

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The College of Education (COE) promotion and/or tenure policy and procedures¹ contained in this document are presented in four sections. Section 1 presents the seven principles that articulate the underlying assumptions and fundamentals of the COE’s promotion and/or tenure policy. Section 2 describes general procedures for promotion and/or tenure, and Sections 3 and 4 provide timelines and specific procedures for COE administrators and candidates. The purpose of this policy is to make the COE philosophy, expectations, and timelines surrounding the promotion and/or tenure process explicit and transparent.

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies to represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy -- in which case, the university-wide policy would prevail.

Contents:	Page:
Section 1: Promotion and/or Tenure Principles	1
Section 2: Guidelines and Materials for Promotion and/or Tenure	7
Section 3: Procedures and Timelines	14
Appendix A	
A1: Office of Academic Affairs Overview and URL	23
A2: COE Curriculum Vitae Template	24
A3: Sample Waiver Letters	29
A4: University Form Letter for External Reviewers	31
A5: UO Promotion and/or Tenure Checklist	32

SECTION 1. PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE PRINCIPLES

The COE expects faculty to assemble a body of work that is accumulated over several years and represents a progression of depth and breadth as faculty move through the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor. As noted in the seven principles described in this section, the expectations are expressed in a language that recognizes achievements in the three areas of research, instruction, and service over several years. The principles not only need to be expressed in an operational process (section 2), but also be consistent with the approved Workload for Tenure Track Faculty Policy Document.

¹ When the criteria for promotion have been substantively revised within the last six academic years, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion may elect to use the new standards or the old standards for consideration of her or his application. This choice must be declared before departmental-level review of the candidate’s file to ensure proper consideration of all elements.

The workload document provides a “set of typical standards for a faculty member’s work effort” for scholarship, instruction, and service as well as guides the process in which workloads result in comparable faculty efforts within and across departments. Through a collaborative dialogue, faculty members are guided through a process of working within their departments to determine three major areas of faculty activities: scholarship, instruction, and service . The distribution across these three major areas is specified in the COE workload policy and represents the relative weighting given to each area in faculty evaluations, including those for tenure and promotion. The annual workload should build over years in a manner that supports promotion and tenure at the appropriate levels of assistant, associate, and full professor.

Ideally, the two documents provide consistent guidance for faculty, annually, as well as in three and six-year increments as part of the promotion/tenure and post tenure review process. Each document is written with well-defined threshold expectations in research, instruction, and service. When a faculty member “meets” expectations, it should be reflected in their annual evaluation and if met over the three-year periods, decisions on promotion/tenure would be consistent in making judgments of the faculty member’s body of work. At the same time, consistent decisions of “exceeds” would be reflected with more productivity annually than is explicated in the documents for research, instruction, and service. Finally, “does not meet” may be warranted, both annually and as part of a promotion/tenure decision, when the expectations described in these documents are not satisfied. The critical issue is that the promotion/tenure process be anticipated and consistent with annual workload expectations and evaluations.

The COE promotion and/or tenure policy is guided by seven foundational principles that have been derived from a thorough review of promotion and/or tenure policies at comparator universities, policies from other colleges at the University of Oregon, deliberations of all college governance committees and bodies, and approved by vote of the COE faculty.

Principle 1: The COE uses quality and impact as indicators to evaluate scholarly contributions.

Faculty members’ scholarship is evidenced in their contributions to a body of knowledge, practice, and/or methodology to advance understanding and application in their field of study. The quality of a faculty member’s scholarship is determined using multiple indicators compiled in the faculty member’s promotion and tenure dossier including the personal statement, publication record, grant-related work, external and internal reviewers’ evaluations, and other pertinent data sources. Quality indicators include the importance of the research questions being studied, peer evaluation of technical adequacy of research methodology, quality and ranking of publication outlets as determined by disciplinary standards, record in obtaining external and competitive peer-reviewed grants, and professional awards related to scholarly activity. Impact is defined as the spread and effect of the individual’s research and scholarship. One measure of impact is the scope and scale of the outlets through which scholarly work is disseminated. The evolution and significance of the faculty member’s research agenda are evaluated in terms of its impact on other scholars, the professional community of practitioners, standards of professional practice, the policy environment, and the general public. Every candidate for promotion to either associate or full professor is expected to generate consistently high quality scholarly work that appears regularly in peer-reviewed publications.

Principle 2: The COE criteria for promotion and/or tenure are inclusive to accommodate a wide range of scholarly approaches and research methods.

Different research questions require different disciplinary approaches and/or research methodologies. No one form of inquiry or research method should be presumed to have greater weight than another. Rather, all questions require rigorous and appropriate processes of inquiry. The promotion and/or tenure process does not pass judgment on one form of inquiry over another. Instead, the quality of the scholarship produced (i.e., scholarly rigor) is judged based on the criteria established within that disciplinary tradition. Regardless of scholarly approach, the standards of independent peer review are used in the personnel review to gather evidence for the quality and impact of scholarly contributions. In their personal statement, candidates should provide a sound rationale and context for their scholarly work, including explanations of selected research methodologies, research themes and agendas, and choice of methods or outlets of dissemination of scholarly work. Junior faculty members whose research methodology is atypical for their field of study may need particular guidance and support through formal or informal mentoring.

Principle 3: The COE criteria for promotion and/or tenure balance being explicit to allow a clear and common understanding of the performance standards, and not being so specific as to prohibit reasonable and acceptable modifications or variations.

As a general rule, the typical expectation for faculty in tenure track positions is that they should publish an average of two refereed scholarly publications or comparable refereed products per year. Consideration will also be given to the quality of the journals, author order, and inclusion of students or colleagues as co-authors. Although the number of articles published in refereed journals is the traditional indicator of scholarly productivity, it is not the only measure. In judging the quality and impact of a faculty member's collective works, judgment criteria should allow reviewers to take into account and contextualize each faculty member's work in terms of her or his research agenda, the nature of the discipline or field of study in which the research is being conducted, and the possibility that a variety of formats and forums may be appropriate for exposition of scholarly work. The candidate's personal statement and the Department Head's letter should also make clear the context for the candidate's scholarly activity in terms of other demands on the faculty member especially when they are different from typical expectations or practice at peer institutions (e.g., teaching load, service obligations).

Distinctions should be made regarding the difficulty, complexity, scale, and time required to conduct the research and prepare articles for publication, as well as the faculty member's trajectory and development as a scholar. Some programs of study lend themselves to reporting incrementally different findings from the same or similar studies, whereas others encompass consideration of entirely new phenomena for each study. In addition, attention should be given to disciplinary expectations and the availability of external support for the candidate's interests and areas of scholarly activity. Although typical benchmarks for productivity exist (e.g., an average of two peer reviewed articles per year), the candidate must help provide the context for her or his work in the personal statement and evaluators must consider the context and development of the candidate's research agenda in evaluating scholarly productivity. Within these contexts, the

criteria for evaluating scholarly productivity go beyond mere quantity to include the consideration of rigor, quality, and impact.

