Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Files
June 2016

CONTENTS

Who is Responsible for What?................. ………………………………………………….. 2

Overall Timeline................. ………………………………………………………………… 2

Collecting Materials for the File............... …………………………………………….… 3

Internal and External P&T Committees 5

Assembling the File................ ……………………………………………………………… 8

Updating the file .... ………………………………………………………………….9

Special Situations.................. …………………………………………………………….… 9

Sources of Information .... ……………………………………………………..... 9

Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Files
May 2016

Each department in CAS has detailed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that should be consulted and followed. The purpose of this document is to help you follow the Collective Bargaining Agreement with United Academics and University (Academic Affairs) guidelines and to clarify the timeline.

Who is Responsible for What?

- Head: The Head normally leads the P&T process, in speaking with the candidate, in contacting external reviewers, and in reviewing every part of the file before sending it to CAS. It is not normally acceptable to ask other department members to take responsibility for preparing a case and/or contacting external reviewers, and the Head remains responsible for vetting any file material prepared by another employee. Heads should attend the relevant workshops and consult the Academic Affairs and CAS guidance on the kind of information the complete file must contain.

- Departmental Staff: The Department Manager should track when faculty are becoming eligible for promotion and tenure, ensure that deadlines are met, that files are accurately assembled, and that communications are clear and effective. They should attend relevant workshops and consult the material on the Academic Affairs website for assembling files.

Overall Timeline

- Winter Term, Pre-decision AY: Initiate P&T Process.

  - *Confer with candidate*. The Department Head or Program Director must contact the candidate "no later than winter term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required" (*CBA*, Art. 20 Sec. 12) and discuss the candidate's contributions to the file, including the nature of the confidentiality waiver the candidate prefers (details below).

  - *Check on peer reviews of teaching*. If the candidate's file doesn't already contain the required number of these reviews (see below for detail), make arrangements to get them as soon as possible.

  - *Notify CAS of the P&T cases you plan to put forward*. If any cases have unusual features, such as changes to standard timing, for example, you should discuss them with your divisional Associate Dean before soliciting external reviews.

  - *Request that the candidate assemble updated CV and personal statement* for tenured faculty review before the end of spring term.

- April, Pre-decision AY

  - *Collect the candidate's CV and statement*. Make these, together with teaching evaluations and peer evaluations, available to the department personnel committee.

  - *Department personnel committee meets*. Department Head provides feedback for improvement to the candidate. In some cases this feedback may include a suggestion that the promotion process be delayed if that is an option. In all cases if there are serious reservations the Department Head should discuss this with the Associate Dean

- May, Pre-decision AY

  - *Contact external reviewers*. The Head identifies potential external reviewers. The Head normally consults with department faculty, and may also consult with other experts in the field. The Head should also consult with the candidate who may also identify potential reviewers. All external reviewers must meet the criteria described below. The Head should inquire with the reviewers about their availability to review this candidate, and be ready to send the candidate file to the reviewers by June 1.

  - *Notify the Registrar's Office* of your need for Teaching Evaluations (from students) for your P&T candidates.

- By October 1, Decision AY: Send list of confirmed P&T cases to Academic Affairs

- By October 15, Decision AY: Review in Department

- By November 1, Decision AY: Send complete files to CAS

- Mid Fall Term—Winter Term, Decision AY: Review in CAS (DAC + Dean), CAS sends files to Academic Affairs as reviews are finished.

- By March 15, Decision AY: All files (typically ~35) sent by CAS to Academic Affairs

- Late Winter Term—Early Spring Term, Decision AY: Review at University level (FPC + Provost)

- By May 1, Decision AY: Candidates will be notified of the decision by the Provost

Collecting Materials for the File

- Letter of Waiver

The candidate should decide early in the P&T process (by May 1st and before any external reviewers are contacted) which waiver they prefer and sign and date the appropriate document. External reviewers must be notified about the contents of the waiver that the candidate has signed (see details and model letters on AA website). You must use the standard wording for this letter (available on the Academic Affairs website; links to all sample P&T documents are here: http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/preparing-promotion-and-tenure-files. 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.

