

## **Psychology Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines January 2011**

These guidelines were prepared by the Psychology Executive Committee and approved (with revision) by the department at a faculty meeting on January 24, 2011. The purpose is to provide guidance and suggestions to junior faculty as they prepare for their tenure and promotion review and to more senior faculty as they prepare for promotion to Full Professor. This report is a collection of information and advice about the tenure process and about promotions to Associate and Full Professor; it is not a substitute for the official UO statement of tenure guidelines on the Academic Affairs website (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>).

### **I. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW.**

#### **1. Overview.**

Promotion to a tenured position in the Department of Psychology at the University of Oregon depends on superior scholarly research and teaching, and satisfactory institutional and public service. Tenure-track faculty are hired with confidence that they have the potential to achieve these high standards and with the expectation and hope that they will become permanent colleagues. The purpose of this document is to codify departmental tenure policies and expectations with the intention of promoting achievement among untenured faculty while minimizing undue anxiety and stress. This report first discusses criteria for achievement in research, teaching, and service; then procedures for preparing a tenure case.

#### **2. Criteria for Tenure.**

The four areas of competence upon which the institution judges faculty are: (1) Quality of teaching; (2) Professional growth, scholarly activities, and creative and artistic achievement; (3) Leadership in academic and administrative service; and (4) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community. The handbook notes that these four elements may not carry equal weight. The following represents relative levels of importance attached to each element by the Department of Psychology when considering candidates for tenure.

##### **2.1 Scholarly Activities.**

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 evidence to support achievement in scholarly research is a series of high quality publications that are judged to be important by peers at the university and experts at other institutions. A second criterion is evidence of a continuing commitment to research as evidenced by a body of work that is in progress and important work being planned.

Written evaluations of research quality and significance will be obtained from outside reviewers; internal evaluations may also be sought from colleagues in the department and Institutes in which the candidate is a member. Additional evidence of impact may sometimes include invited lectures, excellence of the candidate's research group, invitations to serve on journal editorial boards and granting agency study sections, and outside financial support. Scholarly work, however, will be judged on its own merits, not on the funding which it may or may not receive. Furthermore, 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.

##### **2.1.1 Scholarly Activities--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:**

All faculty are hired with the expectation that they will establish themselves as outstanding research scientists. We try to facilitate this process by reducing teaching loads and service expectations for untenured faculty. If, at tenure review time, letters from outside expert peers evaluate a candidate's research as less than outstanding, then it is unlikely that the department will recommend promotion. This is true even if teaching and service are judged to be outstanding.

Publications 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. While collaborative research is encouraged, it is necessary to demonstrate independence. In addition,

more weight is given to publications that are peer-reviewed, compared to those that are not. Evidence of consistent productivity is desired, with publications 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.

Outside financial support for research is often necessary to pursue high quality scholarship. We recognize the competitive nature of research funding in psychology and that substantially more funding is available in some areas than in others. Moreover, substantially more support may be required to carry out some types of research than others. Our department's emphasis is on research quality and significance, not on levels of research funding. A candidate's research funding will be considered within the framework of need and availability. Junior faculty should be cautioned that while the ability to attract research funding is highly valued, the record must also include empirical publications in excellent journals.

Documentation of research accomplishments is crucial. When a research project is complete, it should be published promptly. Internal and outside reviewers alike will look much more favorably on a set of published papers than on a set of manuscripts nearly ready for submission. As such, in order to fully count toward the tenure decision, papers, book chapters and books must be published or "in press" (that is, accepted for publication and requiring no further substantial revisions, as indicated by a letter from the editor). At the same time, the department discourages publishing before the work is ready, or a breaking apart of what might make a single very nice story into a collection of substantially less coherent pieces purely for the sake of increasing the number of publications.

Take opportunities to let departmental colleagues know about your research progress. The department includes considerable breadth, and generally colleagues in your own interest group will be the most knowledgeable about, and have the most expertise to evaluate, your research program. There are several ways of informing members of the department about your research progress. Asking departmental colleagues to critique manuscripts and grant proposals is a superb avenue for evaluation in a way that will be of particular benefit to you. You should take advantage of area research meetings for ongoing communication and feedback about progress in your research. The Departmental Colloquium Series also provides an opportunity to inform your colleagues about your research.

## **2.2 Teaching Quality.**

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 an absolute requirement for tenure in the Department of Psychology. Unsatisfactory teachers will not become tenured even if their research is stellar.