Principle 4: The COE acknowledges the importance of external funding in promotion and/or tenure decisions without creating an expectation that it is required.

Although external funding is highly valued in the COE, obtaining external funds is not a requirement for promotion and/or tenure. Successfully securing external funding usually requires a rigorous external review process in which one competes with leading scholars in a field. Such competitions may require evidence of deep understanding of a field and the ability to make connections between the theoretical and applied dimensions of a field of study. Most grants are awarded after a peer review process, and successful funding reflects recognition by peers of new or novel thinking, cutting-edge developments, or innovative solutions to complex problems. As such and in combination with other measures, external funding contributes positively to evidence in favor of promotion and/or tenure. Thus, external funding is valued as one indicator of scholarly productivity and success, but the ability to secure external funding should not be used as a substitute for more basic standards, such as quality and impact of the candidate's overall program of research and scholarship. It must also be acknowledged that external funding is differentially available to scholars depending on their interests and area of scholarly activity. Often, external funding opportunities are rare in certain areas and more available in others. Thus, external funding, when it includes rigorous peer review, should be used as one indicator of scholarly activity but should not replace or supplant other indicators.

Principle 5: The COE emphasizes the importance of effective instruction and advising in promotion and/or tenure decisions.

Faculty members in the COE have a special responsibility to be effective instructors and models of best instructional practices. A faculty member's pedagogical contributions and success are evaluated based on her or his approach to instruction such as commitment to instruction and its importance in the candidate's professional life, the goals and aims of instruction, the pedagogical methods employed, and efforts toward continuous improvement of instruction. Candidate's contributions are also evaluated in terms of how her or his instructional assignments and course offerings contribute to an academic major and department. Other factors that are usually considered in evaluating a faculty member's instruction include the number of different courses taught, the size of courses (e.g., small seminars, large lecture classes), and the level of the courses (e.g., graduate, undergraduate). Candidates' instructional effectiveness is primarily evaluated in three ways: student feedback, peer evaluations, and a teaching portfolio. University faculty legislation requires that all courses with an enrollment of ten or more students conduct student evaluations of instruction using the online UO Course Evaluation system.

Student evaluations can be a valuable tool for ascertaining students' judgments about the effectiveness of instruction and the quality of courses. However, the limitations of student feedback should be acknowledged. Student evaluations can reflect contextual factors outside the instructor's control. Therefore, when making interpretations of course evaluations, results should be compared to other relevant courses or groups that provide context for interpretation such as courses with the same class size, level (i.e., graduate vs. undergraduate), course content, or class

type (e.g., required vs. elective, small seminar vs. large lecture class). In addition, appraisals of instructor quality based on student evaluations should consider the possibility of bias in student evaluations based on instructor demographics.

Student course evaluations are only one source of evidence of instructional effectiveness. Peer evaluations provide additional information on candidates' instructional accomplishments. Faculty chosen to serve as peer evaluators should be familiar with the course content as well as methods of effective teaching. To ensure familiarity with course goals and content, the peer evaluator should review the course syllabus, course materials and assignments, and measures used in the course to assess student progress prior to any observations. Following the observation, an evaluative report is developed that describes the results of the peer observation and evaluative review including such issues as instructional purpose, instructional strategies, effectiveness of presentations, quality of content delivered, completeness and currency of readings, texts, and course materials, quality of feedback provided to students, strategies for monitoring student learning and progress, student engagement, and content covered. Faculty should also be proactive in seeking mentoring and support for their instructional activities and professional development, which might include participation in the UO Teaching Effectiveness Program. Mentoring and professional development activities should be documented and included as evidence of the faculty member's efforts to continuously improve his or her instruction.

Teaching effectiveness can also be evaluated by examining a portfolio of teaching artifacts submitted as part of the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file. Portfolios often include course syllabi, assignments, tests or other assessments of students, the use of evidence-based or innovative instructional strategies, information on new course preparation and/or curriculum development, the use of technology to support teaching and learning, examples of student work or products, or other evidence of teaching practices and instructional effectiveness.

Advising and mentoring students is a critical component of a faculty member's instructional activities and is recognized as a component of the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. Descriptions of advising efforts and products that demonstrate student success and improvement are important indicators of quality instruction and advising and should be documented in the candidate's personal statement, Curriculum Vitae (CV), and/or other documentation (e.g., advisees' theses, dissertations, and co-authored publications, as well as advisees' scholarships, awards, and job placement).

Principle 6: The COE acknowledges the responsibility a professional school has to practicing members of its profession, the multifaceted nature of its service, and the synergy among service, scholarship, and instruction.

Professional schools are expected to provide service to a larger professional community as well as to produce knowledge that leads to improvements in practice. Students expect faculty to be experts in problems of practice. Service in professional schools encompasses an expectation of active participation in the professional community. Additionally, faculty in professional schools often have unique contributions to make that are fostered by experience in problems of practice. These contributions can be valuable and inform research, instruction, and service activities at the departmental, college, and university levels. There is an expectation that faculty will contribute

in university-level service activities increasingly as they develop through the ranks of the profession.

Promotion and/or tenure criteria include the expectation that candidates create linkages between their work and the needs of the profession. Quality research generates knowledge that influences practice. Likewise, a faculty member's research agenda is shaped and influenced by problems of practice and by the issues and priorities of professionals in the field. Furthermore, schools and colleges of education have an obligation to produce evidence-based research that helps identify and validate effective educational practices.

Faculty are expected to contribute to institutional equity and inclusion, which may include efforts to address any barriers that may have historically limited access and advancement for specific groups of individuals. Demonstration of equity and inclusion practices may vary considerably by discipline and program, but may include specific examples of scholarship, instruction, or service. For guidance in discussing contributions to equity and inclusion statement, visit the CoDAC website at <http://codac.uoregon.edu/faculty-equity-statements/>

Work with schools, agencies, and state organizations improves the relevance of instruction and currency of course topics. Students judge their classes at least in part by the relevance of the research, theory, and practice knowledge presented to them. Thus, maintaining visibility locally, within the state, and in a range of national organizations is important and requires faculty members to devote significant energy to these practice and professional societies. Faculty are expected to participate in roles of increasing responsibility and visibility as they move from Associate to Full Professor. Because the boundaries among the traditionally separate areas of scholarship, instruction, and service tend to blur in professional schools generally, and in colleges of education particularly, the promotion and/or tenure process acknowledges and supports faculty whose work integrates these sometimes compartmentalized areas.

Principle 7: The COE evaluates faculty by using evidence of the developmental progression of a faculty member's research and scholarship, instruction, and service.

Faculty development is considered to be a continuous process and, therefore, there is an expectation of a progression of research and scholarship, instruction, and service performance over time. Such maturation is observed in a diverse array of contexts and responsibilities. Differences are expected between the performances of junior faculty members in comparison with more senior faculty members.

