

# Department of Human Physiology Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

Approved by the Human Physiology Faculty: (01/21/2011)

## I. Procedures

### a. Preamble

Promotion to a tenured position in the Department of Human Physiology at the University of Oregon depends on superior scholarly research, excellence in 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. Promotion to Full Professor requires demonstration that the faculty member is an internationally recognized expert who has contributed significantly to their discipline, the Department, and the University community. The purpose of this document is to codify departmental and University tenure and promotion policies and expectations. It is expected that each faculty member will be responsible for knowing their individual timeline for review.

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>). Below are specific procedures for the Department of Human Physiology.

### b. Compendium of Procedures

#### i. Annual Reviews

Every assistant professor will submit an annual report to the department head, usually in late-April. The department head will review the annual report to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the junior faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The candidate's annual report should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of his or her courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

#### ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in April of the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. If faculty have credit towards tenure, then the report should be submitted in the final year of their initial contract. The contract renewal/third-year review is a more comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the candidate's overall progress to date. The format of the material the candidate submits, and the department's evaluation of this material, is intended to duplicate the actual review for promotion and tenure described below, except that the department does not solicit outside letters. The candidate will submit a report including: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, lists (by year and term) of courses and committees; (2) a personal narrative statement describing accomplishments to date in

the areas of research (technical where appropriate, but this section should be written so that non-scientists can understand it), teaching, and service; (3) a personal narrative statement of goals and plans for the next 2-3 years; and (4) copies of published papers and manuscripts based on work carried out at the UO. A senior department member (Associate or Full Professor) will review the documents and provide a report to the Faculty. A department vote by tenure-track faculty is held whether or not to renew the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head (usually with significant input from the senior members of the Faculty), and forwarded to the college for approval by the dean. 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 Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion during the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. 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 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. In all other cases, consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. 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. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult 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.

iv. 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. 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.

v. 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, and is in addition to the External Reviewers.

vi. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the summer term prior to tenure and promotion consideration, typically by July 15th. The 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, though eight to ten page documents are more common. 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 prior to submission to the Department.

vii. Dossier

In addition to the letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, including one from a candidate's research institute/center director, the dossier should 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) signed student comments; (8) at least three peer teaching evaluations; (9) external reviewer biographies and a description of any relationship between the candidate and the reviewers; and (10) a signed waiver (see xii, below) indicating the degree to which the candidate has retained access to their file (this will be shared with referees). It is possible to update the dossier with supplemental material such as news about submitted manuscripts, awards, etc., but is the candidate's responsibility to bring these materials to the department head, who then forwards them to the College.

viii. Promotion and Tenure Committee/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: request the assistance of an Emeritus Faculty or 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 will be made available in the department office to all faculty for review prior to the department meeting. Both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. In the case that sufficient Faculty are not at the appropriate rank, members of equal rank to the Faculty going forward with promotion or tenure can vote, at the discretion of the department head.

ix. Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically 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.

xi. 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 generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

xii. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring or summer 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.

xiii. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), 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.

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

4. 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. Except in rare and difficult cases, 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). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15<sup>th</sup>.

## II. Guidelines

### a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Human Physiology. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

### b. Research

Excellence in research is required, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. In the context of the Department of Human Physiology, development of a successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for promotion. The following indicators are the primary ways in which scholarship is evaluated. The quality (as measured by the peer review process) of scientific publications is of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. The primary venue for publication of scholarship in our field is as scientific articles in established, peer-reviewed journals. The department does not establish a minimum number of publications for promotion and/or tenure. Instead we rely upon external evaluations to help judge a faculty member's productivity and the quality of his or her contributions relative to the norm in the sub-discipline. External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research in the candidate's sub-discipline is crucial; however, the Department does recognize that the average funding available in different sub-disciplines of Human Physiology varies. External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered. For tenure cases, we expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue. For a promotion to full professor, continued professional development and leadership in the field are expected. In all cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.

### c. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is required within the Department of Human Physiology. The Department assesses quality of teaching in the following ways:

- *Peer evaluation.* 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. It is the Department Head's responsibility to ensure that reviews are performed at the appropriate timeframes.

- The faculty visitor will review all appropriate syllabi and other course materials. The visitor will write a report to the department head, evaluating the performance and effectiveness of the candidate.
- *Student evaluations.* Numerical and written student evaluations are collected for each course taught. These written evaluations often provide a reliable picture of the quality of the teaching, as perceived by the students.

An important aspect of the teaching mission in the Department of Human Physiology is the training and mentoring of students and post-docs. These include:

- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students working on graduate student thesis projects.
- Supervision and mentoring of undergraduate students who participate in undergraduate research projects.
- Supervision and mentoring of postdoctoral scholars or physicians during their temporary appointments as research associates.

d. Service

Faculty members in the Department of Human Physiology are expected to contribute to sustaining and enhancing the learning communities in which they work through service activities. We view this as a developmental process, beginning with minimal departmental service responsibilities in the early years of the probationary period, and increasing in importance following the granting of tenure. Untenured faculty members are expected to participate in departmental governance and share in committee work, although assessment of service contributions plays a minor role in the department's evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor and the granting of indefinite tenure. In contrast, the evaluation for promotion to full professor should involve a clear demonstration of leadership in either administrative or service activities. Furthermore, this increased level of commitment to professional service should extend beyond the department to the college, university and/or professional (external) level. Evaluation of service is classified into two broad categories, internal and external:

*Internal Service Indicators*

- Committee: Evidence of participation on committees (departmental, institute or center, college, university) as a member or chair that requires an effort and contributes to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, institute or center, college, or university. Examples for assistant professors include, but are not limited to, serving as a member of the graduate admissions committee, the curriculum committee, and the research development committee. Examples for associate professors include, but are not limited to, serving as a Chair of a Faculty Search Committee, Director of Graduate Studies, Research Director, or Curriculum Director.

Additional examples external to the Department may include serving on the Institutional Review Board, the Faculty Senate, or University Curriculum Committee.

- Administration: Evidence of performance of administrative or program development duties that requires a substantial amount of effort and contributes significantly to the mission, goals and objectives to the department, institute or center, college, or university. Examples for assistant professors and associate professors include, but are not limited to, organizing seminar series or assisting with student advising.

*External Service Indicators*

- Service Contribution: Evidence of service contributions at the state, regional, national or international level include activities such as participating in scientific organizations (e.g., advisory board or review panel of agencies such as NIH or NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory board, executive officer, symposium/meeting organizer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).
- Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by a professional association, organization, agency or journal regarding service contributions.