

Department of Earth Sciences

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 Earth Sciences are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

B. Department-Specific Procedures

i. Annual Review

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, usually in mid-April. These annual reviews are written with input from senior colleagues, and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's; (1) CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) 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) brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-year Review

The candidate's dossier, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by tenured members of the department and 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 promotion and tenure 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 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 promotion and tenure 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

Late 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 UO 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. Independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. 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. 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.

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 spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure or promotion case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of faculty at the rank being sought by the candidate or higher to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of faculty members at the appropriate level in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the Department Head may select committee members from appropriate faculty in other related departments

with guidance from the Dean's Office. 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 must be completed sufficiently in advance of the deadline for submission of the dossier to the College for the Department Head and faculty of appropriate rank to have time to review the dossier prior to the Department meeting. It is generally made available in the Department office for review. In our Department, Associate and Full Professors and Senior Instructors vote on tenure cases, but only Full Professors and Senior Instructors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the eligible faculty 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). When all votes have been registered, the votes are tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the voting members of the Department are 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 Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost.

e. Department Head's Review

After the Department vote, the department head will prepare an independent report and recommendation, and then forward the entire file to the dean. The Department Head's statement includes a description of the process, including 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 a personal opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the Department vote. The Department Head's statement, the promotion and tenure committee report, and the recorded vote are then added to the dossier.

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble

The Department of Earth Sciences considers excellence in research and teaching to be essential for establishing a career, and thus weighs them more heavily than service in consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor – a distribution of roughly 40/40/20 is a typical goal for research/teaching/ service. At the senior level, for promotion to Full Professor and subsequent post-tenure reviews, significant leadership-level service is considered as important as research and teaching and may substitute to some degree for activities in the other two categories.

B. Research (40%)

Faculty members in the Department of Geological Sciences are expected to establish a high quality research program and generate new knowledge in their sub-disciplines, consistent with expectations outlined on the UO Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Development of a program of independent, scholarly research is a requirement for being recommended for promotion and the granting of tenure.

The principal criterion for evaluating a faculty member's scholarship is how significantly the research has impacted their discipline through the publication of scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals. The impact of publications on the discipline is evaluated by leaders in the discipline external to the University of Oregon. External reviewers also evaluate the magnitude of success in securing research funding through application for competitive, peer-reviewed grants, and the recognition that comes from invitations to present research at scholarly meetings, discipline-specific workshops, and other universities. Other data, such as awards from professional or scholarly organizations, and citations of the candidate's work by others, may also be considered.

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly agenda and progress through a program of research that is developmental and advances a field of inquiry. Perceptions from nationally recognized experts regarding the path and scope of a faculty member's research are generally used to document the faculty member's research progression. Evidence from the faculty member's personal statement is also used to determine the coherence and progression of the research agenda. We recognize that a faculty member could decide to shift the emphasis of their research direction to new directions during the review period.

C. Teaching (40%)

As with research, faculty members in the Department of Earth Sciences must demonstrate excellence in their teaching. We view teaching to be a complex enterprise with many components that vary in relative importance for different faculty members and sub-disciplines. Teaching encompasses much more than just the hours that faculty members spend in the classroom. Teaching also involves scholarship in one's field, planning lectures and outside learning experiences, advising students, and supervising the research of undergraduate and graduate students. Our procedures for evaluating teaching can be categorized into the following four general indicators.

- i. Effectiveness of instructional delivery methods
- ii. Quality of curriculum/course design
- iii. Quality of evaluation/assessment of student learning
- iv. Quality, impact, and quantity of advising and mentoring

Effectiveness of a faculty member's instructional delivery shall be ascertained primarily from peer reviews of teaching and student evaluations. Student evaluations enable us to assess a faculty member's ability to (a) create a positive learning environment, (b) engage and challenge students, and (c) provide intellectual leadership. The Department of Earth Sciences uses a version of the on-line course evaluation form that contains University-wide questions and narrative statements, plus four additional questions relating to the instructor's effectiveness in challenging and engaging the student, knowledge of the subject, and quality of the assigned readings.

Instructional delivery methods are also evaluated through peer evaluations of teaching that are conducted at least once per year in the three years preceding promotion for assistant professors, and at least once every other year for associate professors. These evaluations include a classroom visit and a review of teaching materials such as class packets, syllabi, problem sets, internet resources etc.

Faculty members are also expected to provide high quality advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research or other participatory learning experiences. The faculty member should help the student to develop research skills, including design of research questions, implementation through data collection, analysis and completion in the form of a written document, and should assist in the timely completion of degree requirements. Evidence of the quality and impact of advising and mentoring may include a tabulation of thesis or dissertation supervision, written evaluations from peer and external evaluators regarding student research, written testimony from current and former students, and evidence of student success after degree completion. An assessment is also made of

the number of students that have benefited from a faculty member's advising and mentoring.

D. Service (20%)

Faculty members in the Department of Earth Sciences are expected to contribute to sustaining and enhancing the learning communities in which they work through service activities. We view this as a developmental process, beginning with minimal departmental service responsibilities in the early years, and increasing in importance following the granting of tenure. Untenured faculty members are expected to participate in departmental governance and share in committee work, although assessment of service contributions plays a relatively minor role in the department's evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of indefinite tenure. In contrast, the evaluation for promotion to Full Professor involves a clear demonstration of leadership in either administrative or service activities. Furthermore, this increased level of commitment to professional service should extend beyond the department to the College, University and/or professional (external) level. Evaluation of service is classified into two broad categories, internal and external:

Internal Service Indicators

- i. Committee: Evidence of participation on committees (departmental, college, or university) as a member or chair that requires an effort and contributes to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, or university.
- ii. Administration: Evidence of performance of administrative or program development duties that requires substantial effort and contributes significantly to the mission, goals and objectives to the department, College, or University.

External Service Indicators

- i. Service Contribution: Evidence of service contributions at the state, regional, national or international level include activities such as participating in scientific organizations (e.g., advisory review panel or executive officer of agencies such as NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory panel, executive officer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).
- ii. Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by an association organization, agency or journal regarding service contributions.

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 Earth Sciences 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.

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.