

School of Law
Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Periodic Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

a. Annual Reviews for Untenured, Tenure-Track Faculty

At the beginning of each academic year in which the law school has added new untenured, tenure-track members to the faculty, the Chair and at least one other committee member meets with the new tenure-track faculty to go over the law school and university tenure guidelines and expectations.

The committee is responsible for conducting written annual reviews of pre-tenure faculty. Each review includes a written annual peer evaluation based on a classroom visit.¹ The peer evaluation is attached to the annual review. Peer teaching reviews may be conducted by members of the committee or by other tenured faculty members.

During the appropriate year, the committee also conducts a thorough contract renewal review of each pre-tenure faculty member and provides the Dean with a recommendation regarding the renewal of the untenured faculty member's contract. (These reviews are commonly called "third-year reviews," although the timing of such reviews does not always correspond to the third year of a pre-tenured faculty member's employment at Oregon.) The recommendation as to contract renewal should be based on a realistic assessment of the candidate's demonstrated prospect of satisfying, at the appropriate time, the standards for tenure.

During the appropriate year, the committee also takes the administrative lead on an untenured faculty member's application for tenure. See below for detailed information about candidates for tenure.

b. Reviews for Tenured Associate Professors

(1) Classroom observations.

The committee is responsible for arranging classroom observations and written peer evaluations¹ of associate professors at least once every other year. These reviews may be conducted by members of the committee or by other tenured members of the faculty.

(2) Third-year (interim) reviews

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) presently in effect provides that all tenured faculty members will be reviewed "in an alternating cycle of an interim (third-year) review and a major (sixth-year) review." Although the law faculty is not part of the bargaining unit, these periodic reviews are presently required of all

¹ See attached university guidelines for peer reviews in Appendix C.

UO faculty members.

The Dean has the primary responsibility for third-year (interim) reviews of associate professors. To aid in the review process, the Dean will gather the FAR forms during the relevant evaluation period, a current CV, and any relevant teaching evaluations. The faculty member will provide a three- to six-page statement evaluating his or her performance measured against the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and service contributions law school, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.²

The Dean may request that the Personnel Committee participate in gathering and assessing materials relevant to those reviews. The faculty member's record of progress will be measured against the relevant promotion standards (currently articulated in Appendix A of the Personnel Committee Handbook). As a result of the review and assessment, the Dean will prepare a statement and share it with the faculty member, who may respond in writing. If the faculty member is not meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service, a professional development plan may be created at this time (see below for details). The statement and any response will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

(3) Sixth-year (major) reviews

In an ideal case, an Associate Professor will submit her or his candidacy for promotion to full, rather than undergo a sixth-year review. However, in the event an associate professor elects not to seek promotion, the faculty member must be reviewed according to the sixth-year review standards and processes articulated in the section immediately below. The only exception is that associate professors are not eligible for salary increases associated with favorable sixth-year reviews. If the faculty member is not meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service, a professional development plan may be created at this time (see below for details).

c. Reviews for Tenured Full Professors

(1) Classroom observations.

The committee is responsible for arranging classroom observations and written peer evaluations of full professors at least once every three years. These reviews may be conducted by members of the committee or by other tenured members of the faculty.

(2) Third-year (interim) reviews

The Dean has the primary responsibility for third-year (interim) reviews of full

² The contents of this personal statement substantially parallel the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

professors. These reviews are identical for full professors and associate professors. See section (b)(2) immediately above for details on interim reviews.

(3) Sixth-year (major) reviews

The Personnel Committee has the principal responsibility for the first stage of all sixth-year reviews. The Dean will provide to the Committee a current CV, the Faculty Activity Reports filed during the evaluation period, and any relevant teaching evaluations. The faculty member will provide to the Committee a three- to six-page statement evaluating his or her performance measured against the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and service contributions law school, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.²

The Personnel Committee will assess the faculty member's record using the relevant promotion standards (currently articulated in Appendix A of the Personnel Committee Handbook). The Personnel Committee will provide the Dean and the faculty member a signed, written report summarizing its assessment of the faculty member's record, including an indication of its judgment about the extent to which the faculty member has exceeded, met, or failed to meet each of the relevant promotion standards. The faculty member will have 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material and information, which shall be included in the evaluation file.

