

**Department of Psychology  
Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines**

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

**II. DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

**1. Review Criteria**

This section describes the department-specific review criteria, as well as their relative weights, as mandated by the Article 20, Section 4 of the CBA.

All faculty are hired with the expectation that they will (a) establish themselves as outstanding research scientists, (b) become effective teachers and mentors, and (c) provide service contributions to the department and beyond (university-level, the academic field, and/or the local community).

Excellence in research is an absolute tenure criterion. Excellence in teaching and mentoring is nearly as important, but can be compensated to some degree through excellence in research. In terms of service, faculty on the level of assistant professors should demonstrate a basic commitment to being a good department and university citizen, but we weigh these contributions significantly less heavily than research and teaching. These different emphases for the tenure decision are reflected in a relative weighting of 50%, 40%, and 10% for research, teaching, and service.

**1.2.1. Research Activities (50%)**

Development of a mature program of independent scholarly research is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure in the Department of Psychology.

The most important criterion is evidence of achievement in scholarly research, primarily in a series of high quality publications that are judged to be important by peers at the university and experts at other institutions (e.g., through peer review). Other scientific products may include open datasets, materials, inventions, and other scholarly work that is disseminated to the scientific community. As with publications, the value of other scientific products is demonstrated through the evaluations of professional peers.

Publications and other scientific products resulting from work carried out while a member of the University of Oregon faculty will be given more weight in the tenure decision than those resulting

from work carried out previously. In cases where credit for prior service has been assigned and fully used, work carried out during the period of time leading to that credit will also be a subject of the primary review. If only some or none of the credit is used, primary focus will be on the six years of work leading up to the tenure decision. While collaborative research is encouraged, faculty should demonstrate independence. Evidence of consistent productivity is desired, with work coming at a regular pace rather than in bursts (especially just before the tenure decision), but it is acknowledged that this may not be possible for all research programs.

A second criterion is evidence of a continuing commitment to research as demonstrated by a body of work in progress and important work being planned. Outside financial support for research is often necessary to pursue high quality scholarship, and the ability to attract outside funding is an important indicator of recognition in the field and future productivity. However, we also recognize the competitive nature of research funding in psychology and that more funding is available in some areas than in others. Thus, when evaluating a candidate's level of external funding, need and availability of funding will be taken into consideration.

Additional evidence of impact may sometimes include awards, invited lectures, excellence of the candidate's research group, invitations to serve on journal editorial boards and granting agency study sections, and other indicators of favorable recognition by scientific peers.

The department recognizes that standardized criteria cannot exist that will apply equally to all faculty members. Rather, we will make every effort to consider the various factors that impinge on each individual case, and judge accordingly.

### **1.2.2. Teaching and Mentoring (40%)**

One mission at the University of Oregon is to educate students by helping them learn to question critically, think logically, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically. Therefore, good teaching is a very important requirement for tenure in the Department of Psychology. While excellent research can compensate to some degree of weaknesses in teaching, clearly unsatisfactory teachers will not become tenured even if their research is stellar.

The department assesses quality of teaching in several ways: (1) Self-assessment of teaching performance; (2) Peer evaluation of classroom teaching; (3) Student evaluation and grade distributions; (4) Supervision of student research and reading; and (5) Contribution to the teaching aims of the department.

- Self-assessment of teaching performance. Candidates are required to write a short narrative describing their teaching accomplishments and goals. The narrative will include: (1) A list of courses taught; (2) A statement of how the candidate's courses fit into the teaching goals of the department; (3) A self-assessment of strengths of the candidate's teaching program. Additional benefit may be gained by a self-assessment of teaching weaknesses, but it is not required that the candidate point these out; (4) A statement of teaching plans for the future.
- Peer evaluation of classroom teaching. Serious, candid peer evaluation is weighted heavily in the overall assessment of teaching quality. Classroom teaching will be regularly evaluated, in accordance with university legislation, which dictates that tenure-track faculty members be evaluated in each of the three years preceding the tenure review; however, the department also encourages earlier evaluations. (See appendix for the full UO policy on Peer Reviews.)