Teaching will be evaluated based on the guidelines presented below from the "Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" as compiled in a study supported by the American Association for Higher Education and the Education Commission of the States:

- Good practice encourages student-faculty contact. Student motivation and interest is encouraged by frequent student-faculty contact. Does the teacher spend the appropriate amount of contact hours in lectures, labs, discussions, office hours, and drop-in visits?
- Good practice encourages cooperation among students. Working with others often increases active learning. Sharing ideas and responding to others' thoughts can improve critical thinking and can deepen understanding.
- Good practice encourages active learning. Effective learning does not occur simply by sitting in class listening to a lecture, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. Does the teacher encourage students to talk about psychology, think about psychology, write about psychology, and relate psychology to past experience?
- Good practice gives prompt feedback. Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Does

the teacher provide frequent opportunities for students to demonstrate performance and provide early, prompt, and adequate suggestions for improvement?

- Good practice communicates high expectations. Expecting students to perform at a high level becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Does the teacher hold high expectations for students and communicate to students that level of achievement?
- Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning. Students bring different talents and backgrounds into the classroom and learn in different ways. Does the teacher give all students the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work best for them?

The department also encourages the recognition of ethnic and racial diversity, and the fostering of an inclusive classroom environment.

The central criteria for teaching excellence are command of the subject matter, the ability to present key ideas clearly and logically, and the progress made by students toward mastery of the concepts that are central to the subject.

The department assesses quality of teaching in several ways: (1) Self-assessment of teaching performance; (2) Peer evaluation of classroom teaching; (3) Student evaluation; (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. Tenured Associate Professors are required to be evaluated every other year until promotion to Full Professor. (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.
- Supervision of student research and reading. Individualized teaching is a major aspect of university education. You will put a good deal of effort into advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. This may 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?

### **2.2.1 Teaching Quality--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:**

You should take the opportunity to attend courses taught by other faculty members. Additionally, the university has a Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP) that provides support and training for faculty at many different levels. We highly recommend the utilization of TEP's services to help enhance faculty members' teaching abilities.

Student evaluations are important; however, it is not just the raw scores that we are interested in.

Student comments will be interpreted in the context of the rest of the teaching record, as well as the context of the particular course. Sometimes very good teachers do not get the best scores on student evaluations, and vice-versa. That is why we try to make a distinction between faculty member A with a score of 4.5 and comments like "this was a fun and entertaining class" and faculty member B with a similar score but comments like "the instructor really challenged me to think". Likewise, we would try to distinguish between faculty member C with scores of 3 and comments such as "there was too much work for a 200-level class" and faculty member D with similar scores but comments such as "the teacher was arrogant and inaccessible" or "the teacher was habitually late for class".

### **2.3. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service.**

A criterion for promotion and tenure is institutional service including department, college, and university committees on curriculum, personnel, and policies. The faculty play an important role in the governance and policies of this university, and the university in fact expects participation of its faculty members.

The department similarly expects a demonstration of competence in the area of institutional service. This does not imply that each faculty member must contribute in some fixed proportion to institutional service or that faculty must equally share responsibilities. In particular, untenured faculty 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. Responsibilities at the various levels of organization must be weighed against each other, balancing heavy commitment in one area against lighter responsibilities in others.

Note, however, that a faculty member's first responsibilities are toward excellent research and superior teaching; exemplary service coupled with lackluster scholarship and ineffective teaching will not merit tenure.

#### **2.3.1 Academic and Administrative Service--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:**

The department realizes that administrative and committee responsibilities can detract from the main mission for untenured faculty: academic development, achievement of scholarly goals, and effective teaching. Consequently, 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.

While untenured faculty and junior tenured faculty may wish to contribute to university governance and policy making decisions through service outside the department, this wish should be discouraged among untenured faculty. Remember, service is no substitute for scholarship and teaching at tenure time.

### **2.4. Service and Activities on Behalf of the Larger Community.**

The final criterion listed is community service. This includes academic contributions to community activities and public bodies, as well as to local, national, or international professional organizations. Service activities for professional organizations might include reviewing of manuscripts, editorial responsibilities at a research journal, and reviewing grant proposals. The main point to consider with respect to community service is that it serves largely as an embellishment to one's list of scholarly activities. Service activities have a transient impact on one's scholarly reputation, and in no way substitute for direct involvement in an active program of research.

#### **2.4.1 Community Service--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:**

Untenured faculty should be cautious in taking on larger responsibilities, such as membership on editorial boards or grant-review panels. While such activities can be quite educational, and they carry a certain amount of prestige, faculty who have not yet successfully developed their own research and teaching programs may be better off postponing such activities for a few years.

Invited lectures (seminars at other universities or at national and international meetings) provide

substantial evidence of one's scholarly reputation. Service in an advisory role to governmental agencies also provides an indication of recognition, and to some extent of one's scientific maturity. However, travel fragments time blocks that might otherwise be available for research and teaching. Thus, while untenured faculty are encouraged to present their research to colleagues outside the university, they should be cautious about traveling excessively.