- Candidate's CV and Statement

  - *Candidate's CV*: Early in the process (by April), it is extremely valuable for the Head or other senior colleagues to review the CV with the candidate or to provide a model of a well-ordered

CV. Because disciplinary conventions for the abbreviated reporting of scholarship vary widely, candidates should take care to create a CV that will be understandable to colleagues in a range of disciplines. To that end, we recommend using a standardized CV format for the purpose of P&T review, even while retaining an individualized one for other purposes.

Whatever format is chosen, organization of the CV should be based on these principles:

1. Peer reviewed publications are the primary consideration.

2. There should be a clear distinction between published and unpublished materials. Works that have been fully accepted for publication (that is, are "in press" with no further author revisions beyond reading the copy-edited manuscript or page proofs) may be listed among publications if the file includes letters from press and journal editors attesting that the work is fully complete and "in press" or "in production." These letters (emails are fine) should precede the most recent iterations of the CV in the CV section of the promotion file. In contrast, work that is "in progress" may not be listed among publications and should instead be listed in a separate Works in Progress category.

3. All materials should be identified by the categories they fall into (Books, Articles, conference proceeding contributions, Book Chapters, Reviews, Other). Moreover, the CV should be straightforward in identifying publications that have been reprinted—for instance, a journal article that then appears in an edited collection. These are not separate publications, and it's best to have one citation that lists the publication and the various places and dates of its appearance.

4. Any material which is not peer reviewed should be listed separately and indicated as not peer reviewed.

5. The Department Head will indicate disciplinary standards on co-authorship as part of their evaluation of the candidate. For publications that are exceptions to disciplinary standards, the nature of that exception should be indicated.

6. Publications in each category should be listed in reverse chronological order–that is, beginning with the most recent–and complete citation information, with inclusive page numbers for published articles and chapters and word counts for unpublished manuscripts and for books, should be given for each of them.

7. The CV should be signed and dated and if revisions are submitted, each one should be signed and dated. An accompanying email from the candidate constitutes a valid signature and date in the case of an electronic submission.

- *Candidate's Statement*: This should provide an Introduction that offers an overview of the candidate's work and its place within the discipline or field. The Statement should be organized into separate discussions of Research or Creative Work, Teaching, and Service, and it must include a discussion of the candidate's contributions to equity and inclusion either in a separate section or within the relevant individual sections. For guidance on "Equity and Inclusion in Personal Statements for Reviews of Bargaining Unit Faculty," see the Division of Equity and

Inclusion website: http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/content/equity-and-inclusion-personal-statements-reviews-bargaining-unit-faculty.

- Portfolios

The CBA identifies three portfolios among the materials requested from the candidate: portfolios for Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. The relevant scholarly or creative material is provided to external reviewers by the department. Contributions in scholarship, teaching, service, and equity and inclusion should be discussed in the Candidate's Statement, and candidates my also submit additional materials for the supplementary file in teaching, service, and equity and inclusion to be evaluated by internal committees if they wish.

- Reviews of Teaching

  - *Peer Reviews*: Assistant Professors should receive a peer evaluation of teaching every year. There should be a minimum of three peer teaching evaluations for each P&T or promotion case, and Academic Affairs strictly enforces this requirement. Ideally these reviews should be assigned to colleagues and written over a span of years. All such reviews shall be included in the file, and at least one should be from within the last year. Each review should be signed and dated by the reviewer. 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, we highly recommend scheduling at least one class visitation now or early in Fall 2016.

  - *Student Evaluations of Teaching*: Typically, this information will come from the online teaching evaluation system, and CAS requires a standardized format for reporting it in tabulated form. The Registrar's Office produces a spreadsheet for each promotion candidate with the data presented in the required format. On request, the registrar will send the data to the department's Office Administrator approximately two weeks after the completion of the Spring term of the Pre-decision Academic Year. University legislation requires that evaluation of teaching not be limited to consideration of numerical scores. The file must contain additional material that bears on teaching quality, including signed evaluations and peer reviews.