The COE expects faculty members to show a clear progression in their scholarly productivity. The COE expectation is that faculty will publish an average of two refereed publications or comparable refereed products per year (not including publications that have been submitted but not yet accepted or accepted pending revisions). Chapters in books and professional presentations complement such productivity. Early scholarly works may be published in less prestigious journals and subsequent work should be published in higher impact journals. As development progresses, greater impact is measured by publication in high quality journals (i.e., with high impact factors or journals that reach a broader audience of researchers, practitioners, or policy makers) or the publication of books or other larger scholarly works. Progression in

recognition and activity at the national and/or international level should increase commensurate with rank.

In instruction, faculty members' development can be observed in the increasing complexity of their syllabi and instructional goals (e.g., knowledge transfer, development of expertise, elimination of misconceptions). Faculty instruction should reflect a diversity of pedagogical strategies (e.g., didactic instruction, small group learning, web-based instructional materials). Faculty strategies for monitoring student learning should reflect the use of a number of different formative and summative assessment and feedback approaches (e.g., individual projects, class presentations, tests and assessments, web-based instructional materials, peer critique). Faculty instructional and evaluative strategies should become more sophisticated and improve over time. Also, an improvement in student course evaluation reports and peer observation reports is generally expected as faculty members progress in their development as instructors. Faculty members are expected to increase their graduate advising, mentoring, service on student degree committees, and chairing of dissertations over time as well.

A faculty member's leadership role in her or his department, college, university, and profession is expected to expand progressively over time. For example, Assistant Professors may serve initially on department/COE committees and national committees, and serve as ad hoc reviewers for journals; Associate Professors may serve on or chair a COE/university committee, serve on journal boards, chair national committees, and be elected to leadership roles in professional organizations; and Full Professors are expected to fulfill significant COE, university, and professional leadership roles (e.g., Department Head or Associate Dean, chair a significant college/university committee, serve as a journal editor, be elected to a major office in a national professional association).

Regarding performance reviews (e.g., annual reviews), faculty members achieving the performance standards described above are recognized as meeting expectations, and those exceeding the standards are recognized as exceeding expectations.

SECTION 2: GUIDELINES AND MATERIALS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Each recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must adhere to the following guidelines and include the sources of documentation described in this section.

General Procedures

Management of the promotion and/or tenure process. The Department Head shoulders much of the responsibility for ensuring that the candidate progresses successfully through the promotion and/or tenure process. The Department Head receives support from and will work with the COE's Administrative Program Assistant and the relevant COE Associate Dean to oversee and coordinate the promotion and/or tenure process. Department Heads are encouraged to orient new faculty to the process during the first year of appointment and to work with candidates strategically each year to plan and prepare for the promotion and/or tenure process during each annual review. Early attention to the professional development of the candidate and the preparation of materials and documentation can greatly facilitate the process.

Adhering to procedures and timelines. For both candidates and administrators, it is essential that the COE and university timelines and procedures provided in Section 3 are followed closely. The promotion and/or tenure review process is complex, and each step depends on the successful completion of the previous steps. If procedures are not followed or if timelines are not met, the process can be delayed or undermined. In extreme circumstances, it is possible that a candidate's file will be delayed until the following year if procedures or timelines are not followed correctly.

Locating information and getting support. There are several sources of information to support faculty in the promotion and/or tenure review process. The UO Office of Academic Affairs provides extensive information on policy and procedures on its web site and also conducts annual workshops on promotion and tenure. Candidates in the COE can also contact the Associate Dean for information or support or participate in the college's faculty mentoring program, or access the COE's web site for information on promotion and tenure (<https://education.uoregon.edu/governance/promotion-tenure>).

Preparing for review. Preparation and organization can make the promotion and/or tenure process easier and less stressful. Candidates should establish files to collect documentation during the first year of appointment and update files at least annually. Learning about the promotion and review process will make it much easier to comply with requirements, accomplish necessary tasks in a timely fashion, and minimize the burden of creating the dossier later on.

Changing the schedule. In unusual circumstances, the timeline for promotion and/or tenure can be altered. Occasionally, candidates may apply for early promotion, but this step should be carefully considered and only attempted after consultation with the Department Head, Dean, and Provost. It is also possible for the candidate to initiate the process of "stopping the clock" on promotion and/or tenure at the candidate's discretion for personal or professional reasons, including (1) for one year for the birth or adoption of a child or other family-related needs, (2) for up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay, or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Provost or designee. As with alteration of timelines for early promotion, delaying the process requires careful consultation with the Department Head, Dean, and Provost. Additional information on changes in schedule appear on the UO Office of Academic Affairs website.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation is an important mechanism for formative assessment and continuous improvement of instruction. A colleague in the same department typically, but not always, completes the peer evaluation. The peer evaluation should focus on more than an observation of teaching. A thorough evaluation and assessment of course materials (including syllabi, course content, texts and readings, assignments, tests, activities, and assessment methods) can provide valuable additional information on the instructional activities and effectiveness of the candidate. It should be noted that the Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP) and the UO Office of Academic Affairs regularly offer workshops in support of the peer evaluation process.

The expectation in the COE is that Assistant Professors will have at least one peer evaluation of teaching per year beginning in the first year of appointment. Feedback can be most helpful early in the candidate's instructional career. Associate Professors are to have peer evaluations conducted for at least one course every other year, depending on their year of appointment and time to promotion and/or tenure. In some cases, a newly appointed Associate Professor may seek a peer evaluation more frequently than every other year. Full Professors are to have peer evaluations conducted for at least one course in each post-tenure review period. Reports of all available peer observations and evaluations should be included in the second supplementary file in the promotion and/or tenure dossier.

Teaching Advocate

Some departments appoint a teaching advocate several years before the promotion and/or tenure review. The advocate can provide advice and mentoring to the candidate and also ensure that evaluations and documentation are conducted and collected. In the summer before the dossier is submitted, the teaching advocate summarizes and analyzes student and peer evaluation reports and other evidence of instructional activity and accomplishment and prepares a detailed summary of the candidate's body of instructional work. This report is used to provide information for the Department Head's letter and can be included in the dossier.

External Review

A requirement for promotion and/or tenure reviews (but not other reviews) is the evaluation of the candidate's file by external reviewers. A total of 6 completed letters should be obtained for the dossier. The intent of external review is to secure independent evaluators who can provide a broad national perspective in evaluating the candidate's accomplishments, specifically against the standards for promotion and tenure enunciated in this document and those used at the reviewer's institution.

The candidate and the Department Head independently create a list of external reviewers. Reviewers must hold a faculty appointment from an AAU member or other institution comparable to the UO (e.g., *Carnegie Research University: Very High Research Activity* institution). Generally reviewers should be tenured Full Professors. Sometimes reviewers at the Associate Professor rank are acceptable for cases considering a promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor when the reviewer possesses particularly relevant expertise.

