

Department of Planning, Public Policy, and Management

Criteria for the Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Approved October 19, 2001

Introduction

The Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management (PPPM) is concerned with creating and disseminating knowledge, educating graduate and undergraduate students, and improving the human condition through teaching, research, and applied practice. The department's concerns are the issues of the day and the emerging problems of tomorrow. Its approach is action-oriented, interdisciplinary, and solution focused. PPPM faculty members have interests and expertise in a broad range of planning, policy, and management areas.

The Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon is home to two master's degree programs and an undergraduate program. The master of community and regional planning is accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board and the master of public administration is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.

The PPPM department endorses the general university criteria of 1) quality of teaching; 2) professional growth, scholarly activities, creative and artistic achievement; 3) leadership in academic and administrative service; and 4) service and activities on behalf of the larger community (Faculty Handbook, 1999, pp. 74-75). This document interprets and extends these criteria to assist PPPM faculty in understanding what evidence of achievement is important to the department and the university. Further, this document provides guidance to those outside PPPM responsible for making promotion and tenure recommendations and decisions.

The PPPM faculty will be evaluated for promotion and tenure based on their achievements in teaching, scholarship, administrative and professional service, and public service. This document describes the department's criteria for evaluating the above areas for promotion and tenure. Although we list the criteria for evaluation separately, the department believes that they are interrelated and mutually supporting activities. For instance, public service activities can lead to important research opportunities, students learn when involved with faculty research or public service activities, etc.

While the department recognizes that during any particular time an individual may be more productive in one area compared to others, the goal is for each faculty member to provide a balanced contribution to teaching, scholarship, administrative and professional service, and public service. For tenure track faculty, as a guide for the allocation of time and resources in

attaining tenure, these areas are roughly weighted as follows: teaching (40%), research and scholarship (40%), and administrative, professional and public service (20%). For tenured faculty, the service component may be of greater importance.

This document applies to the tenure-track and tenured faculty. PPPM faculty who are not tenure-related are not covered by this document.

A. Criteria for Evaluation

1. Teaching. Quality teaching is defined by evidence that students are engaged in the learning process and evidence that student are gaining knowledge and skills. Good teaching stimulates student interest and motivates students to perform high-quality work. Proficiency in teaching includes the ability to teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Good teachers are intellectually engaged in the content of their teaching and are skilled in teaching techniques. Effective classroom teaching includes keeping course materials current, clearly defining educational objectives and evaluation criteria for students, and using sound pedagogical approaches. Teaching activities extend beyond the classroom and include academic advising, the supervision of student research, the supervision of student field work, and informal teaching. Evidence for the effectiveness of teaching include:

- reports from peer reviewers (classroom observers)
- student evaluations (letters, written comments, and ratings)
- the quality of student research that the faculty member supervises
- the quality of syllabi and teaching materials
- the accomplishments of students once they leave the University
- measures of student learning and/or achievement

2. Research and Scholarship. Research and scholarship are defined as creating and disseminating new knowledge in the fields of planning, public policy, and management. High quality scholarship makes a significant contribution to the knowledge base that informs policy, practice, teaching, and/or research in the field. Faculty members are expected to produce a body of work that reflects a defined and coherent research focus. Normal expectations for a faculty member are to produce, on average, one to two refereed journal articles per year while at the University of Oregon and to have in the range of 6-10 journal articles when reviewed for tenure and promotion. There is a further expectation that at least some of these articles will be published in the most highly regarded peer-reviewed journals in the field. Other evidence for the quality of research include:

- peer-reviewed books
- research monographs
- presentations at professional and or academic meetings
- invited presentations
- the number of times the faculty member's work is cited by other researchers
- grant awards
- special awards and recognition
- invited book chapters

- book reviews, commentaries, or editorials in professional publications

3. Administrative and Professional Service. Administrative service is the contribution faculty members make to the governance of the university, the department, and the college. This includes service on standing committees (e.g., the curriculum committee) as well as appointed, elected, and special ad hoc committees. For untenured faculty members, the expectation for administrative service is minimal. Assistant professors are typically expected to serve on one departmental committee and one college committee per year. After tenure the expectations for administrative service increase.