The dean will then review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the dean deems the file complete, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean will share his or her report and recommendation with the faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material and information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The dean will then submit the complete evaluation file, including any responsive materials the candidate wishes to be forwarded to the Provost or designee.

The Provost will consider the cumulative evaluations and make the final determination regarding increases associated with a sixth-year review. Currently a faculty member whose sixth-year review exceeds expectations on all measures will receive at least an 8% salary increase, and that a faculty member whose review meets expectations on all measures will receive at least a 4% salary increase.

“For a full professor receiving a range of performance evaluations for scholarship, teaching, and service (e.g., exceeding expectations for scholarship, meeting expectations for teaching, failing to meet expectations for service), the academic judgment of the dean will determine the magnitude of any increase in base salary.”³

³ This provision is drawn directly from the Collective Bargaining Agreement in effect as of August 2016.

If the faculty member is not meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service, a professional development plan may be created at this time (see below for details).

The reports and, if applicable, the professional development plan should be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level and also submitted to Human Resources for inclusion in the permanent personnel file.

2. Tenure Files

The committee should make sure that each candidate for tenure is familiar with the university policies and procedures regarding tenure and promotion. The most current set of materials is available on the university's Academic Affairs [website](#).⁴

a. Waiver Letter

At the outset of compiling a tenure file, the committee should solicit a "Statement of Waiver" from the candidate. The Academic Affairs website has three different [sample waiver statements](#).⁵ The committee must not coerce a candidate into opting for a particular level of waiver, but can (and probably should) provide advice about typical practices among law schools. The committee must receive this statement before it solicits external reviews, as information about the candidate's waiver (or non-waiver) must appear in the letter soliciting a review.

b. Personal Statement and CV

The candidate must provide committee with an updated, signed and dated personal statement and curriculum vitae. The university's Academic Affairs website provides guidance about the content of the [personal statement](#)⁶ and about the [vitae](#).⁶ These will both be included in the materials sent to external reviewers.

c. Selecting External Reviewers

In a typical case, the committee should receive reviews from six external reviewers. The Academic Affairs website provides detailed [guidance](#)⁷ on the selection of external reviewers and the [solicitation](#)⁸ letters to external reviewers. The expectation is that the reviewers are among the strongest scholars in the candidate's discipline and come from institutions that are at least comparable to ours. Generally, reviewers should be full professors; if associate professors are chosen, the committee should provide a rationale for this choice.

When a candidate waives the right to know the names of the external reviewers, the best practice is for the committee to develop its own list of at least ten

⁴ <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>

⁵ <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/academic-affairs-forms>

⁶ <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/promotion-tenure>

⁷ http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_3_-_selection_of_external_reviewers.pdf

⁸ http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_4_-_initial_solicitation_of_external_reviewers_0.pdf

prospective reviewers before soliciting names from the candidate. After developing its list, the committee then asks whether the candidate would like to provide the names of one or two people that the candidate would prefer not to serve as a reviewer and several names that the candidate recommends as potential reviewers. If the committee selects a reviewer from its own list, that person is not designated as having come from the candidate, even if the candidate identifies the same person. Any reviewer identified by the candidate, rather than by the committee, must be designated as such in the committee report. A majority of the reviewers (typically 4 out of 6) must have been identified by the committee, rather than by the candidate.

The committee must maintain a record of every solicitation communication it has with prospective reviewers, even if a prospective reviewer declines the invitation to review a file.⁹

d. Soliciting External Reviews

The academic affairs website provides a [sample solicitation letter](#)¹⁰ for external reviewers.¹¹ The letter should include explicit mention of all of the materials being included in the mailing to the reviewer, so that the letter provides evidence of the materials a reviewer has received and considered.