- Student evaluation. These evaluations include: (1) Opinions as evidenced from the standard student evaluation computer-scored forms; and (2) signed written statements from students on course evaluations. Given the often-documented, positive relationship between student evaluations and average grades achieved in a particular class, we will consider student evaluations in the context of grade distributions.
- Supervision of student research and reading. Individualized teaching is a major aspect of university education. Faculty will put a good deal of effort into advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. This involve supervising research projects or teaching individualized reading courses.
- Contribution to the teaching aims of the department. (1) Does the candidate participate in curriculum development? (2) Does the candidate generate any special initiatives in teaching (i.e., training grant director, innovative teaching programs, etc.)? (3) Does the candidate's teaching program balance the needs of the department with specialty courses of the candidate's own choosing?

### **1.2.3 Service (10%)**

Pre-tenure faculty should demonstrate a basic commitment and competence to provide service contributions to the department, the university, and the broader academic and non-academic community. While still important, service contributions cannot compensate for weaknesses in the area of research or teaching/mentoring. This is reflected in the fact that untenured faculty will generally have lighter service responsibilities than tenured faculty.

Untenured faculty are encouraged to exercise judgment in their allocation of time. Likewise, the department head is strongly discouraged from assigning junior faculty time-consuming service assignments. Typically it is most common for untenured faculty to provide service contributions on the department level. While service contributions on the level of the university or to the broader academic and non-academic community can be weighted favorably, a lack of such contributions in itself will not prevent a positive tenure decision substantial service contributions are not needed for a positive tenure decision.

### **1.2.4 Pre-Tenure Reviews**

#### **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 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.

#### **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 faculty. 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.

## **2. Department-Specific Procedures for Consideration for Tenure.**

### **2.1. Initial Meeting with Department Head.**

Within one month after a new faculty member in a tenure-track position is in residence in the Department of Psychology, the department head will schedule a meeting with that individual to review the procedures and expectations for tenure review at the level of the department, the college, and the university. The department head will discuss with new faculty members the kinds of records they should keep to demonstrate their accomplishments, and the sequence of annual and midterm reviews leading up to tenure, as specified in the CBA. The department head will also inform the candidate about rules around accelerated review or stopping of the tenure clock.

### **2.2. Establishment and Functions of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.**

No later than the spring term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required, the Department Head will appoint a Tenure and Promotion Committee, typically consisting of two tenured faculty members within the candidate's own area and a third tenured faculty member outside that area. An additional Committee member may be drawn from any Institute in which the candidate is a member. The candidate will consult with the Chair of the committee in the preparation of the tenure materials.

### **2.3. External Reviewers**

The committee will also initiate the external review process. Members of the candidate's Tenure and Promotion Committee will consult with other 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. Independent of the Committee's list of referees, the candidate will be asked to submit to the Committee a list of potential external referees (and a description of his or her relationship to each of these reviewers) who can provide insightful critiques of the candidate's contributions to the field. External referees 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. During the spring term of the pre-decision year, external referees from the list will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Referees who accept the invitation to evaluate, will receive the candidate's review materials by June 1. 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.

#### **2.4. Committee Report and Department Decision**

During the fall term of the tenure year, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is charged with submitting a written report evaluating the candidate's case for promotion to tenured members of the department. 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' assessments 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 Tenure and Promotion Committee's report and recommendation will be available for review by tenured members of the department (or Full Professors only, for decisions on promotion from Associate to Full Professor) in advance of a faculty meeting held in October. The chair of the Committee will present the candidate's case, and the faculty will discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, faculty members vote (except for the department head, who abstains) 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 by the department head, and the faculty members of the relevant rank within the department will be notified 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. Content of the discussion in the meeting, and the results of the vote, will remain confidential among the faculty members who participated in the decision.

#### **2.5 Department Head's Review.**

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement that characterizes the discussion of the faculty meeting and reports the vote totals. 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.

### **3. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

#### **3.1 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.

### **3.2 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 Psychology 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.

## **4. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

In general, the criteria and processes for promotion to full professor are similar to those for tenure. The Promotion Committee appointed by the department head consists of three full professors. In terms of criteria for promotion to full professor, excellence in research remains the most important, absolute criterion. In particular, candidates on this level are expected to have a national or international reputation in their areas of specialty (as indicated for example by memberships on editorial boards, associate editorships, or invitations to talks). Teaching remains a very important criterion, and in addition candidates at this level are expected to have provided a greater level of service. In this respect, evidence of leadership within the department, college, university, community, and/or research arena is expected for promotion to full professor. The emphases on the three domains of performance on this level are reflected in a relative weighting of 40%, 30%, and 30% for research, teaching, and service for the promotion decision.