

## **MEMORANDUM**

May 16, 2013

**TO:** CAS Department Heads, Office Managers, and Promotion/Tenure Committee Members

**FROM:** Judith Baskin, Associate Dean, Promotion and Tenure

**SUBJECT:** Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Files for 2013-2014

---

This memo includes updated information on the preparation of CAS promotion and tenure files, as well as suggestions for avoiding some of the more common errors and omissions that can slow consideration of submitted files. Each department in CAS has detailed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that should be consulted and followed. These guidelines must be included in the candidate's file. General university instructions for the preparation of promotion and tenure cases can be found at the Office of Academic Affairs' website: <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure>. This extremely helpful collection of information includes a sample promotion and tenure file and also specifies the documents that are to be sent to external referees, including sample letters. In addition to these resources, I strongly encourage you to attend the various workshops offered by Academic Affairs that review our promotion and tenure processes in detail.

**Points of Emphasis:** Based on past experience and recommendations from the DAC, I recommend that you pay close attention to the following matters when putting together the Promotion and Tenure File.

- **External Referees:** The referees should be persons who are credible evaluators of the candidate's scholarly work. This means individuals at peer or aspirational institutions with areas of expertise similar to that of the candidate; these referees should be at or above the rank to which the candidate hopes to be promoted. External referees may have interacted professionally with the candidate but should not have a personal relationship with the candidate that will jeopardize the independence of the review. It is best to avoid choosing external referees who are co-authors or co-editors, close colleagues, or former mentors; those from -non-research institutions; or those who work in unrelated areas of scholarship. However, if there is a good reason to choose such a reviewer, an explanation should be given in the file and the remaining group of referees should be balanced such that subsequent committees can be confident that they are receiving a competent and independent review from appropriate individuals.
- **Waiver Letters:** It is crucial that letters sent to prospective referees state whether or not candidates have waived their rights to see the file. You must use the standard wording for this letter (available on the Academic Affairs website: <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-virtual-file>). Any changes in the wording must be approved in advance by Office of Academic Affairs. Use of nonstandard letters may in some instances require that a new set of external letters be solicited. Candidates may choose freely from among the three available waiver options.
- **Tenure Clock:** If the tenure clock has been formally stopped during the review period for any reason (e.g., for the birth or adoption of a child, illness, or other leave without pay), both internal and external reviewers should be informed that the appropriate time period over which the candidate's work should be evaluated does NOT include any such periods of leave. That is, the candidate's productivity should be judged by the effective length of the actual review period, not the total time passed since the beginning of the review period.

