Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: April 19, 2017

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

B. 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, usually in mid-April. 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, 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

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 the tenured members of the Department. A department vote is then held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head. 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. 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 in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In the Department of Geography, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

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 or head of the personnel committee, and voting members of 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.

e. 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.

III. Guidelines

A. Preamble

Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure in the Department of Geography at the University of Oregon is contingent upon the establishment of a significant and progressive research program, a strong teaching record, and satisfactory departmental and institutional service. Subsequent promotion to the rank of professor is dependent on the maturation of those research and teaching programs and also requires contributions to the maintenance and governance of the department and university, and when appropriate, to the discipline.

This document outlines the guidelines for promotion and tenure within the department and describes how the departmental requirements are related to the general UO requirements for advancement. In addition, a description is provided of the relationship between the variety

of scholarly activities pursued by geographers and the criteria used by the university for the evaluation of scholarship. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

B. Research (40%)

Geography is, by its nature, interdisciplinary and composed of several major subdisciplines as well as more-focused specialties. Each subdiscipline and specialty has a potentially distinct set of scholarly products and aspirations. Consequently, individual geographers may produce bodies of scholarly work that differ substantially one from another. At the UO, individual faculty members have research and teaching interests that fall in the major subdisciplinary units of physical geography, human geography, geographic information science, and geographic education.

- *Physical geography* emphasizes the spatial and temporal variations of the physical elements and processes that make up the environment: climate, water, landforms, soils, animals and plants, and human impacts. Physical geographers typically publish in specialty journals, the majority of which are outside of the discipline, and rarely are junior faculty members the authors of books or monographs. Research in physical geography typically involves the substantial use of field, laboratory, and data-analytical methods, and when appropriate, requires external research support. Peer-reviewed articles in important journals or edited volumes are widely viewed by physical geographers as the appropriate method for distributing new information.
- *Human geography* emphasizes the temporal and spatial character of human activities and their underlying social and cultural processes, the relationship of people to place, the landscapes produced by human activity, and the impacts of humans on the physical environment. Scholarly output for human geographers can range from the production of a book or monograph to peer-reviewed journal articles to some combination of the two. Research in human geography typically involves either field work or work with textual sources, but methodological or theoretical contributions are appropriate as well. In some cases, external funding may be required to support research activities. Human geographers writing journal articles often publish much of their work in disciplinary journals, but extra-disciplinary publication is acceptable and encouraged, where appropriate.
- *Geographic information science* is the subfield of the discipline that embraces the nature, representation, acquisition, management, display, and analysis of geospatial data. Because of the emerging nature of this part of the discipline, development of teaching materials and advancement of curricular matters in GIScience are also of academic importance. Scholarly output may include the presentation of theoretical and methodological advancements in geographic techniques, and publication of maps or compilations of maps in paper or as on- line atlases. External funding may be necessary to support these activities. Although a number of publication formats are recognized (chapters in edited volumes, on-line journals, CD-ROMs, and books), peer-reviewed articles in journals both within geography and in related disciplines

are generally recognized as the primary medium for reporting the results of research.

- *Geographic education* is a subfield of the discipline that emphasizes the application of educational theory to classroom practice. Research focuses on understanding and improving the processes of learning and teaching geography at all levels of instruction. Scholarly output in geographic education may include peer-reviewed journal articles and monographs, but also textbooks and original materials that support instruction, such as electronic media and curricular packages. External support may be required to help implement innovative educational programs and learning activities.

A standard form of scholarly output that is common to all subdisciplines and specialties within geography is the single- or lead-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume. Single or lead-authored books or monographs that present the author's original research are also a form of scholarly output in geography. These types of publication are highly valued within the discipline and are also a measure of achievement that can be recognized by colleagues in other disciplines within the university. Consequently, such forms should be a component of the evidence of scholarly work presented by a faculty member at the time of evaluation for promotion and tenure. The quality of the journal and/or publisher as well as the overall quantity of publications will be taken into consideration. There is not a universally accepted ranking of journals in geography. Instead, we emphasize the appropriateness of publication outlets, and the quality of individual journals as perceived by external reviewers.

A 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. 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.

The general criterion for evaluation of the research program is the production of original research that is recognized as significant by a scholar's peers. There are several other more specific criteria that are also important. The UO criteria that are most relevant to evaluation within the Department of Geography are:

- publications of significance and quality;
- participation in conferences, conventions, seminars and professional meetings; and
- research in progress and substantially planned work.

Of secondary importance, and mainly for the evaluation of promotion from associate to full professor, are:

- holding office and serving on committees of relevant professional organizations; serving on the editorial boards of relevant journals; acting as a reviewer of peer-reviewed articles and grant proposals within one's area of expertise; and
- recognized evidence of scholarship, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the re-publication of work.