The candidate should create a list of no more than 4 potential external reviewers with complete contact information and provide this list to the Department Head. The candidate should indicate on the list the nature of her or his relationship to the proposed reviewer (e.g., "co-author," "never met"). Candidates may also indicate one or two individuals they choose not to have review their work. External reviewers cannot be a former supervisor, dissertation advisor, or a close colleague.

The Department Head also generates a list (independent of the candidate's list) of at least 6 external reviewers. Selection of a final list of 6 external reviewers and 2 alternates is made by the Department Head in consultation with the relevant COE Associate Dean or designee. Typically,

no more than 2 reviewers are chosen from the candidate's list, although names that appear on both lists are not counted toward this number. After approval by the Associate Dean, the Department Head contacts the final list of 6 external reviewers to solicit participation.

The packet sent to each external reviewer must include the following: (a) Department Head cover letter including a hyperlink to the COE Tenure and Promotion Policy (see template in Appendix A4), (b) candidate's CV, (c) candidate's personal statement, and (d) 4 examples of scholarly activity. Clear context, explanation, and/or documentation on reprints should be provided in the Department Head's letter, the candidate's personal statement, or both. For example, a reprint of a book chapter should include page numbers and the cover material of the book showing title, editor(s), and publication date. Generally, a book or unpublished works should not be used as an example of scholarly activity.

The Department Head manages all communications with the reviewers, as the list of external reviewers is not disclosed to the candidate. If by chance, the candidate gains knowledge of external reviewers, the candidate is *not* to contact the reviewers at any point during the review process. If a reviewer is unable to participate, a replacement is chosen from one of the alternates. If additional reviewers are needed, the Department Head works with the Associate Dean to gain approval of additional reviewers.

The Department Head is responsible for requesting and accumulating external reviewer letters of evaluation, for identifying the relationship of all referees to the candidate, and for ensuring that the file of written evaluations and recommendations from within and without the university presents a fair and complete picture of the activities and accomplishments of the candidate under consideration. The Department Head needs to keep careful documentation on the process of soliciting external reviewers, recording reasons for any refusals, and documenting correspondence (e.g., date, time, reason) with the reviewers.

The Dossier

The dossier contains all materials necessary for the evaluation of the candidate's application. It is the responsibility of the Department Head and administrative staff to compile and organize the dossier, but it is the responsibility of the candidate to supply some of the needed materials and documentation (as noted in relevant elements). The dossier includes two files (primary and supplementary files), and both advance through each step of the review process for evaluation at each level. The supplementary file must be maintained in the Dean's office and made available to any reviewer seeking more detailed evidence from the dossier until the promotion and/or tenure process is completed.

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure or promotion to Full Professor

The **primary dossier file** for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure or promotion to Full Professor should include the following 11 separate elements:

I. Faculty Review and Promotion Policy for Tenure Track Faculty. This element includes the COE policy (this document).

II. Dean's Evaluation and Recommendation. The Dean's review should be independent from those at the department level. It should analyze the candidate's record of professional accomplishment relative to the standards established by the department within the college. An important step in the review process is feedback to the candidate prior to submission of the file to the Office of Academic Affairs. This step, which must take place prior to the transmittal of the completed dossier to the Office of Academic Affairs, requires a meeting between the Dean or Associate Dean if designated, and the candidate, after the dossier has been reviewed at the college level. The candidate must be provided with at least three days advance notice of this meeting and may be accompanied by a representative of the candidate's own choosing. During this meeting, the Dean will provide the candidate with a description of the documents that have been assembled in the dossier and a summary of the recommendations made to date, including that of the Dean. If requested by the faculty member, the Dean shall provide a written version of the oral summary. If the candidate wishes to provide a written response to the Dean's recommendation, the candidate may do so within 10 calendar days of the meeting or receipt of the Dean's written summary; that response will be added to the dossier prior to its transmittal to the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs.

III. Department Head Recommendation. The Department Head prepares a letter that is expected to accomplish two main purposes: (a) provide a clear summary of the department faculty evaluation and recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure, and (b) provide the Department Head's independent personal evaluation of the case. The letter should describe the candidate's conditions of appointment and any special circumstances surrounding the appointment, the departmental review process, who was eligible to vote on the particular candidate, a summary of the faculty discussion and a report on the faculty vote, including rank and status of those voting. Departmental votes on promotion and/or tenure cases must be by secret ballot with only the totals revealed to the departmental faculty. The Department Head letter must explain any abstentions or reasons for faculty who were absent from the vote.

The Department Head letter should also include an appraisal of the candidate's scholarship, instructional activity, service, and contributions to institutional equity and inclusion that is independent of the departmental or any other reviews of the candidate. The letter should provide a clear recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, which need not coincide with the vote of the department faculty. The Department Head's letter carries more weight when it presents a balanced analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and is not simply advocacy of a colleague's case. Often the Department Head can provide important information that can help other reviewers of the candidate's file to understand details of the candidate's instructional or research record. Careful analysis presented in the Department Head's letter can also help to resolve discrepancies in the letters from external reviewers. Thus, the Department Head's letter is a critical piece of information in the dossier that helps to evaluate the file, summarize external reviewers' recommendations, and provide analysis and context to support consideration of the candidate's application. The Department Head's letter must be signed and dated.

IV. Department Vote and Recommendation. This element reports results from the secret ballot vote by department faculty (for voting eligibility and procedures, see COE Voting Policy).

V. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers. Letters of evaluation, as well as a summary of reviewers solicited, those who refused, and copies of correspondence from those who refused are included in the dossier.

VI. Curriculum Vitae (provided by the candidate). The candidate must prepare a current and complete curriculum vitae (CV) that is signed and dated. It is important that the CV is well organized and follows certain conventions. A template describing the suggested contents and organization of the CV appears in Appendix A2. Activities and accomplishments should be listed in chronological order, usually from recent to distant. Different types of scholarly activity should be separated and clearly labeled. It is particularly important to distinguish between peer-reviewed publications and other forms of scholarly work using separate headings in the CV. It is also important to describe work that is in the midst of the review and publication process correctly. A publication should only be listed as “in press” if the review process has been fully completed. In that case, a letter from the editor is included in the dossier establishing that work is “in press,” and the work counts as a completed publication.

