

Department of Political Science TTF Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

Preamble:

This policy applies to all represented tenure-track and tenured (TTF) 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 TTF, 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 Political Science are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

Part I: Department-Specific Procedures

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. 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. 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) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, service, and contributions to equity and inclusion (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 the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a mid-term review. This is a thorough review that involves a departmental committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, a review by the dean, and final decision by the Provost.

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 (usually with significant input from the senior members of the appropriate division), 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.

The contract review, typically at the end of three years, is a very important process that should be conducted with care. It is designed to give a junior faculty member clear feedback on directions that

are, and are not, appropriate in the interests of making a successful promotion case. The department expects that an assistant professor will have shown substantial progress toward the research expectations for promotion and tenure by having submitted a book manuscript or several articles or book chapters for publication by the time of this contract review.

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 mid-term review 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 mid-term review 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 process.

III. Review for Promotion and Tenure

A. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Workshop

During the fall term of each year, the Department Head in Political Science, along with other senior faculty, will conduct a workshop that will inform new faculty of the promotion and tenure procedures and guidelines.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty

in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. 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 generally made available to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In most departments, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

E. Department Meeting and Vote

1. 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). 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.
2. The department head will distribute the committee report to faculty eligible to vote in sufficient time to ensure that they have the opportunity to conduct a fair review. Other relevant materials will also be available to eligible faculty. Promotion and tenure files cannot be seen in whole or in part by any faculty ineligible to vote on it. The only form of access to such files available to faculty ineligible to vote will be in the form of a redacted committee report read aloud at the department meeting convened to discuss the report.
3. Faculty ineligible to vote are welcome to attend the departmental meeting convened to discuss the committee report and contribute to the discussion of the redacted version of the report. After discussion of the redacted version of the report, faculty ineligible to vote will be excused and the meeting will move to a second stage devoted to a discussion of the complete file.

F. 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. 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 file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is November 1.

Part II. Guidelines

I. Preamble

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

II. General criteria governing particular promotions and reviews:

1. Promotion to associate professor

Candidates should be aware that, in addition to quantity, quality, and impact, their work may be evaluated in terms of the visibility, appropriateness, and prestige of the publication outlets. It is expected that a successful candidate will have demonstrated research beyond the dissertation work.

In order to achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, candidates must establish a record of satisfactory service to the department, the university, the profession, and the larger community. The department attempts to limit committee assignments for untenured faculty, but all tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance at official department meetings is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department.

As noted earlier, the contract review, typically at the end of three years, is a very important process that is designed to give a junior faculty member clear feedback on directions that are, and are not, appropriate in the interests of making a successful promotion case. The promotion committee should pay careful attention to the recommendations that were given to a candidate by this earlier review.

In general, a candidate for promotion and tenure must have demonstrated a strong record in both scholarship and teaching, and an appropriate record of service. A very strong record in any of those areas does not compensate for deficiencies in any of the others. The Department recognizes that the granting of tenure indicates confidence that the candidate will continue as a strong scholar and teacher throughout his or her academic career.

2. Promotion to full professor

For promotion to full professor, the criterion is one's overall research, teaching, and service excellence. The amount of research should not be qualified by time in rank; the issue is whether the candidate has for the past several years been publishing high quality, important scholarly work. To be considered eligible for promotion, an associate professor must have an accomplished record of outstanding teaching, both in the classroom and in other aspects of teaching; an outstanding record of scholarly research (including significant work beyond that on which tenure and promotion to associate professor was based); and a substantial record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department. In order to achieve tenure and promotion to full professor, candidates must establish a meritorious and externally recognized record of service. Tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance at official department meetings is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is

considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department. Committee assignments and other service responsibilities performed for units outside the department (i.e., college, the university, the profession, and the larger community) constitute an important benefit to the university and contribute equally to the service component of the profession dossier.

Exceptions to these criteria are appropriate only when achievements in one area are truly extraordinary by national and international standards, in which case achievements should normally reflect sustained contributions over a long period. For example, a superb teacher (reflected by fundamental contributions to pedagogy; nationally or internationally recognized development of innovative curriculum; recognition with national, international, or University teaching awards, etc.), with modest accomplishments in other areas, could merit promotion. Similarly, a superb scholar (reflected by path breaking contributions to the field) with modest accomplishments in other areas, may also merit promotion. Although typically subordinate to teaching and research, extraordinarily effective service (reflected by creative and sustained contributions to important functions of the University) is also an important consideration. In all cases, significant minimum standards remain in each area.