The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor with indefinite tenure is the establishment of a significant research *program*, distinct from unrelated research *projects*. Scholarly contributions are evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field (for example, work that opens new lines of investigation), and future promise. The work needs to be programmatic or progressive. Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion would be a series of publications or a monograph that illustrates the development of a coherent research theme or themes. This theme would be recognized as significant by peers and external referees and would tend to be identified with the faculty member being evaluated if continued over time. The specific aspects of the scholarly work that peers and referees may regard as significant will of course vary from scholar to scholar but could include the development of a perspective or approach that represents an advancement from that used in dissertation work, and through citation can be seen to be contributing to the overall advancement of the field.

For promotion from associate to full professor, maturation of the research program is required. Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion could include a continued stream of publications, a second monograph, or other longer scholarly work, that builds on the work begun prior to promotion to Associate Professor, or that represents the development of a secondary research focus. The research program should be recognizable by peers and referees as being identified with the scholar.

At all levels, a strong indicator of perceived quality of the research program is provided by externally funded research support. However, not all specialties within geography require external funding, and the resources available are not equally distributed across the discipline. Consequently, we do not have an explicit requirement for external funding of research, but recognize its desirability *where appropriate*.

C. Teaching (40%)

All faculty are expected to maintain strong and continuously developing teaching programs, that include course offerings across different levels from introductory to upper-division to seminars, and the supervision of graduate-student research. The UO criteria most relevant for evaluating the teaching program include:

- classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation;
- supervision of student research; and
- academic advising, consultation, and informal teaching.

In addition, faculty members are encouraged to make contributions to the definition of educational objectives and the development of teaching and evaluative materials that reflect current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory. However, we recognize that there is considerable variability across the discipline in the availability of resources and in the development of educational theory.

All faculty are expected to contribute both to the core of the department's curriculum, as well as to the parts of it that are related to a faculty member's specific research focus. In addition, all faculty are expected to make contributions (as appropriate relative to committee assignments) to student advising at all levels. For promotion from assistant to associate professor, we expect faculty members to have adopted or developed a small number of courses in a particular specialty or theme (in addition to helping support the core curriculum) and to be actively advising graduate students. At all ranks, we consider it mandatory that courses continuously evolve in terms of the materials that are presented and the methods appropriate for presenting them.

In assessing teaching performance, peer evaluations are of considerable importance. Consideration will also be given to numerical and written student evaluations, but it is recognized that different types and levels of courses are likely to be evaluated differentially. In assessing teaching, strong performance or improvement over time is viewed particularly positively. 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 peer 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 peer every other year until promotion to full professor.

D. Service (20%)

The general criterion used in evaluations of the service contribution of faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure is the satisfactory participation in departmental maintenance, university governance, and academic infrastructure building. The specific level of service activities is determined by the rank of the faculty member. The specific UO criteria we emphasize include participation in:

- departmental administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities;
- college or school administration and committees or activities; and
- university or state system administration and committees or activities.

Where appropriate, a faculty member may also be credited with providing:

- academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university; or

- academic service on behalf of public bodies.

We expect faculty members to make appropriate contributions to the maintenance and development of their academic communities. In common with many other departments and programs, our intention is to limit the service loads of junior faculty as much as possible. However, the department's role in several interdepartmental programs on campus sometimes makes it difficult to control demands placed on faculty members from sources outside of our department.

The specific criteria we use to determine whether satisfactory service contributions have been made is based on consideration of typical profiles of faculty at different ranks. For promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure, satisfactory performance would include:

- participation on departmental committees (e.g., search committees, graduate admissions, undergraduate advising), but probably not administrating ("chairing") such committees in the first few years;

- participation on committees of university interdepartmental committees where appropriate; and
- participation in professional activities, including, for example, the organization of sessions at meetings and the completion of editorial and review service, but not necessarily at the level of elective or appointed office on disciplinary committees or editorial boards.

For promotion from associate to full professor, satisfactory performance would include:

- administration of a major departmental committee, such as a search, graduate admissions, personnel committee, or service as the graduate or undergraduate advisor;

- participation in general university governance, with some form of elective office (e.g., University Senate or Graduate Council) being desirable, or participation in the administration of an interdepartmental program; and

    i. administration of a major departmental committee, such as a search, graduate admissions, personnel committee, or service as the graduate or undergraduate advisor;
    ii. participation in general university governance, with some form of elective office (e.g., University Senate or Graduate Council) being desirable, or participation in the administration of an interdepartmental program; and
    iii. significant service to the discipline, including the organization of regional or national meetings, editorial board service, or holding

elective or appointed office in a professional organization.

E. Joint Appointment Evaluation

Some faculty with split appointments may have teaching loads that differ from the standard geography course load of 4 courses. In this case, the evaluation standards for research productivity will be commensurate with teaching course loads.

II. 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 Geography 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.