### **3. Procedures for Consideration for Tenure.**

#### **3.1 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. At that time, the individual will be given this departmental policy statement and reference to the Academic Affairs web site on this topic (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>). In addition, the department head will discuss with new faculty members the kinds of records they should keep to demonstrate their accomplishments.

This initial meeting should also provide a discussion of ways to optimize the balance between research, teaching and service requirements. Although the typical teaching load in Psychology is three undergraduate courses and one graduate course per year, current departmental policy provides for four teaching releases during the pre-tenure years (although this may be reduced for individuals with an accelerated tenure clock) as a way of providing additional support to the candidate's efforts at establishing an independent research laboratory. Typically, these reductions will take the form of a course reduction in each year for the first 3 years of employment and a further one course reduction in the year before tenure is decided. The nature of the course reductions will be determined by the needs of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, but the reductions will typically constitute 3 undergraduate courses and 1 graduate course.

#### **3.2. Annual Reviews.**

Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed annually by the department head in consultation with the departmental executive committee. The individual will submit an annual report to the department head that includes a summary of accomplishments in research, teaching and service. An evaluation written by the Department Head in consultation with the Executive Committee will be given to the faculty member. This report will be discussed in a meeting with the Department Head and faculty member. The discussion at this meeting should be a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's progress during the previous year and should include suggestions for possible improvements during the subsequent pre-tenure years. The report is signed by the faculty member and the department head. The faculty member may attach a response if he or she desires. Note that the annual reports from department head are not included in the materials submitted in the tenure file. The purpose of the annual reviews is to 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.

##### **3.2.1 Annual Review--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:**

You should begin to keep a record of your accomplishments as soon as you are in residence in the Department of Psychology. This record should include: (1) all publications, (2) all courses that you are involved with as a teacher, co-teacher, or guest lecturer, (3) all academic and administrative service within the university, (4) all professional service within organizations outside the university (editorial boards, professional societies, funding agencies, etc.) and community-related service, (5) all undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students, and their present affiliations where this is known, (6) all thesis titles, and other titles of pertinent reports and publications not in the faculty member's personal bibliography, (7) all invited lectures, seminars and symposium talks, etc., (8) all grant support.

#### **3.3. Third-year Review and Contract Renewal.**

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 contract renewal. The faculty member provides a current vita and a brief statement about his or her professional activities, scholarly accomplishments, and plans for the future. These materials will be reviewed by the Executive Committee

and a report will be prepared. Members of the Executive Committee then present the report to a faculty meeting of all tenured faculty, who vote on whether to recommend renewing the contract. After this vote, the Department Head prepares a review, and shares it with the dean for approval. The Department Head then shares the results with the individual under review, and gives the individual an opportunity to submit a response. 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 (or for another three years if the tenure decision is delayed due to child birth/adoption or medical leave (see below)). 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.

### **3.4. Tenure Review Period.**

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service.

#### **3.4.1 Accelerated Review.**

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. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon.

#### **3.4.2 Stopping the Tenure Clock.**

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, due to circumstances such as pregnancy and childbirth; extended illness or death of a partner, parent, or child; or an extended illness of the individual. In these cases, the individual can petition to stop the tenure clock, but there is no guarantee that such petitions will be granted, either by the department or by the university. In addition, there are specific time constraints on this process, as outlined on 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. Generally, a leave of absence for pursuit of scholarly research does not stop the tenure clock.

### **3.5. Confidentiality.**

Discussions between the candidate, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the department head concerning the candidate's tenure case are to be considered confidential. In no case should this information be disseminated without the explicit approval of the candidate.

### **3.6. Preparation of the Tenure File.**

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, 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: a curriculum vitae, a personal statement, and a set of published papers and completed manuscripts (including letters from appropriate

journal editors to indicate the status of manuscripts that are “in press”, a possibly short statement from the candidate to indicate how the order of authorship was decided). The personal statement should describe the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient, but some research programs have a complexity that will require additional space (even then, brevity is important, and under no circumstances should the statement exceed ten pages). 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. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate’s area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues. During the spring term, the contents of the candidate’s tenure file will be made available to the department’s tenured professors, who will have a preliminary discussion concerning promotion and tenure.

### **3.7. External Reviewers.**

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 who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Independent of the Committee’s selection 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 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. 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 late September or early October.

### **3.8. 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.

### **3.9. Dossier.**

The candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will assemble the tenure dossier, which is to include: (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) peer evaluations of teaching; (8) letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, including one from a candidate’s research institute/center director; and (9) external reviewer biographies and a description of any relationship between the candidate and the reviewers; and (10) a signed waiver (see section 3.13) indicating the degree to which the candidate has retained access to their file (this will be shared with referees).

### **3.10. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report.**

During the fall term of the tenure year, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is charged with submitting a written report to tenured members of 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' 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.