Internal and External P&T Committees

- Internal Committee Membership and Charge: In accordance with your unit's governance document, the departmental committee should consist of faculty members who are at or above the rank aspired to by the candidate; appropriate faculty members from relevant units may also serve if there are not enough ranking colleagues in your unit. The internal committee's report should honestly assess both strengths and weaknesses of the case. Their evaluation of the case will be discounted by subsequent levels of review if it appears to be advocacy for the candidate rather than an objective evaluation. For guidance from Academic Affairs about the departmental review committee and process, see https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_8_-_departmental_review.pdf

- External Letters: A minimum of five letters is required, and they should be from 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. Any relationship must be explained in the biographies of the reviewers. Generally, at least five years should separate any research collaborations.

- However, if there is a compelling reason to make an exception, the appropriate divisional Associate Dean should be consulted ahead of time and an explanation should be given in the file. The remaining referees should be balanced such that subsequent committees can be confident that they are receiving a competent and independent review from appropriate individuals.

- Reviewers should not work in unrelated areas of scholarship but need not be in the candidate's exact specialty, especially if it is somewhat narrow and the field sparsely populated.

- Information for External Reviewers: Heads must accurately communicate the time period under evaluation, outlining receipt of credit for prior service when applicable. Check the letter of offer when in doubt. Generally, scholarship accomplished while at the University of Oregon, or, in the case of promotion to Full Professor, since the appointment to Associate Professor, is privileged in the P&T process, and this should be made clear to the reviewers.

  Reviewers should receive a copy of the unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, so they have precise information about the stated standards and expectations for promotion and tenure in that unit. They should be asked to evaluate the candidate with reference to those guidelines.

  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 (while the clock is ticking) not the total time passed since the beginning of the review period.

- Biographies of External Reviewers: Short biographies of all external reviewers who have contributed letters to the file are required. Two or three sentences should suffice to convey why this person is an appropriate reviewer: the person's rank and institution; areas of expertise and major achievements; and an indication of the reviewer's professional relationship to the candidate, if any. The biographies should be prepared by the Department Head or, at the least, by a faculty member familiar with the case and should be consistent with what the reviewers have said about their relationships with the candidate. External letters that speak of many years acquaintance with the candidate are incompatible with a bio that says "no known relationship."

- Departmental Vote: Department votes on candidates should be held only after the file has been assembled and all voting members have reviewed it. Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines detail which department members vote in different types of cases. Votes should be by signed, secret ballots; these are kept by the department head for five years and are not made part of the file.

Aggregate votes only are to be recorded in the file (on second inside page of the file cover). 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.

- Department Head's Report: In addition to conveying the department's assessment of the strength of the case, the Head's Report should do the following to facilitate the next review steps, which are by colleagues increasingly distant from the candidate's academic specialty:

  - Explain any unusual features of the departmental vote: Explanations are needed for abstentions and for the absence of votes from any faculty.

  - Explain multiple authorship conventions: In those disciplines in which co-authorship of research is common, it is essential that candidate's statements, as well as Department Heads and Promotion Committee reports, explain how the list of names translates to contributions. This includes, as appropriate:
    - the kinds of contributions that individual authors have made (e.g., overall intellectual leadership of a big project *vs* design and execution of a particular part of it by a colleague or student)
    - the significance of the order in which authors are listed
    - the co-authors' rank or relationship to the candidate (*e.g.* former advisors/mentors, senior faculty colleagues, junior faculty colleagues, post- doctoral fellows, Ph.D. students, or undergraduate students)
    - the frequency of single *vs* multiple authorship in the candidate's sub-field and the Department's standards with respect to co-authored work.

  - Put the candidate's contributions in context:
    - explain where the research fits into the field and in what way it is influential
    - outline expectations regarding external funding for research—both within the field or subfield, and within the candidate's department)
    - provide standard measures of quality or appropriateness for venues of published work (publishing houses or series for books; journal rankings for articles)
    - describe the standard course load and teaching expectations in the department (including norms for class sizes), the candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission, and any extenuating circumstances that affected the candidate's teaching record (e.g., teaching assignment policies, special releases as a result of research awards, etc.)

  - Be explicit about the status of unpublished work:
    - 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.

