**Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Files**

**June, 2015**

Each department in CAS has detailed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that should be consulted and followed. 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/content/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** of 2013; I provide important **CBA** requirements for the P&T process below. In addition to these resources, I strongly encourage you to attend the various workshops offered by Academic Affairs that review our review and promotion and tenure processes in detail.

**P&T is the responsibility of the Head**: The Head must take the lead in this 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 acceptable to ask other department members to take responsibility for preparing a case and/or contacting external reviewers, and it is definitely not appropriate to leave preparation of the file completely up to an OA or classified employee. Heads and appropriate OAs should attend all relevant workshops and consult the material available on the Academic Affairs website in preparing files, especially the **virtual file (see: <academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/tenure-related-appointments>).**

**Letter of Waiver:** The candidate should decide early in the P&T process (before any external reviewers are contacted) which waiver she/he prefers and sign and date the appropriate document. External reviewers must be notified as to 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: <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.

**Checklist on inside cover**: Be sure names are accurate and spelled correctly; that the names of all those invited to be external reviewers are included with a notation of when the letter was received, “DECLINED,” or “DID NOT RESPOND’’; and that external reviewers who were “SUGGESTED BY CANDIDATE” are indicated accurately

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

**Head standing for Promotion**: there are two options: (1) no Department Head letter is necessary or (2) an outside Department Head is invited to write the summary letter (consult with AD) (3) this letter should NOT be written by an associate head or other department member.

**Candidate’s CV and Statement**: the CV and Statement submitted by candidate MUST be signed and dated at the time of initial submission to the file; subsequent updated CVs, or additions to the CV or Statement, must also be signed and dated. An accompanying email from the candidate constitutes a valid signature and date in the case of an electronic submission.

It is extremely valuable for the Head or another senior colleague to review the CV with the candidate or to provide a model of a well-ordered CV. Ideally, the CV should list publications and presentations in reverse chronological order, beginning with the most recent.

There must be clear separation among published and unpublished materials, and publications should be separated by peer-reviewed and not peer-reviewed in categories that may include the following: Books, Articles, Book Chapters, Reviews, Other. Works that have been fully accepted for publication (ie: are “in press” with no further author revisions beyond reading the copy-edited ms. 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. Work in progress must listed be in a separate category. The CV should be straightforward in identifying publications that have been reprinted – eg, a journal article that then appears in an edited collection. These are not separate publications – best to have one citation that lists the publication and the various places and dates of appearance. Publications in each category should be listed in reverse chronological order,

**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.

**Co-Authors:** 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. It is very important that the Department Head’s report explains the conventions in the field as to how joint contributors to a journal article or book chapter are listed.

**External letters**: A minimum of 5 are required.

**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.

Heads must be VERY CAREFUL that the external reviewers have a minimal relationship to the candidate – ANY relationship must be explained in the biographies of the reviewers. Generally, at least five years should separate any research collaborations. Do not feel you must stick to the candidate’s exact specialty, especially if it is somewhat narrow and sparsely populated. Sometimes relationships are not evident until the letters arrive. The Head must be vigilant in reading the external letters and in ensuring that the information in the letters and in the bios provided by the department is consistent (see below).

Heads must delineate accurately to external reviewers 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.

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

The file must include one sample copy of each type of letter sent to the external reviewers. These include: the initial inquiry of availability; a detailed letter on the review itself; a letter of thanks when review is submitted. The AA virtual file contains examples of each of these types of letters.

Be sure that a complete and accurate “List of Materials” sent to reviewers precedes the external letters in the file. These materials should come from the period under review.

If the external reviewer sends her/his letter electronically and it is not signed, be sure that it is accompanied by the transmittal email (this email constitutes a legal signature).

**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 those who declined is not sufficient.

**Biographies of External Reviewers**: Short biographies of all external reviewers who have contributed letters to the file are required. Ideally, these biographies should be prepared by the Department Head or, at the least, by a faculty member familiar with the case. Whoever prepares the bios should have read the external reviewers’ letters and should take note of what the reviewers have said about their relationships with the candidate. We often see external letters that speak of many years acquaintance with the candidate and the bio says “no known relationship.” The bio should provide two or three sentences including information about the rank and institution of the external reviewer; her or his areas of expertise and major achievements; and some indication of why this person was invited to write a review of the candidate’s research. They are generally places in the “External Letters” file following the record of correspondence with the outside reviewers.

**List of Materials sent to External Reviewers**: This list must provide the title of each article, book, unpublished manuscript, and any other materials sent to the reviewers.

**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.

**Peer Evaluations**: There should be a minimum of three peer teaching evaluations for each P&T or promotion case; ideally these should be assigned to colleagues and written over a span of years. Each should be signed and dated by the reviewer.

**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 from press or journal editors) 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. 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.

**Peer Reviews of Teaching**: The Office of Academic Affairs strictly enforces the requirement for peer reviews. They have stated their expectation that all cases should include three peer reviews of teaching, including at least one recent review. 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 2014.

**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 managers 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.

**Important Procedures:** 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

**\***The file must contain ***ALL*** versions of the candidate’s statement and CV that have been submitted for this case; 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.

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 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. The Department Head’s Report should explain any abstentions and give reasons why some faculty may not have participated in the review meeting.

**P&T and the CBA**

(some of the new requirements you should know about)

**Article 20** of the CBA (pp. 30-45) details the Tenure and Promotion process. Be sure to review it carefully. Some of the new requirements for faculty and Heads laid out in the CBA include the following (text in bold is directly quoted from the CBA):

(1) Section 12: **To initiate the tenure review process, the department or unit head will contact the bargaining unit member no later than winter term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required** and request the following: CV, Scholarship portfolio, Personal Statement, Teaching Portfolio, **Service Portfolio**, a list of qualified outside reviewers.

(2) Sections 12 and 17. The file should include: . . . **“Evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion”** (supplying an Institutional Equity and Inclusion Portfolio or other documents is optional) but the candidate should discuss her/his contributions to institutional equity and diversity in the **Personal Statement** (p. 34, top paragraph).

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