- **Publication Status:** The Department Head's report must be explicit about the status of any unpublished scholarship considered to be a component of the research profile. For the UO in general, and for CAS more specifically, an article or book manuscript is properly represented as "forthcoming" if, and only if, there is (1) a commitment to publish by a journal or press, reflected in a contract or editor's letter, a copy of which should be included in the supplementary file; and (2) the manuscript has been completed and requires no additional revision beyond copy editing; this must be confirmed through the inclusion in the file of a letter from the editor verifying the article's or book's status as "in production" or "in press." If a tenure case depends on a book but the manuscript does not meet both of these criteria, the case will likely encounter serious difficulty. Cases of promotion to full professor that depend on a book should be delayed if the manuscript does not clearly meet these criteria at the time the file is submitted.
- **Updates to File:** Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (including acceptance, "in production," and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for promotion and tenure as that information becomes available.
- **Co-Authors and Distinguishing Peer-Reviewed from Non-Peer Reviewed:** Publications listed on the candidate's curriculum vitae (CV) should include all co-authors, in the same order as on the actual publication, as well as inclusive page numbers for each publication. Peer-reviewed material should be separated from non-peer-reviewed material on the CV in clearly divided sections. It is most helpful for the candidate's vita to list publications by type (books, peer-reviewed articles and book chapters, non-peer-reviewed publications, submitted scholarship, scholarship-in-progress, and book reviews, etc.) Publications in each category should be listed in reverse chronological order, beginning with the most recent.
- **Peer Reviews of Teaching:** The Office of Academic Affairs strictly enforces the requirement for peer reviews. They have stated their expectation that all cases in 2013-14 will include at least one timely peer review of teaching. If this timely review is missing, such a review must be completed during Fall 2013 or Winter 2014. UO policy on peer reviews requires one peer review for assistant professors in each of the three years immediately prior to the candidate's standing for promotion and tenure. For associate professors, peer reviews should be conducted every other year. If you currently have no peer reviews for a faculty member up for promotion and/or tenure next year, I would highly recommend scheduling at least one class visitation now or early in Fall 2013.
- **Teaching Evaluations:** The transition to an on-line student evaluation process, along with a new set of seven required questions with a different range of scores, means that most departments will have to produce two sets of tables; course evaluations prior to Winter term 2008, and those submitted for Winter term 2008 and onward. For those evaluations prior to Winter 2008, it is acceptable to follow prior department practices and precedents. However, for the new online teaching evaluation system adopted in Winter 2008, CAS requires a standardized format for the tabulated teaching evaluations. The Registrar's Office has agreed to produce an EXCEL spreadsheet for each promotion candidate with the data presented in the required format. For persons identified as promotion candidates in the Spring term prior to the year of promotion consideration, the Registrar's Office will send the EXCEL spreadsheet to the department's Office Administrator approximately two weeks after the completion of the Spring term. In late September, CAS will submit to the Registrar the names of candidates identified subsequent to Spring term; the Excel spreadsheets will be sent to department. Office Administrators within two weeks of CAS submission. University legislation requires that consideration of numerical evaluations is not the only way teaching is evaluated. The file must include other teaching materials including signed evaluations and peer reviews.

### **2013-14 Deadlines:**

- September 24:** Departments shall submit a list of all those being considered for tenure and promotion and promotion to Full Professor, to the Dean's office.
- October 1:** Files for all cases requiring a decision *prior* to December 15, 2013 must be submitted to the Dean's Office.
- November 15:** Files involving tenure must be submitted to the Dean's Office.
- November 29:** All other files must be submitted to the Dean's Office.
- March 31:** Promotion files for NTTF faculty (i.e., to Instructor and Lecturer ranks) must be submitted to the Dean's Office.

### **Important Procedures:**

- All of the following should be **signed and dated**:

- 1) Candidate's Statement\*
- 2) Candidate's CV\* (each version)
- 3) Promotion/Tenure Committee Report
- 4) Department Head's Report

\*The file must contain **ALL** versions of the candidate's statement and CV; newer versions (signed and dated in each case) can be added but the older versions must remain with the file. Please be sure to include dated copies of the statement and CV sent to the external reviewers.

- At the beginning of the section entitled Letters of Evaluation, please include a list of all of the external referees. You must also include a page listing the materials that were sent to the external referees. For each referee, prepare a brief biographical paragraph and specify his/her relationship to the candidate. You must also list and include correspondence with all individuals who were invited to serve as referees but who declined to do so, as well as the correspondence with one individual who did agree to serve as a reviewer.
- Departmental votes on candidates should be held only after the file has been assembled, and all voting members have reviewed it. Votes should be by signed, secret ballots; these are kept by the department head and are not made part of the file. Aggregate votes only are to be recorded in the file. The individual votes may be requested by the Dean, however, and if they are, the Dean's Advisory Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee and Provost's staff will have access to this information. The Department Head's Report should explain any abstentions and give reasons why some faculty may not have participated in the review. Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines detail which department members vote in different types of cases.

If any questions arise about a specific candidate's file or the process of assembling a file, please call Pauline Miller or me at 6-3902. Or contact me by email <[jbaskin@uoregon.edu](mailto:jbaskin@uoregon.edu)>.

JRB:pm