

MEMORANDUM

June 8, 2012

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 2012-2013

This memo includes updated information on the preparation of CAS tenure and promotion cases, as well as suggestions for avoiding some of the more common errors and omissions that can slow consideration of tenure and promotion cases. General university guidelines 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> . These university guidelines are extremely helpful and include a sample promotion and tenure file. They also specify the documents that are to be sent to External Referees. In addition, each department in CAS has its own Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that provide detailed directions on the process.

Points of Emphasis: Based on past experience and recommendations from the DAC, there are several points of emphasis that should be stressed 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, close colleagues, or former mentors; those from non-research institutions; and those who work in un-related 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.
- **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 review period, not the total time passed since the beginning of the review period.
- **Publication Status:** Consistent with enduring practice at the University of Oregon, it is important to be explicit in the department head's report 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, a book manuscript is properly represented as "forthcoming" if, and only if, there is (1)

a commitment to publish, reflected in a contract, 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 book's status as "in production." If a tenure case depends on a book but the manuscript does not meet both of these criteria, it 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. Similarly, any article-length manuscript should not be presented as forthcoming without a statement from the publisher that the manuscript is "in production." Changes in the status of publications should be provided at any stage in the promotion and tenure process.

- **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 (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 vitae should include all co-authors, in the same order as on the actual publication, and inclusive page numbers. Peer reviewed material should be separated from non-peer reviewed material on the vitae in clearly delineated sections. It is most helpful for the candidate's vita to list publications by type (books, peer-reviewed articles and chapters, non-peer-reviewed publications, book reviews, etc.) Publications in each category should be in chronological order, beginning with the most recent.
- **Peer Reviews of Teaching:** The Office of Academic Affairs is now strictly enforcing the requirements for peer reviews. They have stated that they expect that all cases in 2012-13 will include at least one timely peer review of teaching. If this one timely review is missing, such a review must be completed during Fall 2012 or Winter 2013. 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 certain faculty member up for promotion and/or tenure next year, I would highly recommend scheduling one class visitation early in Fall 2012.
- **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, will mean 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 teaching online evaluation system adopted in Winter 2008, the Dean's office requires a standardized format for the tabulated teaching evaluations. The Registrar 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 Office will send the EXCEL spreadsheet to the department's Office Administrator approximately two weeks after the completion of the Spring term. For those candidates identified subsequent to Spring Term, the Dean's office will submit their names to the Registrar at the end of September. The department Office Administrators will receive the EXCEL spreadsheet within two weeks of submission to the Dean's Office from the registrar. Note that Political Science and Mathematics will need to add rows to the EXCEL spreadsheet provided by the Registrar with teaching data for Fall 2007 because they participated in the pilot online evaluation system one term earlier than the other departments in CAS. It is important to emphasize that, by university legislation, the numerical evaluations are not the only way we evaluate teaching. The presentation of other teaching material in the file (e.g., signed evaluations,

peer reviews) should follow past college and university requirements. These have not changed with the adoption of the online system.

2012-13 Deadlines:

September 24: Submit a list of all those being considered for promotion and/or tenure to the Dean's office.

October 3: Files for all cases requiring a decision **prior** to June 15, 2013 must be submitted to the Dean's Office.

November 15: Files involving tenure must be submitted to the Dean's Office.

November 30: All other files must be submitted to the Dean's Office.

March 30: Files for promotion to Senior Instructor (without tenure) 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 Vita* (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 make sure to include the statement & CV sent to the reviewers.

- On a separate sheet at the top of the section entitled Letters of Evaluation, please include a list of all of 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.
- 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. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines detail who votes in different types of cases.

If any questions arise about a candidate's file or assembling a file, please call Pauline Miller or me at 6-3902. Or contact me by email <jbaskin@uoregon.edu>.

JRB:pm