

Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluation
Department of Sociology
(revised, approved by Provost's office, April 5, 1999)

The criteria for promotion, tenure, and annual evaluation discussed below rest on the following premises:

1. the granting of tenure to a faculty member is the most important decision an academic department makes, for it gives a claim to that faculty member to profess the discipline and shape that program for decades to follow.
2. national standards of scholarly performance in America's Ph.D. granting universities apply at the University of Oklahoma. This is indicated in both the spirit and letter of the *Faculty Handbook* (especially Section 3.7.4).

The criteria listed below reflect these premises. Although promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure are discussed separately, the criteria applied to each are essentially the same.

I. Tenure

University policy, as stated in Section 3.7 of the *Faculty Handbook*, will be followed in the consideration of all tenure cases, both in respect to the criteria on which it is granted (Section 3.7.4) and the procedures to be followed (Section 3.7.5). However, departmental and institutional goals and priorities may be taken into account in decisions on tenure.

The criteria on which tenure decisions are based are as follows:

A. GOOD TEACHING as measured by:

1. regular evaluations by students in campus-wide student-teacher evaluations; and
2. peer evaluations;

B. SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION

1. articles in refereed journals;
2. citations of papers and articles in the published works of other scholars;
3. other refereed publications (e.g., invited book reviews in professional journals);
4. books and monographs published by commercial or university presses;
5. chapters in books;
6. interdisciplinary publications in outlets described in parts 1-5 which are germane to the faculty member's area of specialization in Sociology;
7. research grants from outside funding agencies.

We recognize that not all articles published in refereed journals are of high quality and that important, sound, and imaginative work may appear elsewhere. In recommending tenure, therefore, quality of the published work must be taken into account. Indeed, judgments about quality may outweigh considerations concerning quantity.

C. OTHER SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

1. papers read at national and regional meetings or at national and regional symposia;
2. other "presentation related" activity at professional meetings: discussant, panel discussant, session chairperson, etc.

D. SERVICE in four areas, as follow:

1. to the profession, as evidenced by:
 - a. reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, university presses, and other publishers;
 - b. editing scholarly journals;
 - c. holding office in professional associations; and
 - d. serving on committees of professional associations;
2. to the university, as evidenced by committee service and contributions outside the department;
3. to the department, as evidenced by committee service, academic advising, and other contributions to the department; and
4. to the community, as evidenced by lectures, memberships on boards, and other contributions at the local, state, or national level.

Activity in all three of the areas are important to the development of a strong Sociology Department. However, given the small size of the department, the large number of students we serve, and our desire to be recognized nationally for contributions to the field of sociology and to the profession, teaching excellence and scholarly productivity count more heavily than service in making recommendations for tenure. As a general rule, recommendations for tenure shall be made only if the person under consideration has made exceptional contributions in research and teaching and has at least an acceptable record in the area of service to the profession, university, and community.

Moreover, we expect that persons recommended for tenure have met responsibilities to their colleagues derived from common membership in a community of scholars. This implies they respect and defend the free inquiry of their associates, show due respect for the others' opinions, are objective in the professional judgment of others, and contribute to the accomplishment of collective departmental goals. Further, persons recommended for tenure must have met responsibilities to students. In

addition to encouraging students in the pursuit of learning while holding them to high scholarly standards, they shall respect the students as individuals, further honest honest academic conduct, and evaluate the performance of students fairly and accurately.

In all tenure decisions the department will obtain the opinions of external referees who have well-established reputations in the candidate's area of competence. Where practical these references will include at least some from departments "ranked" in the America Council on Education analyses of graduate schools. The referees will be asked to provide an evaluation of the candidate's research in terms of its originality, creativity, industry and thoroughness, and significance as a contribution to knowledge in its area. Further, each referee will be asked to respond to the following question:

Assuming that the candidate satisfactorily meets other criteria, is the scholarship as revealed by the quality of the publications such that you would regard the person as a deserving candidate for tenure in your own department?

Procedures in making tenure decisions are those outlined in Section 3.7.5 of the *Faculty Handbook* and do not have to be outlined here. However, it is appropriate to stress the following elements of the process: (1) only tenured members (and all tenured members) of the department vote by secret ballot [Section 3.75.(f)] and (2) the chairperson will submit a separate recommendation with supporting reasons [Section 3.7.5.(g)].

II. Promotions in Rank

A. Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor are essentially those discussed in Part I on tenure and are not repeated here. However, tenure and promotion to associate professor nevertheless are not interchangeable actions, e.g., a person can be promoted without being awarded tenure.

Specifically, the criteria for promotion to associate professor are performance appropriate to that rank at the national level in teaching and scholarly productivity. Considerations regarding promotion shall include the quality as well as quantity of scholarly production. Further, performance in the areas of service must be positive.

B. Professor

The central criterion for promotion to professor is the quality of one's published work relative the standards specific to that rank at the national level. Further, performance in teaching and service to the profession, department, and university must be positive.

C. Procedures

The procedures in making decisions regarding promotion are detailed in Section 3.11.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*. All tenured full professors vote on promotions to that rank and all tenured full professors and associate professors vote on promotions to the associate professor rank. All votes shall be by secret ballot. Independently and irrespective of the anonymous votes cast by peers, the chairperson and members of Committee A will provide reasons for their voting in writing.

In all promotion decisions, the department will obtain the opinions of external referees who have well-established reputations in the candidate's area of competence. Where practical, these referees will include at least some from departments "ranked" in the American Council on Education analyses of graduate schools. The referees will be asked to provide an evaluation of the candidate's research in terms of its originality, creativity, industry and thoroughness, and significance as a contribution to knowledge in its area. Further, each referee will be asked to respond to the following question:

Assuming that the candidate satisfactorily meets other criteria, is the scholarship as revealed by the quality of the publications such that you would regard the person as a deserving candidate for promotion in your own department?