The provost's office strongly discourages customized solicitation letters. If the committee deems it important to customize a solicitation letter, the provost's office requests the opportunity to review it prior to the letter being sent.

The committee should include, in a candidate's file, one copy of the letter used to solicit reviewers (with the reviewer's name redacted).

e. Presenting External Reviews in the File

The committee prepares a summary of each external reviewer's credentials for eventual inclusion in the candidate's file. The best practice is to include a one-page narrative, explaining why the reviewer is well positioned to judge the quality of the candidate's scholarly contributions. This narrative should describe the reviewer's standing in the legal academy in the relevant area of legal scholarship. The committee should also request a full CV from each reviewer, so that it, too, can appear in the file along with the reviews. Finally, the narrative should identify any professional or personal relationships with the candidate, either as known ahead of time or determined in the course of the review process.

f. Committee Report and Recommendation

The Academic Affairs website provides detailed guidance regarding the content of the [committee's report](#).¹²

⁹ http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_5_-_the_formal_request_for_external_review_update_gd_8-14-15_0.pdf

¹⁰ <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/preparing-promotion-and-tenure-files>

¹¹ A sample law school request-to-serve-as-reviewer-for-tenure letter is set out in Appendix B.

¹² https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_8_-_departmental_review.pdf

The report should typically include five sections.¹³ The introduction describes the candidate's background and summarizes the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching and service. Next, the heart of the report addresses scholarship. This sections states the publications and names of reviewers. It then summarizes the reviewer's comments¹⁴ and discusses the candidate's scholarship. The third section addresses teaching, including student evaluations and peer reviews. Fourth, the report reviews service to the law school, university, local and state bar, and the national and international academic and legal community, as well as the candidate's contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. Finally, the report provides a conclusion and recommendation.

The report should not be an "advocacy" piece. Instead, it should include an assessment of all aspects of a candidate's file. It is the appropriate place for the committee to explain disciplinary practices (for example, the fact that law journals are not typically peer-reviewed, how we treat co-authorship, the significance of casebooks, etc.).

g. Committee Voting

Each member of the committee is eligible to vote on the report and recommendation to the faculty. All committee members must sign the committee's report. A committee member who disagrees with some or all of the committee's report has the option of writing a separate assessment, which will accompany the committee's report.

h. Presentation of Report and Recommendation to the Faculty

The Personnel Committee's report and recommendation to the faculty is made available to faculty members eligible to vote on the personnel matter. In the case of a tenure file only tenured faculty members may have access to the report and recommendation. The Chair and the Dean will take steps to assure that these materials do not circulate beyond the eligible faculty.

The eligible faculty also may have access to the supporting documents upon which the committee relied in reaching its recommendation. The best practice is for a single copy of these personnel documents to be held in a central location, with some procedure to permit eligible faculty to review it.

i. Faculty Consideration and Vote

The faculty will meet in Executive Session to consider the committee's report and recommendation. Only faculty who are eligible to vote on the matter may be present at the executive session discussion and vote.

¹³ If the candidate directs a program, a sixth section assessing the candidate's administrative work is included.

¹⁴ This should include each reviewer's response to two questions: Would the candidate qualify for tenure at the reviewer's school? How does the candidate compare to others in the field?
https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_8_-_departmental_review.pdf and
https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_9_-_school_or_college_review.pdf

The vote on a tenure file is conducted by written, signed ballot. The votes are counted by the Dean's executive assistant, and the count is confirmed by a faculty member. The vote totals are announced to the faculty in Executive Session. The ballots are destroyed in accord with State records retention laws.

