

**University of Oregon Economics Department
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

Approved by department on Dec. 6, 2010

Section I of these guidelines provides a summary of the general procedures followed at all levels in the University of Oregon with regard to review, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty. Section II provides further department-specific detail on review, promotion, and tenure procedures. Finally, section III provides the department's specific guidelines for promotion and tenure decisions.

I. Procedures

a. Preamble

Full details of the university's promotion and tenure procedures are available from the Office of the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. The rest of this section provides a summary of these procedures.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

ii. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In all other cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the department head who may also consult with the dean and the provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

iii. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted

file. If the department's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

iv. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

v. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

vi. Dossier

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate's dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, "forthcoming" or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications; "forthcoming" work may also be included

(an unpublished work may be described on the c.v. as “forthcoming” if it has been accepted and is in production; there must be written affirmation [may be email] from the editor of a press for a book, an editor of a journal for an article, and a book editor for a book chapter, as to the full acceptance of a contribution and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate’s statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

vii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate’s case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate’s work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees’ assessment of the candidate’s work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In most departments, both associate and full

professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

viii. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the department head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

ix. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The department head's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

x. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the dean's review after the meeting with the dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

xi. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the dean.
2. After the file leaves the DAC, the dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.
3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.
4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the provost's office. The provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

II. Department- specific Procedures

a. Preamble

This section provides further details about the department's procedures regarding review, promotion, and tenure.

b. Procedures

i. Initial Meeting with Department Head

In the first academic quarter of a new tenure track faculty member's service for the economics department, the head will schedule a meeting with that individual to review the procedures and guidelines for promotion and tenure. The individual will be given this document and a timetable for tenure-related events.

ii. Annual Review

Every spring quarter, each untenured faculty member will submit a current vita and Faculty Activity Report, the latter of which provides a detailed accounting of their past year's academic and professional activities. This report includes records on: a) courses taught, b) supervised student research, c) published research, d) research presentations, e) unpublished research status, f) grant activity, g) on campus service, h) off campus academic and professional service, i) academic consulting. In consultation with the department personnel committee (an appointed committee), the head will prepare a written evaluation report, which will be given to the faculty member. Within two weeks of the receipt of this report, the faculty member and head will meet for a candid discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's progress toward tenure during the previous year, including suggestions for possible improvements during the following year. At the end of this meeting the faculty member will sign the report and, if he or she desires, attach a response. The evaluation and any written response are forwarded to the dean, along with the curriculum vitae, where they become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file.

iii. Teaching Evaluations

The department requires student evaluations for every economics course. Instructors may not see student evaluations until they have submitted grades for the courses involved. Statistical tabulations and any narrative evaluations are provided to the instructor and copies are retained for use in future evaluations (no unsigned narrative evaluations are retained by the department). Statistical summaries are forwarded to the provost's office. Untenured faculty will also have their classroom visited and a course evaluated by a tenured colleague at least every other year. Written reports assessing the quality of instruction will be prepared.

iv. Department Seminar

Untenured faculty will be urged by the head to present a department seminar during their second or third year. This seminar will serve to acquaint the department with the development of the individual's research agenda.

v. Third-year Review

A thorough review of an untenured assistant professor's performance at the university is conducted in the spring of the third year of service, regardless of the FTE level of the appointment. This review is similar to a tenure review, though no outside letters are solicited. The review file includes a signed current vita and a brief statement by the faculty member about his or her professional activities, scholarly accomplishments, and plans for the future. In consultation with the department personnel committee and following a vote of the tenured faculty, the head will prepare a written evaluation report. If the department believes that the faculty member's work has been fully satisfactory and raises a realistic probability of tenure three years later, the report will include a recommendation for contract renewal. If the department finds the faculty member's work less than fully satisfactory and believes the granting of tenure three years later is not probable, it will recommend a terminal one-year appointment. The deadline for department recommendations is typically in early May. After discussing the report and its recommendation with the appropriate associate dean, the head will share the report with the individual under review, and give the individual an opportunity to submit a response, if he or she so desires. The dean has final authority in approving contract renewals. In cases involving a tenure-track faculty member with a probationary period of four years or less, the "third-year" review shall occur no later than the second year of service. In these instances, the length of the initial contract shall not exceed two years, and the length of a renewed contract shall not extend past the anticipated date for promotion and tenure consideration.

vi. Candidate's Preparation of Materials for the Tenure File

In the spring of their fifth (or equivalent) year, untenured faculty will be requested to prepare a tenure file. The department head will provide the individual with a detailed list of materials necessary for their file. These materials include: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae; (2) copies of all significant publications; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) syllabi and other course materials; (5) a list of all Ph.D., M.A./M.S., and undergraduate honors theses committees, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (6) names of potential outside reviewers, including their relationship to the candidate; and (7) a signed waiver/partial waiver/nonwaiver letter. This information should be delivered to the department head by an agreed-upon date (typically early summer) prior to the year the case is going forward. Other materials needed for the candidate's dossier will be independently gathered by the department.