VII. Candidate Personal Statement (provided by the candidate). The personal statement provides an opportunity for the candidate to explicate the context for the body of work for the particular period of review. A typical personal statement is 5 - 6 pages in length (single spaced, 12-point font) and must be signed and dated. The personal statement is sent to external reviewers and later becomes part of the candidate’s dossier that will be reviewed at the department, COE, and university levels; therefore, the personal statement needs to serve several purposes. For external reviewers, the personal statement provides an introduction to the candidate and her or his professional history and a foundation and explanation of the candidate’s scholarly work, including the reprints provided to the reviewers. For all review audiences, the personal statement provides insight into the candidate’s personal philosophy, research agenda, instructional orientation, and commitment and involvement in professional service. The statement should include a description of scholarly and professional activities, accomplishments, goals, and plans and should detail both recent activities and the candidate’s long-term goals as an independent scholar-teacher. The statement must also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (for guidance in this element of the statement, visit the CoDAC website at <http://codac.uoregon.edu/faculty-equity-statements/>). The personal statement also provides an opportunity to explain or contextualize any unusual features in the candidate’s professional record (e.g., change in direction of scholarly inquiry, a period of inactivity in the record) so there is no misunderstanding by reviewers. The candidate should specifically address the areas of research, instruction, service, and contributions to equity and inclusion and discuss how these activities are integrated. In crafting the personal statement, the candidate should avoid technical jargon and keep in mind that it is intended for a broad audience of evaluators who may not be familiar with the candidate’s field of study as the dossier moves beyond the department and COE.

VIII. Statement of Waiver/Non-waiver (provided by the candidate). The Department Head obtains a signed letter from the candidate indicating whether the candidate waives rights to review the documents in the promotion and/or tenure file. Examples of waiver letters appear in Appendix A3.

IX. Duties and Responsibilities. A copy of the candidate's position description is included.

X. Conditions of Appointment. The letter(s) of appointment and evidence of any changes in appointment status that have affected candidate's tenure clock are included, as are any MOUs detailing joint appointments.

XI. Teaching Evaluations and Evidence of Instructional Activity. It is the responsibility of the Department Head and departmental staff to collect and compile evidence of instructional activity and teaching effectiveness for the candidate's file.² The candidate must not prepare these materials. This element should include: (a) UO Checklist for the evaluation of teaching; (b) a list of all courses taught at the university and other institutions of higher education as appropriate, including year, term, title, number of students and associated Course Evaluation Report (CER)³ results; (c) a list of any/all teaching awards, including awards from the department, school or college, university, and external sources; (d) a list of all supervised dissertations, theses, and undergraduate honors papers; (e) sample course evaluation questions; (f) statistical summary page for each course taught; (g) peer evaluations of teaching; and (h) any signed and dated letters from students.

Evidence of instructional activity is also gained from the mentoring and advising activities of the faculty member. The dossier should include a list documenting the candidate's service as a student advisor and as a member or chair of graduate student examination or degree committees. Information should also be provided on students at all levels (i.e., undergraduate, Master's, doctoral, post-doctoral) who have carried out independent studies, readings, or independent research/scholarship with the candidate, including indication of the candidate's role in student studies. This list should indicate the years in which degrees were received and current place and status of employment if available. The candidate is encouraged to add commentary that gives perspective on the candidate's activities and accomplishments in mentoring students, joint publication with students, or other mentoring activities.

Dossiers for promotion and/or tenure should also contain complete information on other indicators of the candidate's instructional activity. Both solicited and unsolicited student letters should also be included although they are not required. Each student letter must be signed and dated by the student. If available, the report of the Teaching Advocate can be included.

The **supplementary dossier file** should contain additional materials documenting the candidate's scholarly and instructional activities. It should include the following: (a) a copy of all publications, as well as samples of other papers, reports, and products that capture the body of the candidate's scholarly work; (b) a brief statement by the candidate that summarizes the relative standing of journals and outlets, whether peer review is used, and context or explanations for patterns or themes in the candidate's scholarly record; (c) signed student comments, and sample course materials, such as syllabi, assignments, assessments, and other evidence that

² Although the primary responsibility for compiling and organizing course and instructor evaluations rests with the department, when the candidate has previously worked at another institution, the candidate must take a more active role in the preparation of this documentation and must ensure that the Department Head and staff have all information needed to compile a complete dossier.

³ UO Faculty Senate legislation requires the use of the UO Course Evaluation Report in the evaluation of faculty.

establishes the rigor and substance of the candidate's instruction; and (d) reports of all available peer observations and evaluations.

Mid-Term Review

For Mid-Term Reviews, the **primary dossier file** includes 8 elements (as described above):

- I. Dean's Evaluation and Recommendation.*
- II. Department Head Recommendation.*
- III. Department Vote and Recommendation.*
- IV. Curriculum Vitae (provided by the candidate).*
- V. Candidate Personal Statement (provided by the candidate).*
- VI. Duties and Responsibilities.*
- VII. Conditions of Appointment.*
- VIII. Teaching Evaluations and Evidence of Instructional Activity.*

The **supplementary dossier file** should include the same 8 elements described for promotion and/or tenure cases above.

SECTION 3. PROCEDURES AND TIMELINES

The following procedures and timelines should be followed in preparing candidate files for promotion of tenure-track faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor and/or the award of tenure. Procedures and timelines for Mid-Term Review and for promotion of tenure-track faculty from Associate to Full Professor are somewhat different and are described in separate sections below. In all sections below, the listed timelines are approximate and may vary slightly so they do not fall on a weekend. Otherwise, all faculty and staff should strive to adhere closely to the listed deadlines.

Academic year before file is submitted (typically year 5)

- November 1 Department Head prepares a list of candidates planning to submit a file for promotion and/or tenure in the following academic year. The list, along with each candidate's updated CV is sent to the relevant COE Associate Dean.
- November 15 Department Head confers with the Associate Dean and Dean on plans for promotion and/or tenure of candidate(s).
- December 15 Candidate meets with Associate Dean to discuss promotion and/or tenure process.
- March 15 Candidate and Department Head independently prepare lists of suggested external reviewers.
- Department Head obtains a signed letter from the candidate indicating whether the candidate waives her or his rights to review the documents in her or his promotion and/or tenure file. Examples of waiver letters appear in Appendix A3.
- April 1 Department Head selects 6 external reviewers and 2 alternates and submits the list to the Associate Dean for approval.

- April 15 Department Head contacts external reviewers to ask if they are willing to review the candidate's file and write a letter of evaluation. The Department Head keeps a written record of the contacts and responses. The list of external reviewers is finalized by May 1. The final list of 6 reviewers is submitted to the Associate Dean for approval.
- May 31 Candidate submits the following materials to Department Head for review and approval: (a) CV, (b) personal statement, and (c) 4 reprints or examples of scholarly work.
- Department Head submits all materials for external review to the Associate Dean for approval.
- June 6 Associate Dean approves materials for external review.
- June 15 Department Head sends review packet to external reviewers.
- August 31 Department Head and/or staff compiles the dossier.
- Candidate is responsible for supplying all remaining materials needed to complete the dossier and must work with staff to ensure that all materials are available.