The vote total should be communicated to the candidate. Because this is a personnel matter, no public announcement is made outside of Executive Session regarding the vote. (The candidate can, of course, say whatever he or she chooses, but the Dean or the committee should make sure the candidate understands that no formal announcement is made at this stage.)

j. Dean's Report

Following the faculty vote, the Dean prepares a report and recommendation for the University Personnel Committee and Provost. The Dean's report must include an explanation of the Dean's perspective on the file. This should include a discussion of the committee's report and the faculty's treatment of the file, whether the Dean agrees (or disagrees) with the earlier conclusions. The Dean will meet with the candidate to discuss the file and recommendation, and the candidate is allowed 10 days to respond in writing, if they choose, with that response included in the dossier. See the Academic Affairs website for more information about the [Dean's handling](#) of a file once it leaves the committee.¹⁵

k. Standards for Tenure

The Faculty Handbook articulates the law school's standards for tenure and promotion for tenure-track faculty members. The Handbook is available on MyLaw. The tenure and promotion standards are reproduced in Appendix A.

3. Promotion to Full Professor Files

The procedures for promotion to full professor essentially mirror those for tenure, described above.¹⁶

1. Voting

Tenured faculty members receive the committee's report. The faculty will meet in Executive Session to consider the committee's report and recommendation. Only tenured faculty may be present at the executive session discussion. Only those faculty members who have attained the rank of full professor are eligible to vote.

2. Standards for Promotion to Full

According to the Academic Affairs [website](#),⁶ the standards for promotion to full professor mirror those for tenure and promotion to associate professor: high quality performance in both teaching and service is a must and national or

¹⁵ https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/academicaffairs2.uoregon.edu/files/pt_guidance_9_-_school_or_college_review.pdf

¹⁶ A sample law school request-to-serve-as-reviewer-for-promotion letter is set out in Appendix C.

international prominence in scholarship or artistic performance is expected as well. Promotion to full professor does not come automatically with longevity at UO. While some faculty members retire as associate professors, this is not in the best interest of the university or the individual. One mission of a research university is the contribution of new knowledge and levels of performance. Our resources and faculty workloads are allocated to allow for research. Productivity in your discipline is as much a requirement of the job as is meeting your responsibilities to your students, your department, and the broader university community. In addition to your service as teacher and university community member, you need to stay active as a scholar in your discipline at a level that merits recognition and promotion to full professor within six to ten years of your becoming an associate professor. Standards for promotion do not change over time - when seeking promotion to professor, you are expected to have been as productive - if not more so - a scholarly record after ten or twelve years, as you needed to be promoted to a tenured associate professorship after six years. It is recognized that there is variability in career paths across the UO's many disciplines; therefore, a shift in the weighting of teaching versus research versus service accomplishments may be carried out in some cases, with promotion to Professor as the proper reward for excellence.

3. Materials

The materials that form the basis of an external reviewer's assessment should be principally that scholarship a faculty member produced as an Associate Professor, consistent with the "standards" statement above.

4. Course load increase for unsatisfactory research productivity

If concerns about research productivity arise or persist during any three- or six-year post-tenure review, and the Provost or their designee concludes that the faculty member's research productivity is unsatisfactory, the Dean will consult with the faculty member and recommend to the Provost a development plan for demonstrable improvement. The development plan can include mentoring or other support and suggest directions for research. It should include time lines and measurable goals for improved research productivity. The faculty member is responsible for regularly consulting with the Dean, who will provide guidance for the faculty member's efforts to attain development plan goals. Upon approval by the Provost or designee, the development plan will be implemented as soon as possible with the goal of reaching satisfactory performance by the next scheduled post-tenure review.

Should the Provost or designee conclude that the faculty member's research productivity remains unsatisfactory at the post-tenure review following the implementation of the development plan, the faculty member's standard workload may be adjusted to increase teaching and/or service. This gives the faculty member an opportunity to continue making a full-time contribution to the School's mission. The faculty member's workload reallocation should be recognized in the merit raise process with appropriate adjustments to the percentage of the merit raise

determined by teaching and/or service. The Dean will remain open to discussions with the faculty member about ways to support the faculty member in achieving their research goals, which may include future changes to teaching and service loads.

Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Standards

[Reproduced from the Faculty Handbook, February 2010 Version. Posted on MyLaw]

III. Conditions of Employment

A. Promotion and Tenure

1. Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

For promotion and tenure determinations, excellence in scholarship and teaching are paramount considerations, along with an active commitment to law school and university governance and community service.

Scholarship. The scholarly research mission of the law school is a matter of great importance. Major commitments of intellect, skill, and time must be devoted to research for publication by each faculty member. Research for publication is important because it aids the scholar to sharpen and refine his or her thinking, exposes that thinking to external review and criticism, improves the caliber of classroom teaching, spreads the teaching function beyond the law school, offers the opportunity to develop new insights and understanding, and even to reform the law.

No one model of scholarship is appropriate. Today most legal scholarship falls into one of three models, with considerable overlap between them. Traditional legal scholarship involves exposition, synthesis, analysis, and evaluation of an area of law, often followed by recommendations for change. Alternatively, some legal scholarship seeks to expand understanding of law by making use of the methods and insights of other disciplines. Thus, many legal scholars today seek to use economics, psychology, sociology, history, empirical methodology, philosophy, etc., in studying many areas of law. A third type of scholarship is directed specifically toward describing, drafting, or promoting particular changes in a body of law. It may take the form of a report to a government official or legislative committee on an area of law or operations of the legal system, or perhaps involve the drafting of a report and model legislation. Projects of this third kind often involve a thorough study of comparative models, legal research, and analyses of underlying theories. All three types of such scholarship are valuable to the academy, the judiciary, and the bar.

To achieve promotion and academic tenure, a law faculty member must demonstrate both the ability to publish scholarly work evidencing a substantial and creative intellectual endeavor and an inclination to continue to do so throughout her or his career. Scholarly ability includes the capacity to perform careful and thorough research; to undertake sustained, original analysis and synthesis; to enrich one's work with carefully conceived theoretical or doctrinal frameworks; and to write in a clear and concise fashion. One can best demonstrate such ability by production of scholarly works that constitute (in the view of the law faculty and recognized experts from other institutions) important, substantial contributions to the writer's field. Such works ordinarily will be appropriate for publication in law reviews, similar scholarly journals, or books. Other ways of demonstrating scholarly accomplishment may include publication

of professional reports, casebooks and teaching materials, book reviews, and other similar materials; however, except in the most unusual circumstances, these additional types of publications cannot be complete substitutes for the minimum requirements of independent scholarly production.

While the quality and significance of publications are more important than quantity, a candidate for tenure and promotion normally should have published three articles, or their equivalents, and have a fourth substantially underway. An article or essay in a law review, an article or essay in a peer-reviewed journal, or a chapter in an edited published volume of scholarly work all presumptively count as an “article.” There is no page requirement, but short book reviews, opinion pieces, personal tributes, introductions, and short or descriptive notes on recent developments presumptively do not count as an “article,” even though such works may still be given some credit in evaluating a candidate’s record.

Faculty members who are given tenure service credit for prior professional experience are expected to meet these minimum quantity scholarship requirements. If a faculty member has been given credit for prior experience, the evaluation of his or her scholarly achievements will begin with the first year of credit that the member claims, unless the faculty member’s employment contract provides to the contrary. A faculty member who is given credit for prior professional experience must demonstrate a continuing interest in research and writing by producing at least one piece every two years after becoming a member of the faculty.

Promotion to full professor ordinarily requires the same level of sustained scholarly productivity described above, that is, three additional articles or their equivalents produced since tenure and promotion to associate professor.

The file of a candidate for tenure or for promotion to full professor must also include evidence that the faculty member is likely to continue to be a productive scholar after receiving tenure or promotion.

Because most law reviews are student edited and there is no widely accepted hierarchy among law reviews, law schools rely heavily on external reviewers to assess the quality and impact of a candidate’s work. Selection of the reviewers is, therefore, critically important. The reviewers should ordinarily be full professors from comparable or more highly regarded institutions who have the appropriate substantive expertise and standing in their field to evaluate the candidate’s record. Generally, law school advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might have a conflict are not asked to be external reviewers.