vii. Solicitation of Outside Letters

In consultation with the chair of the department's personnel committee and senior faculty in the relevant fields, the department head will compile a list of potential external reviewers for the promotion case. This list is prepared without prior knowledge of the list of reviewers suggested by the candidate. An effort will be made to ensure that the completed file contains letters of evaluation from scholars on both lists, but the department's primary responsibility is to obtain the best judgments from the most highly qualified experts in the appropriate areas, rather than to achieve a "balance" between the two lists. The purpose of such reviews is to inform, not to replace, campus evaluations. The university requires that there must be at least five letters in the submitted file and that a majority of the letters writers originate from the department's list of reviewers (Note: external reviewers that occur on both the candidate's and department's list count as a department recommendation).

viii. Personnel Committee Report

The personnel committee will begin reviewing the promotion file on or about the start of fall quarter. During the course of a series of committee meetings to discuss and evaluate the promotion case, the chair of the committee will draft the personnel committee report. The committee will vote (by name) on a recommendation to the entire department. The committee's vote, its report, and the entire promotion file will be made available to all faculty members senior in rank to the promotion candidate prior to the department meeting.

ix. Department Meeting

On or about November 1, the department will hold a two part meeting. In the first part, the personnel committee's report is summarized and its recommendation is presented to the entire faculty for discussion. Non-voting faculty members (those of the same rank or lower than the candidate) are excused upon completion of part 1. Part 2 involves further discussion amongst the voting faculty, followed by a vote by individual secret ballot. The vote tally is recorded and announced in summary form.

x. Department Head Report

The Head will write a letter discussing the relevant and unique aspects of the evaluation for an Economics professor, summarizing opinions (pro and con as relevant) expressed at the meeting, and in addition, will include a personal recommendation on promotion to the College as Department Head.

xi. Forwarding the File to the College of Arts and Sciences

The department head oversees the assembly of the candidate's file and delivers copies to the College of Arts and Sciences prior to November 15. From this point forward the progress of the file is as outlined in section I of this document. If the candidate so requests, he or she will be furnished with copies of any materials to which access has not been waived.

xii. Updates to the File

Important changes (such as newly accepted publications) that may occur after the file has left the department should be forwarded to the department head, who will in turn forward the updated information to whomever is caretaker of the file at that time.

III. Department- specific Guidelines

a. Preamble

The economics department has a determined interest in research - both theoretical and applied. The department seeks to recruit and retain faculty who have the ability and desire to publish in the leading economic journals. At the same time, the department places considerable emphasis on attracting and retaining staff who are effective classroom instructors and collegial contributors to the department and the broader academic community. Indeed, eligibility for promotion and tenure requires that the candidate demonstrate excellence in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service and we follow the principle that if a reasonable doubt remains about the candidate's continuing value to the university's mission, tenure is not granted. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

The next sections outline expectations in these criteria (research, teaching, and service) when evaluating a tenure-track professor's record for promotion and tenure. Two final sections discuss the extent to which the criteria differ for the promotion of associate professor to full professor and for other related reviews of tenured faculty.

c. Research

Development of a mature, high quality, research program is an absolute requirement for a research record to be considered excellent and for a recommendation of promotion with tenure in the economics department. The primary indicator of research productivity is a proven record of published research, and the primary outlet for scholarly output in our discipline is refereed

journal articles. It is essential that a significant number of papers are published in leading field and general interest journals that are appropriate for the research topic. Solo-authored work will generally carry more weight than research published with coauthors. A secondary indicator of research productivity is the development of a substantial body of research that is under review and in progress. It is important that research (published and unpublished) is deemed high quality by both internal and external reviewers. Other secondary indicators include invited lectures, conference presentations, research fellowships, and grant awards.

d. Teaching

A demonstrated record of high quality teaching is an absolute requirement to be considered excellent in this criterion and to gain tenure in the economics department. The department assesses quality of teaching through peer evaluation of classroom teaching, numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, supervision of student research (both at the graduate and undergraduate levels), solicited letters from students, a review of syllabi and exams for all courses taught, and analysis of course results such as enrollments and grade distributions. We note that by university rules, each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review.

e. Service

The department requires excellent service for promotion and tenure. While we place relatively light service demands on our junior faculty, these demands are expected to be satisfied in a conscientious and competent manner. Extra-departmental service at the university level (such as a university committee assignment), community level (such as a community lecture), or professional level (such as refereeing for a journal) is also valued, though we emphasize that a faculty member's first responsibilities are toward excellent research and teaching.

f. Department Guidelines for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

The procedures and guidelines for promotion to full professor are essentially the same as those for tenure. We expect the same levels of performance in research and teaching, but hold significantly increased expectations in the area of service, both to the department, university, and community at large. To be considered eligible for promotion, an associate professor must have an

accomplished record of excellent teaching, both in the classroom and in other aspects of teaching; an excellent record of scholarly research (including significant work beyond that on which tenure and promotion to associate professor was based); and an excellent record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department. While there is an expectation in the economics department that all of our tenured associate professors will be eligible for promotion to full professor, promotion is not automatic and demonstrated success in research, teaching, and service over the evaluation period is required.

g. Other related Reviews of Tenured Faculty

Post-tenure reviews are required for all tenured faculty every three years, with a substantive review carried out by both our elected executive committee and department head every 6 years. Additionally, each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor.



Professor Bruce Blonigen, Head
Department of Economics