- Be honest in assessing both strengths and weaknesses of the case. Your evaluation of the case will be discounted by subsequent levels of review if it appears to be advocacy for the candidate rather than an objective evaluation.

Assembling the File

- Checklist on inside cover: This summarizes the contents of the file and includes the list of external reviewers. This list conveys important information in condensed form, so take care that
  - the names of external reviewers are accurate and spelled correctly
  - the names of all those invited are included, with a notation of when the request letter was sent
  - the invited reviewers who declined or did not respond are indicated
  - the date of receipt of each review is recorded
  - reviewers who were "suggested by the candidate" are indicated accurately.

- Correspondence with External Reviewers
  - *Invitations & Responses*:
    - Be sure that a complete and accurate "List of Materials Sent to Reviewers" precedes the external letters in the file. These materials must come from the period under review and that period should be clearly indicated to the external reviewers and to other reviewers who will examine the file subsequently. This list must provide the title of each article, book, unpublished manuscript, and any other materials sent to the reviewers. Be sure to identify the versions (signed and dated) of the statement and CV that were sent to the external reviewers.
    - The file must include a sample copy of each type of letter sent to the external reviewers. These letters include: the initial inquiry of availability; a detailed letter explaining the review itself; a letter of thanks when the review is submitted. These letters should be placed in the "External Letters" file following the record of correspondence with the outside reviewers.
    - Documentation for all declines must be included in the file; place a copy of each email or letter of decline at the end of the "Evaluation Letters" section. A list of the individuals who declined is not sufficient.
    - If the external reviewer sends their letter electronically and it is not signed, be sure that it is accompanied by the transmittal email (this email constitutes a legal signature).

- Unsolicited and Student Letters: Unsolicited letters from colleagues, community members, or students may be placed in a separate marked section—either at the end of the "Evaluation Letters" section or at the back of the "Teaching" section, as appropriate. However, signed qualitative student evaluations are placed in the supplemental file with publications and teaching materials.

- Record of department vote (2nd page on inside cover): If those voting included all faculty (depending on department's P&T Guidelines), break down votes by tenured and non-tenured faculty.

- Signatures and dates: All of the following should be signed and dated (an accompanying email from the candidate constitutes a signature and date in instances of electronic submission):

  1. Candidate's Statement

2. Candidate's CV (each version)
3. Promotion/Tenure Committee Report
4. Department Head's Report

Updating the File

- Updating the File: Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head about the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (including acceptance, "in production," and appearance, with the necessary documentation from press or journal editors) throughout the promotion and tenure process. Each submission should be signed and dated, and it is helpful to attach a brief explanation to ensure that its significance will be understood by reviewers outside the department. The Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for promotion and tenure as such information becomes available. There is also an opportunity to update the file when the candidate meets with the Dean and Associate Dean to hear the Dean's letter of recommendation.

- The file must contain *all* versions of the candidate's statement and CV that have been submitted for the case; newer versions (each signed and) can be added, but the older versions must remain with the file.

Special Situations

- Head standing for Promotion: If a Department Head is standing for promotion, there are two options for handling the head's letter: (1) no Department Head letter is necessary or (2) an outside Department Head is invited to write the summary letter (consult with your Associate Dean about selecting the outside Head). The Head's letter should not be written by an Associate Head or other department member.

- Exceptionally close relationship to the candidate: If a Department Head is a key collaborator with or mentor of a candidate, or has some other relationship with a candidate other than that which would be normal for a department head then the Head should consult early in the process (Winter of the pre-decision year) with the appropriate divisional Associate Dean on how to handle this situation.

Sources of Information

These guidelines must be included in each 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/promotion-tenure. This extremely helpful collection of information includes a sample promotion and tenure file and also specifies the wording and content of documents that are to be sent to external referees, including sample letters. Another essential resource is the Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2015-2018 (http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/2015-2018_cba_final_linked_0.pdf). In addition to these resources, we strongly encourage you to attend the various workshops offered by Academic Affairs that cover our review and promotion and tenure processes in detail.

If any questions arise about a specific candidate's file or the process of assembling a file, please call Pauline Miller at 6-3902 or consult with the appropriate divisional Associate Dean.