Further evidence of a candidate’s research impact may include invitations to lecture, to serve on editorial boards, and to engage in peer review processes. In some cases, research impact may be demonstrated by reference to other scholars’ treatment of a candidate’s materials, for example, through citations, excerpts, or other forms of scholarly engagement.

Teaching. To be promoted or granted tenure, a faculty member must also demonstrate excellence in teaching. Beyond mere mastery of course materials, excellent teaching includes (1) developing student ability to think carefully and critically about law and legal institutions and (2) furnishing one or more coherent analytical frameworks to help illuminate and evaluate assigned material.

The law school views its teaching mission as a matter of great importance. Major commitments on time, intellect, and skill must be devoted to it. Education for a profession with as broad an impact as the law will follow different models and employ different methods. Some teachers will emphasize the learning of vast bodies of legal doctrine; some, the interrelationships among institutions; some, skills of analysis, synthesis, and expression; some, skills of advocacy and interpersonal relationships; some, the ethical dilemmas the profession of law confronts; and some, the need to appreciate and be able to utilize disciplines whose insights may give context to, explain, contradict, or permit evaluation of the law. Different teachers will use different teaching methods; good law teaching encompasses the ability to use different methods as the occasion and subject matter demand.

The first teaching objective, enhancing student ability and inclination to think critically, may be difficult to accomplish by exclusive use of the lecture method. Law teachers, therefore, ordinarily should develop competence at alternative teaching methods—such as the Socratic or discussion methods, the problem methods, or simulation and role playing, etc.,—in which students actively participate and the teacher provides training in analytical rigor. For the second objective, furnishing helpful analytic frameworks, teachers should particularly seek perspectives from other disciplines among the humanities and the social sciences.

University and Community Service. A third important criterion for promotion and tenure is an active commitment to faculty service obligations to the law school, the university, and the community. Academic lawyers, like other lawyers, have available to them unusually plentiful opportunities for useful, even distinguished service.

The law school and the university place heavy service demands upon the law faculty. Each faculty member is expected to play a significant role in the governance of the school and to respond affirmatively when possible to the many calls from across campus for law-related or rule-related assistance. In addition, opportunities often arise to participate in state or national bar activities, law reform projects, task force studies, interim legislative committees, teaching continuing education courses, educating non-lawyers about the law and our legal system, serving as a mediator or arbitrator, participating in professional associations, and many other activities which are valuable and strongly encouraged by the school.

Increased levels of service are expected for faculty members seeking promotion from associate to full professor.

Appendix B: Sample Letter to Tenure Reviewers

Professor XYZ
Address

September 30, 2016

Dear Professor _____ :

Thank you for agreeing to provide an evaluation of R I for a contract of indefinite tenure with the rank of associate professor at the University of Oregon School of Law. Such promotions are made only after consulting specialists in the field, and your willingness to provide input is deeply appreciated.

I am enclosing with this letter the following scholarly works produced by Professor I:

Full-length articles:

The Promise, 60 ALA. L. REV. ____ (2008)

A Roadmap, 57 AM. U. L. REV. 225 (2007)

Norms, 56 AM. U. L. REV. 271 (2006)

Essays and Speeches:

Movement, 23 J. ENVTL. L & LIT. ____ (2008)

Labs, 10 TRANSACTIONS ____ (2008) (this speech has not yet been transcribed for publication, but should be available later this fall if you wish to review it)

Copies of his curriculum vitae and statement of professional accomplishments and goals are also included, as well as a copy of our tenure and promotion standards and policies.

Please write a letter outlining your evaluation of Professor _____'s professional achievements and reputation as evidenced by his scholarship, research accomplishments, and general stature in the profession. As a part of your letter, please state whether Professor I would meet the standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at your school, and how he compares with some of the best scholars at a comparable stage in their academic careers. It would also be helpful if you would briefly address your familiarity, if any, with Professor I and his work beyond the materials we have provided.