3. Criteria weights:

- a) 40%: Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship in the faculty member's discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative activity;
- b) 40%: Effective, stimulating teaching in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable;
- c) 20%: On-going, responsible service and leadership to the faculty member's students and department, the university, the community, and the faculty member's professional discipline more broadly.

III. Specific Criteria for Research

Excellence in research is required, consistent with the Office of the Provost website <https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-evaluation>. A crucial aspect of the departmental assessment of a candidate's research is the evaluations and recommendations of the external reviewers. The department will evaluate a candidate's research using the following criteria: its *quality* (the importance of the issues being addressed, and the findings and conclusions reached); its *impact* (the reception the candidate's scholarship has been given by relevant academic and scientific communities); and its *quantity* (the amount of published scholarly output). Among indicators of quality and impact are the citation record, the status and readership within political science, a sub-discipline or neighboring professions of the journals in which the material has been published, or of the presses by which books have been published.

The department considers all refereed publication outlets (article, book chapter, or book manuscript) to be valuable scholarly contributions, but also recognizes that certain nonrefereed publications can be demonstrated by the candidate to be equivalent in quality to those published in the prestigious refereed outlets. The department also recognizes that it is often quite difficult, if not impossible, to discern whether book chapters are truly subject to "blind" review, and therefore may rely upon other indicators of quality in such instances. External grant funding is also considered quite meritorious, but is not required for promotion and/or tenure. Conference attendance and

other professional activities are valued for their professional regard and their contribution to subsequent research publications.

A research manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production” in order for it to count towards promotion. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. The university defines “in production” as the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to count towards a faculty’s publications. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions or editing of any kind. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended. Generally, it is expected that the book should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the dean in order for the publications to count fully towards promotion.

IV. Specific Criteria for Teaching

(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, any references to standards or metrics for teaching quality are replaced by Section 9 of the August 2019 MOU between the university and United Academics that defines standards for teaching quality. The standards defined in the MOU are to remain in place unless and until the unit modifies those standards in accordance with the MOU and the CBA defined process for modifying unit policies. MOU can be found at <https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-mou-course-evaluations-article-20.pdf>)

Excellence in teaching is required. The indicators of quality of teaching, in no particular order, include

1. Summaries of Student Experience Surveys, and Course Evaluations if they were administered during the review period.
2. Course materials and assignments. The department pays attention to factors such as the clarity and fairness of class requirements and any evidence that the class reflects current scholarship relevant to the subject matter in question. The department may evaluate the fairness of examinations, and the quality of a professor's grading.
3. Peer Reviews. The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty member with the rank of associate or full professor 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 member with the rank of full professor every other year until promotion to full professor.
4. Evidence of graduate teaching and mentoring—for example, numbers of thesis and dissertation committee memberships as well as general availability for mentoring graduate students. The committee may solicit graduate and undergraduate student input.
5. Evidence of undergraduate advising and mentoring.

In general, the department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of high quality teaching, and the committee should attempt to be as inclusive of such indicators as possible in its evaluation of the teaching record.

V. Specific Criteria for Service

Academics must provide service to their department, and are expected to serve their college, university, and profession. The committee must evaluate the quality of a candidate's contributions to departmental, college, university or professional committees, and to other administrative functions that are normally performed by academics. To this end, the committee should solicit letters from individuals around the campus who are in a position to comment on the candidate's role and performance in such work.

As citizens, academics may, of course, play a variety of roles in the wider community. Of particular importance for evaluating service, however, is service to the wider community that draws on an academic's professional expertise in some manner. This might include, for example, giving talks relating to his or her academic field, giving expert testimony, or playing an advisory role on commissions.

Part III: Post-Tenure Review

I. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR process should be initiated during the Fall 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 Student Experience Surveys or summaries, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period.

The department head will review materials and prepare a statement evaluating the performance of the faculty member. For associate professors, the statement 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. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the department. A copy will be forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences.

II. 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

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: April 19, 2017
Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost: November 12, 2019

scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Political Science 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.

The sixth-year post-tenure review shall be conducted by the elected standing Personnel committee. If necessary to reflect the expertise of the person being reviewed, additional tenured faculty members may be added, of whom one may be from outside the department. The committee shall include no department head.

The sixth-year post-tenure review committee will write a report to the department head based on relevant materials.

For the sixth-year post-tenure review, the same criteria will apply as for promotions to full professor, with the exception that it will not normally be necessary to solicit assessments of scholarship from external reviewers. That might be necessary—as, for example, if there is some real difficulty or disagreement in assessing the quality of the work in question. Because such requests are normally an imposition, however, they should be kept at a minimum.

If the Provost or designee concludes that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, a development plan is required. 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.