

**Department of Human Physiology
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 Human Physiology 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 Reviews

Every assistant professor will submit an annual report to the department head, usually in late-March. The department head will review the annual report to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the junior faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The candidate's annual report should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of his or her 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.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in March of the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. If faculty have credit towards tenure, then the report should be submitted in the final year of their initial contract. The contract renewal/third-year review is a more comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the candidate's overall progress to date. The format of the material the candidate submits, and the department's evaluation of this material, is intended to duplicate the actual review for promotion and tenure described below, except that the department does not solicit outside letters. The candidate will submit a report including: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, lists (by year and term) of courses and committees; (2) a personal narrative statement describing accomplishments to date in the areas of research (technical where appropriate, but this section

should be written so that non-scientists can understand it), teaching, and service; (3) a personal narrative statement of goals and plans for the next 2-3 years; and (4) copies of published papers and manuscripts based on work carried out at the UO. A senior department member (from the Personnel Committee) will review the documents and provide a report to the Faculty. A department vote by tenure-track faculty is held whether or not to renew the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head (usually with significant input from the senior members of the Faculty), and forwarded to the college for approval by the dean.

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

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. 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. 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.

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, and is in addition to the External Reviewers.

c. Personnel Committee Vote and Report

During the fall term of the reviewing year, the department head will ask the departmental Personnel Committee, which is composed of at least two faculty at the full professor rank, to review the candidate. This committee will vote and 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 will be made available in the department office to all faculty for review prior to the department meeting.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Both associate and full professors will vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor. In the case that sufficient faculty are not at the appropriate rank, members of equal rank to the candidate going forward with promotion or tenure can vote, at the discretion of the department head. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by 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 will be tallied, usually by the department head, 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 in a signed and sealed envelope by the department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

e. Department head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The 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 an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote.

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Human Physiology. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty.

Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: research, teaching and service, and excellence in all three areas is required. Research, teaching and service are given a weighting of 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively, for assistant professors being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. For promotion to the rank of full professor, research, teaching and service are given a weighting of 50%, 30%, and 20%, respectively.

B. Research (60%)

In the context of the Department of Human Physiology, development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for promotion. The following indicators are the primary ways in which scholarship is evaluated. The quality (as measured by the peer review process) of scientific publications is of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. The primary venue for publication of scholarship in our field is as scientific articles in established, peer-reviewed journals. The department does not establish a minimum number of publications for promotion and/or tenure. Instead we rely upon external evaluations to help judge a faculty member's productivity and the quality of his or her contributions relative to the norm in the sub-discipline.

External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research in the candidate's sub-discipline is crucial; however, the Department does recognize that the average funding available in different sub-disciplines of Human Physiology varies. External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered. For tenure cases, we expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue. For a promotion to full professor, continued professional development and leadership in the field are expected. In all cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.

C. Teaching (30%)

Excellence in teaching is required within the Department of Human Physiology. The Department assesses quality of teaching in the following ways:

- *Peer evaluation.* Each tenure-track Faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a Faculty peer 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 peer every other year until promotion to Full Professor. It is the responsibility of each Faculty member to ensure that reviews are performed at the appropriate timeframes.

- The faculty visitor will review all appropriate syllabi and other course materials. The visitor will write a report to the department head, evaluating the performance and effectiveness of the candidate.
- *Student evaluations.* Numerical and written student evaluations are collected for each course taught. These written evaluations often provide a reliable picture of the quality of the teaching, as perceived by the students.

An important aspect of the teaching mission in the Department of Human Physiology is the training and mentoring of students and post-docs. These include:

- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students working on graduate student thesis projects.
- Supervision and mentoring of undergraduate students who participate in undergraduate research projects.
- Supervision and mentoring of postdoctoral scholars or physicians during their temporary appointments as research associates.

D. Service (10%)

Faculty members in the Department of Human Physiology 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 of the probationary period, 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 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 should involve 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

- Committee: Evidence of participation on committees (departmental, institute or center, college, university) as a member or chair that requires an effort and contributes to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, institute or center, college, or university. Examples for assistant professors include, but are not limited to, serving as a member of the graduate admissions committee,

the curriculum committee, and the research development committee. Examples for associate professors include, but are not limited to, serving as a Chair of a Faculty Search Committee, Director of Graduate Studies, Research Director, or Curriculum Director. Additional examples external to the Department may include serving on the Institutional Review Board, the Faculty Senate, or University Curriculum Committee.

- Administration: Evidence of performance of administrative or program development duties that requires a substantial amount of effort and contributes significantly to the mission, goals and objectives to the department, institute or center, college, or university. Examples for assistant professors and associate professors include, but are not limited to, organizing seminar series or assisting with student advising.

External Service Indicators

- 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 board or review panel of agencies such as NIH or NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory board, executive officer, symposium/meeting organizer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).
- Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by a professional association, organization, agency or journal regarding service contributions.

III. Post-tenure Review (50% : 30% : 20%)

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 Human Physiology 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/VO 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.