

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure: Department of Mathematics

May 3rd, 2011

I. Procedures

a. Preamble

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

The procedures specific to the Department of Mathematics are in this document.

Below, Personnel Committee refers to the committee consisting of all tenured members of the department. In cases of promotion to Full Professor, the Personnel Committee is replaced with the Senior Personnel Committee which is the committee consisting of all Full Professors in the department, even if not explicitly indicated.

Otherwise the procedures for promotion to Full Professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, except where specific differences are spelled out.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed annually in the Spring by the Department. This begins with an annual report submitted by the faculty member; guidelines for these will be provided by the Department Head. Following a review by the Head, the Head will prepare a written evaluation. A copy of this will be provided to the faculty member and within one week he or she will meet the Department Head to discuss the evaluation. The discussion should include a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the previous year's progress and should include suggestions for possible improvements. Research, teaching and service, together with their relative importance to the Department, should be discussed. In addition, the timetable for tenure should be reviewed, as well as the kinds of records that the faculty member should be keeping to demonstrate accomplishments.

Whenever an untenured faculty member requires a renewal of contract the annual review will be replaced by a Midterm Review. This usually takes place in the middle of the tenure and promotion period, so in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure. The process for this review will be the same as for the annual review, with the addition that the faculty member's documents will be reviewed and commented on by the Personnel Committee. That committee will then vote on a contract extension. 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 normally expected year for the promotion and tenure decision if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at that point. 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 whether the record merits renewing the faculty member's contract.

Annual and Midterm Reviews will not be included in the tenure file.

ii. Review Period You speak below of 6 years of full time service etc. but really much of the sixth year isn't considered since the file goes to CAS in November of year six. Maybe a detail but please consider modifying if you think it important.

A candidate with no prior credit toward tenure 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 all other 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. A faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire may choose to delay that review until his or her sixth years of full time service. In that case, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process and consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the candidates years 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.

The preparation of the tenure file begins following the annual review in the year prior to the specified year for tenure consideration. So in a typical case, this preparation would begin in the spring of the fifth year.

Candidates will typically be considered for promotion to Full Professor in the sixth year following promotion to Associate Professor, regardless of the timing of tenure. The decision to move forward with a promotion file will be made jointly between the

candidate and the Department's Senior Personnel Committee, with each party having the right to veto a decision to go forward. This decision will be made in the spring term of the year before the promotion case is to be considered.

iii. External Reviewers

The Department Head, in consultation with appropriate faculty, identifies at least five experts from other institutions from whom to solicit letters evaluating the work of the candidate. The candidate is not informed of the names of the external reviewers but is given the opportunity to independently request that requests be sent to specific individuals for review. When the file goes forward, it will be noted that the candidate requested these latter reviewers.

The Department Head sends the candidate two letters. One retains the right to full access to the promotion file, while the other waives that right. The Department Head will advise the candidate that the candidate may consult the Academic Affairs website for a complete description of the waiver options. One waiver option must be chosen and referees will be informed of it.

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. For promotion to Associate Professor, some referees may also be associate professors at highly regarded institutions. Because of the international nature of mathematics, it is common for many reviewers to be from institutions outside of the United States. 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 mid September.

iv. Candidate's Statement

The Department Head sends a letter to the candidate describing the procedure to be followed and requests a "Candidate Statement". In this statement the candidate has the opportunity to discuss past performance and future plans and goals. This Statement will be included in the material sent to external reviewers either physically or electronically.

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, and a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to other university colleagues, and administrators. The candidate may optionally include a more technical research statement as an addition to the candidate's statement, aimed at explaining the context and importance of the candidate's research to potential reviewers. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

v. Sample Publications

The Department Head requests the candidate to provide a copy of each of three of the candidate's scholarly articles. These may include unpublished articles. These articles will be included in the packet sent to external reviewers, either physically or electronically. It is expected that reviewers will be able to access other articles appearing on the candidate's vita either through their library or electronically.

vi. Dossier for Department Consideration

The Department Head will prepare a dossier which includes, in addition to the letters from the external reviewers, a copy of the candidate's signed waiver letter and a copy of the letter sent by the Department Head to the reviewers: (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 of teaching. (6) may be incorporated into the curriculum vitae.

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, items (2), (4), (5), (7) and (8) will normally be limited to cover the time period since promotion to Associate Professor.

vii. Personnel Committee Meeting and Vote

The Department Head appoints a member of the Personnel Committee to act as reporter for the Personnel Committee meeting. The Personnel Committee holds a meeting early in fall term to consider promotion and tenure recommendation (or promotion for a candidate who already has tenure) for the candidate. After a thorough review and discussion of the case, the Personnel Committee (excluding the Department Head) votes by secret, signed ballot whether or not to recommend promotion with tenure (or promotion for candidates who already have tenure).