Professional service refers to the contributions that faculty members make to the governance of the professional societies to which they belong and to the larger profession. Examples of professional service include:

- serving as a peer reviewer for a journal
- serving on a journal editorial board
- reviewing grant proposals
- doing site visits for professional program accreditation
- serving on committees
- editing a journal
- serving as an elected official

4. Public Service. Public service refers to the application of professional skills and knowledge to benefit communities and organizations. Examples include:

- work with a community organization or planning agency to address a pressing problem or issue
- collaboration with a civic agency as a partner in planning, implementation, or evaluation of a program
- training of citizens or professionals in order to build capacity
- development and dissemination of professional knowledge in ways that make it more understandable and accessible to professionals and citizens
- assistance to community groups, such as data analysis, problem solving, program evaluation, or needs assessment
- serving on public boards and advisory committees

Professionally-related public service should be documented and evaluated. High quality public service advances knowledge and innovative practice. Criteria for evaluating professional public service include:

- measurable impacts on the issue, problem, program, agency, community, or society that are the target of activities
- scope, originality, generalizability, and effectiveness of the work
- evaluative judgement of the quality of the work by professional peers, clients, or external reviewers

B. Preparation for Review

Preparation for tenure and promotion reviews shall begin in the spring prior to the year in which the review will take place. Preparation for annual and reappointment reviews shall begin at the start of the academic year.

1. At the beginning of each academic year the department chair will make public the names of those to be reviewed. Faculty and students will be invited to submit signed letters that pertain to the criteria specified under A.

2. Requisite materials to be supplied by faculty prior to evaluation are fully described in the *Faculty Handbook of the University of Oregon* and *A Faculty Guide to Promotion and Tenure at the University of Oregon*, published by the Office of Academic Affairs. These items include:

- a. A *curriculum vitae*, including a summary of education, experience, honors, public and University service, and a bibliography;
- b. A personal statement outlining the faculty member's scholarly and pedagogical accomplishments, goals, and plans;
- c. Copies of all publications and other writings, including those accepted for publication, working papers, grant proposals currently under review, and reports of service; and
- d. Materials relating to teaching performance including a comprehensive record of teaching activities, student and peer evaluations, and other materials that illustrate teaching scholarship and instructional effectiveness.

C. Annual Review of Non-Tenured Faculty

The goal of the annual review of non-tenured faculty is to facilitate faculty development and progress toward promotion and tenure according to the criteria specified under A.

1. This review will be the responsibility of the department head and will provide the faculty member with a frank appraisal of accomplishments and identify areas of work needing additional attention.

2. The department head's evaluation will be prepared in writing and the evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member. The faculty member will acknowledge this discussion has occurred by signing the review. The faculty member has the right to review all material in her or his file unless she or he waives that right in writing.

3. The faculty member has the right and responsibility to submit a written reply to any aspect of the evaluation that she or he believes to be inaccurate. That reply will be included without further comment in the materials forwarded to the Dean.

4. The annual review will take place in the spring term of each academic year and be completed by June 15.

D. Review of Non-tenured Faculty Being Considered for Reappointment

The reappointment review is important for both the faculty member and the department. It should provide concrete and specific feedback that can be used both to assess whether a contract should be renewed and progress that is being made toward achieving standards for promotion and tenure.

1. The review of a non-tenured faculty member being considered for reappointment to an additional fixed-term contract will be conducted by a committee composed of three tenured PPPM faculty, who are not the department head, and two PPPM students. Under special circumstances and with the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, one of the non-student members of the committee may be a member of an instructional unit other than PPPM or faculty from another university. The committee will be appointed by the department head. The faculty member under review will be consulted regarding the composition of the committee and has the right to veto one of the committee members suggested by the department head.

2. The chair of the committee will be selected by the committee members.

3. In addition to the materials described above (see B. 2.), the chair of the committee may obtain letters of evaluation from members of the university or other universities. The faculty member may be asked to provide names of scholars who could serve as referees.

4. The evaluation and recommendations of the committee will be submitted in writing to the department head, along with all supporting letters and documents and a breakdown of the committee's vote by faculty or student status. The department head will meet with the chair of the committee to discuss the recommendations.

5. The chair of the committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the committee's findings and recommendations. If the faculty member disagrees with the findings and recommendations she or he has the right to respond in writing and this response will be submitted with the committee's report.

6. The committee's findings and recommendations, the materials on which they are based, and any additional statement by the faculty member will be reviewed by the tenured faculty in the department and this body will vote on those recommendations. Vote will be by signed ballot.

