Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Review, 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 Chemistry and Biochemistry 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. These annual reviews are written with input from the senior colleagues of the candidate’s division, and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate’s annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate’s progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

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 members of the candidate’s division and related institutes. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head (usually with significant input from the senior members of the appropriate division), and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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/Report
Since the mid-1970s, the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry has not utilized a Promotion and Tenure Committee to oversee the promotion process or to provide a summary report to the department of the candidate and their case, unlike many other departments at UO; instead, the process is coordinated by the department head. A departmental vote prior to adoption of these current promotion and tenure guidelines reaffirmed this modus operandi. Chemistry and Biochemistry believes every faculty member within the department must read the dossier prior to the faculty vote and thus make up his or her mind about the case unimpeded by the opinions and potential biases of a narrow subsection of the faculty. Instead, the departmental seminar and the presentation of the case and ample discussion in the department meeting provide ample opportunity for review of the candidate and his or her merits (see below).

d. Departmental Seminar
In early to mid-October, the candidate will present a departmental seminar to the faculty, staff and students of the department, outlining their research accomplishments while at Oregon. The seminar should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who are less familiar with the candidate’s area of research.

e. Department Meeting and Vote
The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case, i.e., tenured associate and full professors for tenure decisions and only full professors for promotion to full. In general, a senior faculty member from the candidate’s division presents the case to the whole faculty, any relevant institute director makes the institute’s case, all the members of the particular division discuss the case, members from other divisions comment, and final comments are solicited. Following these discussions, 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 are tallied, usually by the department head, and the department is 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. Emeritus professors may attend the meeting but do not vote.

f. Department Head’s Review
After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The first half of the statement provides 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.), as well as summarizes the department meeting in which the vote was taken. This summary describes in moderate detail the presentation of the case and all relevant faculty discussions about research, teaching and service. The departmental Personnel Advisory Committee assists in the write-up and review of this half of the department head statement. The second half of the department head statement offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. This section is not reviewed by the Personnel Advisory Committee.

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble
These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty.
The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 50 : 35 : 15, respectively.

B. Research (50%)
Excellence in research is required, consistent with the Academic Affairs website [http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/](http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/). In the context of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 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 chemistry 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 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 (35%)
Excellence in teaching is required within the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. The Department assesses quality of teaching in the following ways:

- **Peer evaluation.** For untenured faculty, a member of the candidate’s division will visit one class during the candidates third, fourth and fifth years at UO. For promotion to full professor, peer evaluations will occur once every two years after the granting of tenure. 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 Chemistry and Biochemistry is the training and mentoring of students. 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 during their temporary appointments as research associates.

D. Service (15%)
Faculty members in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry 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
i. 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 safety committee. Examples for associate professors include, but are not limited to, serving as chair of the graduate admissions committee and a member of the personal advisory committee.

ii. 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, advising undergraduate majors and organizing seminar series.

External Service Indicators
i. 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 NSF), professional organizations (e.g., advisory board, executive officer, symposium/meeting organizer), or professional journals (editor/editorial board, ad hoc editor, reviewer).

ii. Service Recognition: Evidence of formal recognition by a professional association, organization, agency or journal regarding service contributions.

III. 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 Chemistry and Biochemistry 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.