Academic year in which file is submitted (typically year 6)

- September 15 Dean sends list of those in COE being considered for promotion and/or tenure to the UO Office of Academic Affairs.
- September 15 Department Head makes sure that all external review letters are on track to be received no later than September 30.
- September 16 Department Heads, in consultation with the Dean and the Associate Dean, confirm members of the COE Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) for the upcoming academic year.
- October 1 Department Head instructs the COE's Administrative Program Assistant to assemble the candidate's file and make it available for department review.
- October 1 Dean provides the candidate with information concerning the state of the candidate's file (e.g., the general content of the reviewers' letters). If letters are generally positive, the process can move forward. If the letters are generally negative, the candidate has options. Candidates under consideration for tenure may develop a written response that can be added to the file. Candidates under consideration for promotion may add a response to the file or can choose to delay the process. Candidates under consideration for early promotion or tenure may

submit a request to their Department Head and COE Dean to return to the standard timeline.

- October 1 Department Head notifies the department faculty about review, voting procedures, and eligible voters (see COE Voting Policy).
- October 3-15 Department faculty members review the candidate's file and complete a written ballot. The vote is confidential and is not shared with the candidate. Ballots are due no later than October 15.
- Department Head compiles the result of the department faculty vote.
- October 23 Department Head completes a letter of evaluation that includes the department faculty discussion and department level vote tallied by rank and tenure/non-tenure status of the voters, in keeping with COE and department level governance policies. This letter and the department faculty vote are added to the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file.
- October 24 COE Administrative Program Assistant provides completed candidate files to the COE FPC for review.
- November 14 COE Administrative Program Assistant adds COE FPC letter and voting summary to the dossier after completion of the review by the COE FPC. The COE FPC's letter includes a review and analysis of each candidate's file, and a summary of the committee's discussion and decision.
- November 15 Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than November 28.
- November 29 Associate Dean and the COE Administrative Program Assistant make a file available to the Provost's office. The Dean's office retains a copy for COE records.
- Winter/Spring UO FPC reviews the file, votes, and writes a recommendation for the Provost.
- May 1 Provost reviews files as they are received from the UO FPC and makes the decision about promotion and/or tenure. There is a single notification date for all candidates, on or about May 1.

Mid-Term (Pre-Tenure) Review of Tenure Line Faculty

An untenured COE faculty member in a tenure-track position is required by the University of Oregon to stand for a formal, pre-tenure review. Typically, this review is conducted halfway between appointment and eligibility for tenure (e.g., during the third year of an initial three-year contract at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor without tenure). This review is designed to reflect and approximate the major elements and standards of the promotion and/or tenure

process that the faculty member will be required to satisfy at a later point, typically three years after the pre-tenure review is successfully completed. In line with this requirement, a Mid-Term Review will be initiated at the department level, include reviews and evaluation letters from the Department Head and Dean and a recommendation from the Dean to the Provost. When successful, the Mid-Term Review results in the issuance of a new multi-year contract.

The review process and procedures are very similar to the review for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor described above. The key differences are a later and abbreviated timeline and a condensed review process that omits reviews of the file by external reviewers, the COE FPC, and the UO FPC.

It is particularly important in the pre-tenure review to provide evaluative and diagnostic information to the candidate. Faculty and administrators evaluating pre-tenure candidates have a responsibility to communicate clearly any areas of weakness or deficiency in a candidate's activities and accomplishments to provide timely notice and opportunity for improvement and professional development.

Academic year in which pre-tenure review file is submitted

- November 1 Department Head requests documents and information from the candidate to prepare the file for review. Documents include: (a) CV, (b) personal statement, (c) a representative sample of no more than 4 recent publications or examples of scholarly work, and (d) copies of instructional materials (e.g., course syllabi).
- January 15 Candidate submits materials to Department Head for review and approval.
- January 25 Department Head and/or staff compile the dossier.
- Candidate is responsible for supplying all remaining materials needed to complete the dossier and must work with staff to ensure that all materials are available.
- Department Head and/or department staff make a file available to department faculty.
- Department Head notifies the department faculty about review and voting procedures. The candidate's file is made available to department faculty for review.
- February 1-10 Department faculty members review the candidate's file and complete a written secret ballot. The vote is not shared with the candidate. The Department Head compiles the result of the department faculty vote. Ballots are due no later than February 10.
- February 24 Department Head completes a letter of evaluation that reflects the department faculty discussion and vote tallied by rank of the voters. This letter and the department faculty vote are added to the candidate's dossier.

- March 15 Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation and recommendation, which is added to the file no later than March 15.
- Candidate reads the Dean's letter. Candidates will sign that they have read the letter. If the candidate disagrees with the evaluation, the candidate has the right to submit a dissenting letter along with the Dean's letter to the Provost.
- March 18 The COE Academic Program Assistant sends letters of the Department Head and Dean to the UO Office of Academic Affairs, attached to the candidate's new Request to Offer Academic Staff Appointment form (RTO).
- May 1 A new contract is issued in accordance with the continuation status of the candidate for a specified number of years.

Promotion to Full Professor

It should be noted that the timing of the decision to apply for promotion to Full Professor may vary more than the typical six year timeline from appointment as an Assistant Professor to application for promotion and/or tenure as an Associate Professor. Although there is usually a span of at least six years from appointment as an Associate Professor to application for promotion to Full Professor, faculty may choose not to apply for promotion. However, once a decision has been made to apply for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, the same procedures and timelines as the process for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are applied, with the following exceptions.

As described in Section 1 of this document, there are expectations for development and maturation of a faculty member's activities and accomplishments as she or he becomes more experienced in the profession. As a result, it is important in the documentation and review of files for promotion to Full Professor to demonstrate increasing levels of responsibility and impact in the faculty member's work. When external reviewers are chosen for a file considering promotion to Full Professor, all reviewers should hold the rank of Full Professor at their institution. All timelines presented above for the promotion and/or tenure of Assistant Professors should be followed for the promotion of Associate Professors up until the early October departmental review and vote. The timelines presented below should be followed for the remainder of the process.

- November 5 Department Head completes a letter of evaluation that reflects the department faculty discussion and vote tallied by rank of the voters.
- November 10 Department Head adds the letter and the department faculty vote to the candidate's promotion file. COE Administrative Program Assistant makes the file available to the COE FPC.

- November 30 COE FPC reviews the candidate's file, votes, and writes a letter of evaluation that reflects the committee's discussion and vote. The committee letter and voting summary are added to the file.
- December 1 Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than January 8.
- January 14 Associate Dean and/or the COE Administrative Program Assistant make the completed file available to the Provost's office. The Dean's office retains a copy for COE records.
- Spring UO FPC reviews the file, votes, and writes a recommendation for the Provost.
- May 1 Provost reviews the file, makes the decision about promotion, and informs the candidate.

Post-Tenure Reviews

The primary function of post-tenure review (PTR) is faculty development. It is guided by the following points:

1. The focus of post-tenure review is not to re-evaluate the award of tenure.
2. The same principles and criteria presented earlier in this document pertain to post-tenure review, with the understanding that as a faculty member becomes more senior, there is an expectation that there will be additional levels of leadership and continued scholarship.

