information Science takes seriously its educational mission and its students: both undergraduate and graduate, as well as major and non-major. Demonstration of effective teaching is a necessary condition for tenure in the Department of Computer and Information Science. A candidate for promotion will have taught several terms of required courses in the undergraduate major program as part of their teaching record.

The Department expects to see signs of effective teaching. Among these are the following:

- Providing an educational experience for the students that goes beyond the routine;
- Providing students with intellectual challenges that reflect high expectations and teaching so as to encourage students to meet them;
- Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students.

There are several ways that the Department assesses quality and effectiveness of teaching:

- *Peer evaluations.* Each year a member of the Tenured Faculty should visit at least one class of each untenured faculty member. The visitor will review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of the performance.
- *Student evaluations.* Every untenured faculty member should collect numerical and written student evaluations for each course taught. Consistent patterns in numerical or written evaluations will be considered to provide a reliable picture of the quality of teaching, as perceived by students.
- *Documentation of other contributions.* There are many ways a faculty member can contribute to the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department. These include participation in new curriculum development, the use of innovative teaching strategies, and conducting one-on-one teaching opportunities, such as directing reading courses and senior theses.

3. Institutional and Academic Service

Faculty members play an important role in the governance of the Department and the University. A candidate is expected to have demonstrated an active interest in Departmental activities, participating effectively and fulfilling any work assignments in a timely manner. Although Assistant Professors will generally carry a lighter service load while establishing their research and teaching records, we do look for the potential of substantial and creative contributions in the future. While not required, service on a University-wide committee is a positive indication.

Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels 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 various forms of academic service the Department will consider during the tenure review process. These include, but are not limited to: peer reviewer of journal articles or conference papers, grant application reviewing, and service on Masters and PhD committees. Some of these service activities may be seen as scholarly achievements, as well, depending on the nature and scope of work.

B. Promotion to Full Professor from Associate Professor

Promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Oregon requires a record of leadership in the areas of research, teaching and service.

1. Research Activity

Continued development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an important factor for promotion. It is expected that the candidate is well-established and recognized to be a leader in their field of specialization. A profound, consistent research portfolio that includes significant instances of original accomplishments that are widely disseminated, cited and used, as well as a consistent record of grants for research is expected. Evidence of research recognition would include several of the following (or equivalents):

- invited addresses at important professional meetings;
- invitations to visit and present colloquia at other major institutions or research centers;
- membership on or chairing journal editorial boards or conference program committees;
- membership on influential national or international research committees;
- awards recognizing academic, research work.

The Department recognizes that a set of standardized criteria for scholarly achievement that can be applied equally to all faculty members does not exist. Every effort will be made to consider all relevant factors involved in each individual case. The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on the candidate's research field. Evaluation of this impact will in part be based upon statements made by external referees, who are leading experts in the candidate's area of research. As noted earlier, citations of a candidates work may also be used to evaluate research impact.

2. Teaching

The Department of Computer and Information Science takes seriously its educational mission and its students: both undergraduate and graduate, as well as major and non-major. Demonstration of effective teaching is an important consideration for promotion in the Department of Computer and Information Science.

There are several ways that the Department assesses quality and effectiveness of teaching:

- *Peer evaluations.* Every other year a member of the Tenured Faculty shall visit at least one class of each Associate Professor. The visitor will review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of performance.
- *Student evaluations.* Every Associate Professor should collect numerical and written student evaluations for each course taught. Consistent comments in written evaluations can provide a reliable picture of the quality of teaching, as perceived by students.
- *Curricular contributions.* It is expected that the candidate has been an innovator in their own courses and has made contributions to the departmental curriculum as a whole.

- *Graduate student advising.* The candidate is expected to have had substantial direct interaction with and to have supervised successful graduate students, including doctoral students.
- *Other indications.* Awards or grants for teaching or curriculum development, design and teaching of University freshman seminars or participation in FIGs; authoring a successful textbook can be recognized as indicating a dedication to effective teaching.

3. Institutional and Academic Service

Faculty members play an important role in the governance of the Department and the University. The candidate is expected to have played an active role in departmental activities and to have initiated significant contributions. Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels within the framework of acceptable performance. Nevertheless, we expect all of our senior faculty to share in the governance of the Department and to provide occasional leadership on tasks of importance to the Department. As a leader in their discipline, it is expected that the candidate will also have had the opportunity for visible service to the profession. At the University level, the candidate will have served effectively on University-wide faculty committees, representing the Department while serving the broader academic community of the University.

Flexible Application of Criteria

There is more flexibility in applying the above criteria to a candidate's case for promotion to Full Professor. Faculty legislation, adopted in 1999, revised the policy for post tenure review. It recognizes that faculty should be evaluated and rewarded for excellence in teaching, research and service, but that the emphasis in each of the three areas may change throughout a faculty member's career. It is important that faculty members establish agreement on the relative importance of promotion criteria as their careers develop, well prior to promotion consideration.