III. Notification Procedures

Notification of all official actions involving tenure and/or promotions will be provided in writing by the appropriate University official. The departmental chair will inform candidates for tenure and promotion in writing of the nature of the recommendation made by those departmental members who have a vote in such matters, subject to the University's confidentiality policies and rules.

IV. Annual Evaluation

The evaluation of faculty performance is a continuous process, both prior to and after the granting of tenure. The annual evaluation is an assessment of performance during one calendar year and is distinct from an assessment of progress toward tenure. It provides feedback concerning the previous year's performance, is a basis for recommendations for merit salary increases, and, when linked with other adjacent annual evaluations, gives one of the pieces of evidence of progress toward tenure or promotion. In the annual evaluation, teaching, research, and service shall be weighted 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively. However, an alternative set of weightings to reflect a different distribution of effort may be adopted on an individual basis. Any alternative distribution of effort must clearly further the mission of the department and should be approved by the Chair and Committee A after discussion with the faculty member. Such an alternative set of weightings must be specified during the previous year's annual evaluation.

The chair and Committee A will rate all other departmental faculty members and each other in each of the three dimensions on a scale of one to five on the basis of information provided by the faculty member. The chair will prepare the evaluation and discuss its content with the faculty member. The faculty member may add a written statement or rebuttal on the annual evaluation form submitted by the department to the dean.

V. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

The Department of Sociology uses student evaluations and peer evaluations to assess the quality of teaching by the faculty.

A. Student Evaluations

The Regents of the University of Oklahoma mandate the use of student evaluations as part of the criteria to evaluate teaching. The department thus will administer the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) evaluation form in all Sociology courses. However, we believe that student evaluations sometimes must be interpreted with caution.

In all evaluations of teaching, the department will report the faculty member's mean ratings on items from the CAS form with the corresponding departmental and college means for the same category of classes. The chair will read the narrative comments written by students on the evaluation form and, if deemed helpful, incorporate material from them in reporting the faculty member's mean ratings.

Faculty members may submit additional material and request that it be taken into account in departmental evaluations of teaching. For example, a faculty member may conduct an additional student evaluation beyond the one required by CAS. This might be some form already available through Instructional Services, such as the IDEA evaluation, or a form designed by the faculty member. Further, the faculty member may submit a written "self-evaluation" which addresses, among other things, the results of the student evaluations.

B. Peer Evaluations

In addition to data from student evaluations, the department will conduct peer evaluation of teaching.

1. Peer evaluation of untenured faculty shall consist of the following. During the first two years of the probationary period, there will be at least one visit each semester by a tenured member of the faculty. Of these visits, at least one will be made either by the chair or a member of Committee A. During the remaining years of the probationary period, classroom visits will be made at the rate of one per year by either the chair or a member of Committee A.

2. Tenured faculty members also are required to have visits to their classrooms. These visits will be made at the rate of one per year by the chair or a member of Committee A.
3. For each faculty member, the chair will select the course which is to be visited and evaluated. Classroom visits should be arranged in advance by the faculty member doing the evaluation. This faculty member will prepare a written report of the visit and review it with the observed faculty member. The report's content should be evaluative and constructively critical. Copies of the report will be given to the observed faculty member and to the chair.
4. Faculty also are required to keep on file in the department the syllabi and assignments for each regularly taught course. This file should be updated any semester in which a significant change in a course is made. Thus, if a faculty member teaches four courses regularly, she/he should maintain a file in the departmental office containing material for the most recent version of these four courses.
5. The materials and information obtained through these procedures will be available to the chair and Committee A for their use in preparing the annual evaluation. These materials and information also will be considered in decisions regarding tenure and promotion.

C. Curriculum and Instructional Development

Faculty sometimes implement new, innovative instructional methods in courses they previously taught or sometimes are called upon to teach new courses. These initiatives should be considered in evaluations of teaching performance.

Changes added to their version, cf/ 4/5/99

bc: Paul Bell

OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST
The University Of Oklahoma
Norman Campus

=====

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Wilbur J. Scott, Chair, Department of Sociology

FROM: Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost

DATE: April 5, 1999

SUBJECT: Revised tenure and promotion guidelines

ARTS & SCIENCES
DEAN'S OFFICE

APR 8 1999

I have now reviewed the proposed revisions to the department's tenure and promotion guidelines as submitted on March 30, 1999. I suggest two changes.

First, to remove any possibility of confusion as to the correct title for the position, and to correct an apparent typographical error, section II(B) should be changed as follows:

B. Full Professor. The central criterion for promotion to full professor is the quality of one's published work relative to the standards specific to that rank at the national level.

Second, the procedure for diverging from the standard 40-40-20 distribution of effort, described in section IV, para. 1, should be a cooperative effort that includes the advice and consent of the Chair and Committee A. Additionally, any redistribution must clearly further the mission of the department. I suggest that this section be changed as follows:

IV. Annual Evaluation. . . . In the annual evaluation, teaching, research, and service shall be weighted 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively. However, ~~there is an exception: tenured faculty do have the option of specifying~~ an alternative set of weightings to reflect a different distribution of effort may be adopted on an individual basis. Any alternative distribution of effort must clearly further the mission of the department and should be approved by the Chair and Committee A after discussion with the faculty member. Such an alternative set of weightings must be specified during the previous year's annual evaluation.