Third-Year (post-tenure) review. Tenured faculty members will have an interim review in the third year following either promotion and/or tenure or a sixth-year review. For Associate Professors, the third-year review serves a similar function to that of the mid-term review, in terms of preparing the candidate for a successful application for Full Professor. The three-year review is conducted jointly by the faculty member and the Department Head. The faculty member will submit a CV and personal statement 5 – 6 pages long, to discuss activities since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure evaluation. The personal statement should address scholarship activity, instruction, service, and a discussion of contributions to equity and inclusion. As a result of the review, the Department Head will prepare a brief letter and share it with the faculty member, who may respond in writing. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in the creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The letter and any response will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Academic year in which third-year review is to be completed

Fall Term Department Head contacts the faculty member and requests: (a) CV, and (b) personal statement.

Faculty Member prepares these materials.

- January 20 Faculty Member submits CV and personal statement to Department Head.
- COE Administrative Program Assistant prepares and submits teaching evaluations summary and course evaluations to Department Head.
- Department Head reviews peer evaluations, course evaluations, CV, and personal statement.
- February 1 Department Head writes Department Head's letter.
- February 15 Department Head meets with faculty member and shares letter.
- Faculty Member may choose to write a written response (within 10 days of the meeting).
- March 1 Department Head places letter (and faculty member's response, if applicable) in faculty member's personnel file.

Sixth-Year (Post-Tenure) Review

Tenured faculty members will have a major review every six years following promotion. This process is more involved than the third-year review. Additional components include a report of accomplishments and benefits resulting from sabbatical (if applicable) and review by the COE FPC and COE Dean. The COE Dean then submits these letters to the Provost (CV, statement, sabbatical report, and teaching evaluations move forward only on request).

In making an evaluation of the faculty member's performance, the COE FPC and COE Dean will use one of the following three levels: (a) does not meet expectations, (b) meets expectations, or (c) exceeds expectations. The standards outlined in Principle 7 shall guide this decision, with the understanding that faculty members at this stage of career may be held to higher standards than those seeking tenure or promotion.

The Provost will consider the letters from the Department Head, COE FPC, and the Dean. If the Provost concludes that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, the Dean and the Department Head shall consult with the faculty member and recommend to the Provost a development plan for restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the Dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval. If a sixth-year PTR results in the creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

Academic year in which sixth-year review is to be completed

Fall Term Department Head contacts the faculty member and requests: (a) CV, (b) personal statement, and (c) sabbatical report (if applicable).

Faculty Member prepares these materials.

January 20 Faculty Member submits CV, personal statement, and sabbatical report (if applicable) to Department Head.

COE Administrative Program Assistant prepares and submits teaching evaluations summary and course evaluations to Department Head.

Department Head reviews course evaluations, CV, and personal statement. Department Head also gathers and submits peer evaluations received during the period under review and submits them to the COE Administrative Program Assistant.

February 1 Faculty Member submits final CV, personal statement, and sabbatical report (if applicable) to COE Administrative Program Assistant.

COE Administrative Program Assistant creates file and makes it available to the COE FPC.

March 1 COE FPC writes letter and submits to Department Head.

March 15 Department Head writes and submits Department Head's letter and COE FPC letter to COE Administrative Program Assistant.

Department Head meets with Faculty Member to review Department Head's letter.

Faculty Member may choose to write a written response (within 10 days of the meeting).

March 25 Department Head puts review documents and any Faculty Member response in Faculty Member's personnel file and submits letters to Dean.

April 1 Dean writes Dean's letter.

Dean meets with Faculty Member to review Dean's letter.

Faculty Member may choose to write a written response (within 10 days of the meeting).

April 15 Dean puts review documents and any Faculty Member response in Faculty Member's personnel file and submits letters to Provost.

APPENDIX A

A1. UO OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

A2. COE CURRICULUM VITAE TEMPLATE

A3. SAMPLE WAIVER LETTERS FROM CANDIDATE

A4. SAMPLE FORM LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

A5. PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE CHECKLIST

APPENDIX A1. OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

The UO Office of Academic Affairs provides detailed guidelines for faculty tenure and promotion. The web URL is <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu>.

APPENDIX A2. COE CURRICULUM VITAE TEMPLATE

[This template is intended as a guide to best practice in organizing and presenting your CV. Use APA style, one-inch margins, Times New Roman, 12 pt. Font. [Instructions, suggestions, and comments are presented below in italics within brackets.]

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jane Doe

[Provide clear and complete identifying information including: name, office address, phone number, and e-mail address, date vitae has been updated. It is recommended to omit personal information such as home address and phone, information about family, etc.]

Address: 10 Education Building (office) Telephone: (541) 346-0000 (office)
College of Education (541) 346-1001 (FAX)
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

e-mail Address: jdoe@uoregon.edu Web Address: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~jdoe>

TEACHING AND RESEARCH INTERESTS:

[Provide information that indicates your research and teaching interests.]

Early childhood learning and literacy....

EDUCATIONAL RECORD:

[Indicate name of schools, degrees and dates granted; earlier in career list doctoral dissertation title and advisor and Master's thesis title and advisor.]

- 2010 Doctor of Philosophy completed at the University of Peer Institution in May, 2010. Major area of study: Education, dissertation title: *Relationships among educational variables*, Dissertation chair: Dr. Good Advisor.
- 2008 Master of Arts completed at the University of Peer Institution in May, 2008 in Education, thesis title: *Relationships among other educational variables*, Thesis chair: Dr. M. A. Advisor.
- 2006 Bachelor of Arts completed at the University of Peer Institution in May, 2006; major: Sociology, minor: Psychology

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

[Indicate location, job title, time/year in position, position description for all professional positions held.]

2010-present Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of Oregon

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

2010-present College of Education, University of Oregon

2008-10 Teaching Assistant, College of Education, University of Peer Institution

Courses Taught:

Undergraduate courses in assessment, educational policy, early childhood learning...

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES:

[Order all entries from most to least recent; number entries in chronological order, e.g., a "1" is oldest. You may want to vary the order of subheadings depending on the accomplishments and activities you wish to highlight.]

[Use separate subheadings for:

- Refereed journal articles; do **not** include articles in preparation or in review here, see next heading. If article is "in press," you must include documentation from the journal editor in the dossier (i.e., a letter or e-mail confirming full acceptance).
- Articles in non-refereed journals
- Books and monographs
- Book chapters
- Reports and other publications]

A. Refereed Journal Articles:

9. Doe, J., & Researcher, E. (in press). Growth on oral reading fluency progress monitoring measures. *Journal of Special Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.11/02914563695
8. Advisor, G., & Doe, J. (2015). Reading achievement growth of students with and without disabilities on a statewide achievement test. *Exceptional Children*, 22, 35-52.

[etc.]

B. Manuscripts submitted for Publication:

- Doe, J. (2015). *Learning Disability Status and Growth in Early Literacy*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Stern, V., Colleague, W., & Doe, J. (2015). *Reading comprehension achievement gaps for students with and without disabilities*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

C. Presentations

[Use separate subheadings for:

- *International invited presentations followed by non-invited presentations or conference papers*
- *National invited and non-invited presentations and conference papers*
- *Regional invited and non-invited presentations and conference papers]*

15. Lewis, J., & Doe, J. (2014, April). *Critical issues in studying literacy development in early childhood*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Philadelphia, PA.