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied 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 in the candidate's personnel file in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The appointed reporter prepares a report summarizing the discussion and evaluation by the Personnel Committee.

viii. Department Head's Review

The Department Head then prepares the final tenure file for submission to the Dean of the College. This file will include, in addition to the material in the preliminary file, a summary of the Personnel Committee vote, a report from the Committee, and a careful and thorough evaluation of the case by the Department Head. The completed file is sent to the Dean by the CAS established deadlines in November.

ix. 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 this committee, he/she 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. 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.

3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), an approximately ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members. If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she 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 with regard to 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.

5.OAR 571-003 permits an appeal of this decision to a faculty committee elected for this purpose.

II. Guidelines

a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Mathematics. Promotion in the Department of Mathematics at the University of Oregon depends on superior scholarly activity, excellence in teaching, and satisfactory institutional and academic service. 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.

In this section we refer to promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure as simply "tenure." Everything here applies equally to tenure for a faculty member who is already an Associate Professor.

The University of Oregon Academic Affairs website lists three areas of competence on which the institution judges faculty.

- Professional activity and scholarly growth;
- Quality of teaching;
- Leadership in academic and administrative service.

Within individual departments these components may carry different weights. The following lists these in their relative importance within the Department of Mathematics and discusses for each the criteria used in the evaluation of the faculty.

b. Research and Scholarly Activities

Development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of tenure in the Department of Mathematics.

Successful candidates are expected to have:

- A series of quality publications that are judged to be significant by peers at the University of Oregon and experts from other major institutions;
- A body of work in progress and a reasonable program for future work.

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

- Advising Ph.D. students successfully to their degree;
- Invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions;
- Invitations to serve on journal editorial boards;
- Research grants from external sources;
- Participation in and/or organization of major professional conferences and workshops;
- Other scholarly activity.

The Department recognizes that standardized criteria cannot exist that will apply equally to all faculty members. Every effort will be made to consider all of the various factors involved in each individual case.

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, candidates are expected to also have

- an established international reputation in mathematical research
- Successful Ph.D. students.
- Invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions.
- Invitations to participate in major professional conferences and workshops.

The standard units of research in mathematics are articles published in refereed journals (or sometimes other refereed venues), although there are exceptions such as refereed scholarly monographs containing substantial original research.

The merit of a single article can vary considerably. Considerations such as venue of publication, influence on the field, opinions of reviewers, citations and length may be among those used to measure quality.

c. Teaching

The Department of Mathematics takes very seriously its obligation to its students, undergraduate and graduate, major and non-major. Thus, a good teaching record is a necessary condition for tenure in the Department of Mathematics.

Evaluating teaching performance is not an exact process. Nevertheless, the Department looks for several signs of good, effective teaching. Among these are the following:

- Providing an educational experience for the students beyond the routine;
- Having appropriately high expectations and teaching at a level to encourage meeting them;
- Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students.

There are several ways that the Department assesses quality of teaching.

- *Peer evaluation.* Each year a member of the Department's Teaching Effectiveness Committee will visit at least one class of each untenured faculty member. The visitor will also review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials. The visitor will write a detailed evaluation of the performance, covering all aspects of the effectiveness of the class. University regulations require that a peer evaluation of teaching be done in each of the three years preceding promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor, and every other year for associate professors until their promotion to full professor.
- *Student evaluations.* Written evaluations (in the context of numerical evaluations) often provide a very reliable picture of the quality of the teaching as perceived by the students.
- *Documentation of other contributions to the teaching mission.* There are many ways a faculty member can contribute to the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department. These include participation in curriculum development, effective work on textbook committees, advising groups like the Putnam Exam team, the use of innovative teaching strategies, one-on-one teaching such as directing reading courses and advising senior theses, and expository seminar talks such as the Basic Notions Seminar

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor have the same teaching expectations as those above, and in addition are expected to be substantively involved in the Department's graduate program. By Academic Affairs policy, each associate professor must have one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor.

d. Service

An important criterion for promotion and tenure is institutional service including Department, College, and University committees on curriculum, personnel, and policies. The faculty plays an important role in the governance of the University, and the University expects participation of its members.

The Department similarly expects such service at the departmental level. This is not meant to imply that each faculty member must contribute in some fixed proportion to institutional service or that faculty must equally share responsibilities. Untenured faculty, in particular, will generally have lighter service responsibilities than tenured faculty.

Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels from time to time 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 many other forms of scholarly and academic service the Department will consider during the tenure process. These include, but are not limited to: service on editorial boards, service as a peer reviewer of journal articles, grant applications and so forth, service on Masters and PhD committees, mathematical translations, and expository writing.

The service criteria for candidates for promotion to Full Professor are the same, with the exception that the expected level of responsibility for Departmental and University service and governance is substantially higher than for tenure. Candidates for promotion are generally expected to have demonstrated significant leadership in some aspect of the Department's undergraduate and/or graduate program. This may include course development, curriculum planning, or leadership of appropriate committees within the Department.