

**Department of Physics
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 Physics are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

B. Synopsis of Review and Promotion Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty

i. Annual Reviews

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 by the department head and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their 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

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by members of the candidate's division and related institutes. 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. Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case, i.e., tenured associate and full professors for tenure decisions and only full professors for promotion to full. Following these discussions, 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 department is 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.

d. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The first portion of the statement provides 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.), as well as summarizes the department meeting in which the vote was taken. This summary describes in moderate detail the presentation of the case and all relevant faculty discussions about research, teaching and service.. The second portion of the department head statement 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 Physics. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The Department of Physics judges all promotion and tenure cases on the basis of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The research programs of our department have national and international impact and competitiveness. Our teaching program provides excellent instruction to our undergraduate and graduate students and it also involves innovative course development. Faculty in the Department of Physics are expected to make distinguished contributions in service to the department, the university, and the external scientific community. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 50 : 25 : 25, respectively.

B. Research (50%)

As a research intensive department, we place great emphasis on the scientific research of the faculty member, except in cases where the nature and intent of the appointment precludes major research activities. The quality (as measured by the peer review process) and number of scientific publications are of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. Publications, including journal articles, book chapters, and books,

must have been accepted for publication to count for promotion. External funding and graduate student support are normally an expected part of the tenure and promotion portfolio of the candidate. External evidence of the candidate's impact on the field -- as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, invited talks, and participation in conferences and workshops -- are among the factors considered. Strong accomplishments in the area of research are a necessary condition for a positive recommendation at all levels of the promotion process within the department. 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. While expectations for the rate of Ph.D. production vary by research specialty, some experience in successfully mentoring undergraduate students, Ph.D. students, or postdoctoral scholars is normally expected for successful promotion to associate and full professor. In both cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.

C. Teaching (25%)

Excellence in teaching is another integral aspect of the evaluation for promotion and tenure. The department expects all faculty to spend a significant fraction of their time on teaching-related activities, and to strive for excellence in this area. Teaching is evaluated on the basis of material provided by the candidate (syllabi, web pages, exams, and any other relevant material), student evaluations, and peer evaluations. All faculty are normally expected to be able to teach effectively at all levels and across our curriculum, though individual aspects such as research specialty are taken into account, particularly in courses taught at the graduate level. Other important elements of the candidate's teaching portfolio include a) individual instruction of undergraduate or Ph.D. students in terms of thesis supervision, specialized research, or reading courses, b) the development of new, innovative courses that help broaden the undergraduate and graduate physics curriculum, and c) authoring and publication of new textbooks and other course media, for example, electronic tools, simulations, and demonstrations, that support and augment course work. The Department assesses quality of teaching in the following ways:

- *Peer evaluation.* For untenured faculty, a member of the candidate's division will visit one class during the candidate's third, fourth and fifth years at UO. For promotion to full professor, peer evaluations will occur once every two years after the granting of tenure. 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 Physics is the training and mentoring of students. 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 during their temporary appointments as research associates.

D. Service (25%)

Faculty members in the Department of Physics 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 safety committee. Examples for associate professors include, but are not limited to, serving as chair of the graduate admissions committee and a member of the personal advisory 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, advising

undergraduate majors and organizing seminar series.

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 board or review panel of agencies such as NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory board, executive officer, symposium/meeting organizer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).
- ii. Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by a professional 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 Physics 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.

[1] <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/physics>