14. Doe, J., Carmichael, S., Lodge, H. C. (2013, April). *Growth in oral reading fluency across two academic years and the intervening summer*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

[etc.]

D. External Funding

[Indicate name and type of grant, awarding entity, award period, amount of award, your role in the project (e.g., principal investigator, consultant) and brief description of the project. It's OK to list grants submitted but not funded as well just indicate "unfunded."]

Literacy Assessment of Children with Specific Learning Disabilities. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences (IES, CFDA 84.123A). Jane Doe, and Ann Collaborator, Co-Principal Investigators, 7/2013-6/2015 (\$1,007,132: funded).

A Multisite Randomized Trial of Embedded Coaching Support and Multi-Component Instruction on Early Literacy Outcomes. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences (IES, CFDA Number: 84.111A). William Colleague and Jane Doe, Co-Principal Investigators (\$3,498,399: unfunded).

Preparation and Analysis of Literacy Assessment Data. Funded by the College of Education
Principal Overhead Funds Allocation Committee, University of Oregon. Jane Doe, Investigator, January, 1994 to May, 1994 (\$1,995).

[etc.]

D. Technical Reports

8. Doe, J., & Stern, V. (2014). *How professional development, teacher satisfaction and plans to remain in teaching are related: Some policy implications*, Research Report No. 2014-2. Eugene, OR: Oregon Reading Research Center.

7. Howard, R., Stern, V., & Doe, J. (2012). *Technical report on the “2011 Oregon Survey of Teachers”*. Eugene, OR: Oregon Reading Research Center.

[etc.]

INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADVISING ACTIVITIES:

A. List of Courses Taught

[Indicate course prefix, number, and title and years taught, some also include enrollment.]

Courses Taught at UO:

EDUC 501 Child Development (Fall, 2010; Spring, 2012; Fall, 2014)

EDUC 574, Literacy Assessment in Education (Spring, 2011; Winter, 2013)

[etc.]

B. List of Service on Graduate Student Committees

[Indicate student name, degree, date if degree completed, your role (chair, member).]

C. List of Advisees

[If your advising workload is not well represented by service on student committees (e.g., undergraduate or MA advising), indicate who you advised with student name, degree, advising dates, your role (primary advisor, other role).]

SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

[For each entry indicate the type of service, years of participation, and your role in the activity (e.g., committee chair). If there are enough entries, use separate subheadings for:

- *National service (e.g., positions or committee service for professional organizations, editorial board membership, journal reviewing)*
- *State service (e.g., positions on committees, pro bono consultation)*
- *University service (e.g., membership on committees; work on university programs or projects not part of research or instruction)*
- *Department/program service (e.g., membership on departmental committees, search committees, service as a program advisor or coordinator if unpaid)*

(Usually it is better to omit consulting activities; also, paid consulting is not considered service.)]

2014-present Member, COE Curriculum Committee

2012-13 **Chair**, Department MA program redesign committee

2013-2014 Member, COE Search Committee, Assistant Professor of Special Education, COE, UO

AWARDS AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Awards and Honors

[Indicate title, year and nature of each award.]

Professional Organizations and Activities

[Indicate: name of the organization, years of participation, and roles in the organization.]

APPENDIX A3. SAMPLE WAIVER LETTERS FROM CANDIDATE

SAMPLE NON-WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate], and of the possibility of waiving this right for certain categories of material.

I wish to retain my legal right of access to all materials in my file.

I have been offered the opportunity to provide a list of suggested external reviewers for my case.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

SAMPLE FULL WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate]. However, it is my view that referees' evaluations should be kept confidential.

Consequently, I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all referees in conjunction with my promotion [and or tenure] review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

You should feel free to inform prospective referees that I have submitted this waiver and agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

I have been offered the opportunity to provide a list of suggested external reviewers for my case.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

SAMPLE PARTIAL WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

In this example, the candidate waives the right of access to external letters, but retains full access to letters from individuals affiliated with the UO.

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative tile being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate]. It is my view that external referees' evaluations should he kept confidential.

I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all referees external to the University of Oregon in conjunction with my promotion [and or tenure] review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

I wish, however, to retain my legal right of access to all letters submitted by individuals affiliated with the University of Oregon.

You should feel free to inform prospective external referees that I have submitted this partial waiver and have agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

I have been offered the opportunity to provide a list of suggested external reviewers for my case.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

APPENDIX A4. SAMPLE FORM LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Date

Name
Institution
Address
City, State Zip

Dear _____:

_____, of the _____, College of Education, University of Oregon, is being considered for promotion from _____ to _____. Such promotions are made only after an evaluation by faculty in the appropriate discipline, both at the University of Oregon and nationally.

You have been recommended as a nationally recognized scholar who can provide an evaluation of Dr. _____'s professional achievements and contributions. We appreciate your willingness to provide this evaluation and recognize the commitment involved. Our process requires that we request three products from you:

1. **Evaluation Letter:** Please write a letter outlining your assessment of Dr. _____'s scholarship, research accomplishments, publications, and stature within the profession. To assist in your evaluation you may wish to consult the UO College of Education's Promotion and/or Tenure Policy: <https://education.uoregon.edu/governance/promotion-tenure>. A comparison of Dr. _____ with others in the field would be appreciated. Please clearly indicate whether you believe that Dr. _____ has a record of scholarship that would support a positive recommendation for promotion (and/or tenure) at your institution.
2. **Vitae:** Please include a copy of your professional vitae.
3. **Brief Biography:** Please include a brief paragraph indicating your current professional position and any professional collaboration or interaction you have had with Dr. _____.

Oregon law permits full access by a faculty member to his or her personnel file. [Dr. _____ has not waived this right of access.] OR[However, Dr. _____ has voluntarily waived in advance the right of access with the expectation that this waiver will enable referees to prepare thorough and candid letters. Since this waiver has been reviewed for its legality, I can assure you the University will not disclose your letter to the candidate, although we cannot predict whether a challenge in court might result in such a disclosure. With the waiver, however, Dr. _____ retains the right to request a substantive summary of all evaluative remarks written in a manner to avoid disclosure of any referee's identity.]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and copies of relevant publications by Dr. _____ for your evaluation.

It will be of great help to us if we receive your evaluation letter, vitae, and biography before September 30, since we are now preparing all the necessary documents for Dr. _____'s file. Your evaluation letter will be placed in the formal promotion file of the candidate and reviewed by (a) the department faculty, (b) the college Faculty Personnel Committee, (c) the Department Head, (d) the Dean, (e) the University of Oregon Faculty Personnel Committee, and (f) the Provost. Your participation in this promotion evaluation is a significant contribution and is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Department Head,

Enclosures