### **3.11. Department Meeting and Vote.**

In the Fall of the tenure year, the candidate's tenure dossier along with 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.

### **3.12. 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. 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 generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

### **3.13. Degree of Candidate Access to File.**

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options. 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. Letter writers will be informed of the level of access to the file that the candidate has retained.

### **3.14. College and University Procedures.**

Once a dossier is sent to the College, it is unlikely that the department will revisit the review. However, if very important information (e.g., grant awarded, manuscript accepted for publication, etc.) is received before a final University decision is reached, the department does have the ability to convey that information to higher review committees. In addition, subsequent reviewers of the dossier (i.e., the DAC, the dean, the FPC, or the provost) may request supplemental information during any stage of the review.

#### **3.14.1. Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC).**

Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee, 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, s/he 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.

#### **3.14.2 Dean.**



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.

### **3.14.3. Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC).**

After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee, a 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.

### **3.14.4. Provost.**

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. Under current policy, the provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1<sup>st</sup> (or before May 1<sup>st</sup> if it falls on a weekend), except in rare cases (the candidate may consult with the department head for updates on this policy). In all cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **II. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

### **1. Overview.**

In addition to regular post-tenure reviews (see UO Policy Statement 3.150, Post Tenure Review), there is also a review when a tenured faculty member is eligible for promotion to full professor. In general, the guidelines for promotion to full professor are similar to those for tenure except candidates are expected to now have an international reputation in their areas of specialty and to have provided a greater level of service. With respect to service, evidence of leadership within the college, university, community, or research arena is expected for promotion to full professor. We expect high levels of performance in research, teaching, and service, while recognizing that the emphasis within the areas of competence may have shifted between the time tenure was granted and consideration for promotion to full professor. It should be emphasized again that outstanding performance in one or two other areas is no substitute for evidence of outstanding scholarship. While there is an expectation in the Department of Psychology that all of our tenured faculty will be eligible for promotion to full professor, promotion is earned and not automatic.

In general, consideration for promotion to full professor may come at any time after the granting of tenure. Normally an individual will be considered for promotion 5 to 7 years after the granting of tenure.

### **2. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.**

Scholarly activities, teaching, and service will be reviewed by a departmental committee that will base its evaluation on a statement of accomplishments submitted by the applicant, other submitted materials, as well as materials not submitted by the person under review, such as student evaluations of teaching on file in the department. Outside peer review of research, and other information (e.g., comments from colleagues) must be obtained and used in the review.

### **3. Review Process.**

The process is similar to promotion to associate with tenure. The department head will appoint a Promotion Committee including three full professors. The candidate will prepare materials in consultation with the Chair

of that committee and will submit a short list of names of individuals suggested as external reviewers, along with a description of the candidate's relationships with those individuals. The candidate's statement and vita will be made available to the department's full professors for preliminary discussion in the spring before the promotion case is formally considered. The candidate's materials, the external reviewers and the committee report and recommendation will then be made available to the full professors the following fall. The Chair of the Promotion Committee will present the candidate's case at a departmental meeting of full professors and a vote will be taken. The votes will be signed secret ballots that are kept by the department head and not made part of the file. The department head will summarize the results in a recommendation letter that goes into the candidate's file. Then the candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and begin the administrative review in a way that is similar to the review for tenure (evaluations by the Dean's Advisory Committee, the Dean, Faculty Personnel Committee and Provost).

## **APPENDIX:**

### **Teaching Evaluation Procedures**

#### **May 1996 UO Legislation on Peer Reviews:**

##### **POLICY**

- Each tenure-track faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion/tenure review. In most cases, this shall be the third, fourth and fifth years of the probationary period.
- Each tenured faculty member with rank of Associate Professor shall have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to Full Professor.

##### **PROCEDURE**

- Courses to be evaluated shall be determined by the department head in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated. In selecting courses to be evaluated, the department head shall plan to achieve a mixture of courses (lower division, upper division, and graduate-level courses).
- Faculty chosen to conduct peer evaluations shall be tenured, and where reasonably possible, shall hold an academic rank higher than that of the faculty member being evaluated. Evaluators shall be selected by the department head in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated.
- Evaluations shall include, but need not be limited to, teaching materials (syllabi, exams, student performance, etc.) and at least one classroom visit.
- A written report, addressing outlined criteria, shall be prepared and signed by the evaluator. The report shall indicate if the classroom visit(s) was spontaneous or arranged in advance with the faculty member being evaluated.
- The department shall archive the written evaluations for use in future faculty evaluations.
- One copy of the peer evaluation shall be placed in the permanent personnel file of the person being evaluated, and one copy shall be given to the faculty member.
- All reports of peer evaluations shall be included in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file, and are to be carefully reviewed at the department and school/college level.