Although Oregon law permits faculty members to have access to their personnel files, Professor I has voluntarily waived this right. Therefore, the University will not disclose your letter to him, and he will not know that you served as a referee.

When you send your evaluation letter, please enclose a copy of your own resume, which we will need to submit to our University Personnel Committee. We will need your letter by the end of September, in order to comply with the schedule set by the University.

If you have any questions, please call me at 541-346-3851 or email me at sbender@law.uoregon.edu. Your assistance with this important matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Appendix C: Sample Letter to Reviewers for Promotion to Full Professor

Date

Professor XYZ
U of Z
Aville, NJ 07028

Dear Professor XYX:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an evaluation of G M for promotion from associate professor with indefinite tenure to the rank of full professor at the University of Oregon School of Law. Such promotions are made only after consulting specialists in the field, and your willingness to provide input is deeply appreciated.

I am enclosing with this letter the following scholarly works produced by Professor M since he was promoted to associate professor and granted indefinite tenure: two books, four law review articles, one symposium article (the second may be available later if you would like to read it), and four other works. A list is provided at the front of the enclosed notebook.

Copies of his curriculum vitae and statement of professional accomplishments and goals are also included, as well as a copy of our tenure and promotion standards and policies.

Please write a letter outlining your evaluation of Professor____'s professional achievements and reputation as evidenced by his scholarship, research accomplishments, and general stature in the profession. As a part of your letter, please state whether Professor M would meet the standard for promotion to full professor at your school, and how he compares with some of the best scholars at a comparable stage in their academic careers. It would also be helpful if you would briefly address your familiarity, if any, with Professor M and his work beyond the materials we have provided.

Although Oregon law permits faculty members to have access to their personnel files, Professor M has voluntarily waived this right. Therefore, the University will not disclose your letter to him, and he will not know that you served as a referee.

When you send your evaluation letter, please enclose a copy of your own resume, which we will need to submit to our University Personnel Committee. We will need your letter by September 15, 2009, in order to comply with the schedule set by the University.

If you have any questions, please call me at (541) 346-0507 or email me at srowe@uoregon.edu. Your assistance with this important matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Appendix D: UO Criteria for Peer Teaching Reviews Modified to Address the Law School

I. Establish a Policy Requiring Peer Reviews of Teaching.

1. Each tenure-track faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the years preceding the faculty member's promotion/tenure review. In most cases.
2. Each tenured faculty member with rank of Associate Professor shall have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to Full Professor.
3. Each tenured faculty member with rank of Professor shall have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every three years.

II. Establish Criteria for Peer Evaluations.

1. Peer reviewers shall approach teaching assessment with the same kind of open, reasoned discussion that reveals the quality of other scholarly endeavors.

Specific criteria for peer reviews should reflect, but not be limited to, five important aspects of teaching:

- a. The intellectual content of the material taught, including relevancy, breadth, depth.
- b. The instructor's grasp of the material; ability to present course content clearly and logically, to place specific material within thematic contexts and to demonstrate the significance and relevancy of course content.
- c. The instructor's ability to engage and challenge students and to teach critical thinking and questioning skills.
- d. The instructor's ability to provide intellectual inspiration and leadership and to awaken new interests.
- e. The instructor's use of innovative approaches to teaching and/or use of instructional technology to enhance the learning process.

III. Procedure for Conducting Peer Evaluations.

1. Evaluations shall include, but need not be limited to, teaching materials (syllabi, exams, student performance, etc.) and at least one classroom visit.

2. A written report, addressing the criteria outlined above (section II) shall be prepared and signed by the evaluator. The report shall indicate if the classroom visit(s) was spontaneous or arranged in advance with the faculty member being evaluated.
5. The law school shall archive the written evaluations for use in future faculty evaluations.
6. One copy of the peer evaluation shall be placed in the permanent personnel file of the person being evaluated.
7. All reports of peer evaluations shall be included in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file, and are to be carefully reviewed by the Law School Personnel Committee and the Dean.