7. When a faculty member disagrees with the decision of the voting faculty, she or he has the right and responsibility to make a written appeal to the department head. Whenever such an appeal is submitted it will be the department head's responsibility to reconsider the work of the committee and the decision of the voting faculty, collect additional information, and write a separate opinion.

8. The faculty member has the right and responsibility to appeal all recommendations with which she or he disagrees to the dean. Such appeals will be in writing and will be forwarded to the dean without further comment.

9. Reviews for reappointment to fixed-term contracts shall be completed in accordance with university time schedules for such reviews.

E. Review of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure

Complete details on University procedures for review for promotion and tenure may be found in the *Faculty Handbook of the University of Oregon* and *A Faculty Guide to Promotion and Tenure at the University of Oregon*, published by the Office of Academic Affairs. The material below outlines the process within PPPM that is used to prepare a file for submission to the School of Architecture and Allied Arts (A&AA) Faculty Personnel Committee and dean.

1. The review committee for a faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion will consist of two tenured PPPM faculty members, one faculty member from another instructional unit of the university, and two PPPM students. With the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, a person from the larger professional community may be added to the committee. The committee will be appointed by the department head. The faculty member under review will be consulted regarding the composition of the committee and has the right to veto one of the committee members suggested by the department head.
2. The chair of the committee will be selected by the committee members.
3. In addition to the materials described above (see B. 2.), the committee will solicit letters from experts in the faculty member's field of scholarly expertise who are external to the university. The faculty member should provide a list of proposed reviewers, from which two to four should be selected. In addition, the committee shall select an additional three or four reviewers. In all cases, the number of reviewers selected by the committee must be 50% plus one (1). That is, the majority of reviewers must be selected by the departmental committee, not the candidate. The committee may also solicit letters from experts within the University.
4. The committee will review all of the material submitted by the candidate, letters solicited by the committee, and any letters submitted by PPPM faculty and students (see B.1. above). The committee will write a report that summarizes and evaluates this material and presents its own recommendation regarding the faculty member's promotion and tenure. The evaluation and recommendation of the committee will be submitted in writing to the department head, along with all supporting letters and documents and a breakdown of the committee's vote by faculty or student status. The department head will meet with the chair of the committee to discuss the recommendations.
5. The committee's findings and recommendations, the materials on which they are based, and any additional statement by the faculty member will be reviewed by the tenured faculty in

the department and this body will vote on those recommendations. Vote will be by signed ballot.

6. The department head shall prepare his or her own evaluation of the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. This report will summarize the findings of the departmental review committee and the comments of the external reviewers, the departmental faculty, and others. This summary of the materials presented in the case shall consider teaching, research, and service separately and should cite appropriate evidence from the file. The department head's report must also clearly state the department head's own evaluation of performance in each area, including strengths and weaknesses of the case for each area. The report should conclude with a direct and specific recommendation regarding disposition of the case.

7. Reviews for promotion and tenure shall be completed in accordance with University time schedules for such reviews.

F. Post-Tenure Review of Faculty

The university provides for a comprehensive post-tenure review of its faculty every three years to encourage, to reward, and to support the continuous development of tenured members of the faculty, and through the process of peer review to identify faculty members who merit special recognition or need special assistance. The university's faculty handbook specifies that two levels of regular, developmental review are required of all tenured faculty: a substantive review at the three year point after a prior major review or after promotion and a major review every six years after a prior major review or after being promoted or receiving tenure. The major six-year review will be the same as the review for reappointment described in D above with the following exceptions:

1. The review committee will consist of at least two tenured members of the PPPM faculty, one of whom will chair the committee, one tenured member of another instructional unit of the university plus two PPPM students. With the approval of the faculty member being reviewed, a professional from outside the university and/or a non-tenured faculty member may be added to the committee.

2. If the post-tenure review committee finds performance to be less than satisfactory in any area it is the department head's responsibility to assist the faculty member in remedying the weakness(es) identified by the committee and to institute a second review two years after the date of the original committee's deliberations.

3. The recommendations stemming from post-tenure review will not be brought before the full faculty unless the faculty member under review requests such consideration.

G. Uses of Evaluations

In addition to matters of promotion, tenure and retention, the department head will use the findings of the various evaluations to determine merit pay increases and to allocate the department's resources. With respect to the allocation of resources, the department head will make every reasonable effort to enable faculty members to overcome any shortcomings identified through the evaluation process and to otherwise encourage performance consistent with the expectations of the university.