

University of Oregon
Department of Sociology
Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Guidelines
Spring Term 2011

(Replacement for “Promotion and Tenure Policy” dated Fall 2006)

I. Procedures

A. Preamble

The first section of this document summarizes procedures in the Department of Sociology governing promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure and promotion. Procedures for promotion to Full Professor are the same unless otherwise specified. It then summarizes procedures for faculty tenure and promotion at the level of the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) and at the level of the University of Oregon. A complete compendium of the University’s tenure and promotion procedures may be found on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>. The second section of this document, entitled “Guidelines,” outlines general criteria for promotions.

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 way.

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who lack prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review, involving 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 tenure and promotion, 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 tenure and promotion 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 tenure and promotion 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

An Assistant Professor is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. Associate Professors are considered for promotion to Full Professor when they meet the criteria described in “Guidelines” below, often in a similar time frame as the Assistant to Associate decision. For either type of promotion, an accelerated review can occur for 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 procedures. For 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 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 tenure and promotion 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 preceding the year when a when a promotion case is considered, the Department Head will appoint a review committee (see item vii below). The Chair of that Committee will consult with faculty members in the department (and, as appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated), to enlist their suggestions of potential external referees who are in a position to give an informed and responsible review of the candidate’s scholarship. The Committee Chair will invite those persons to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently and independently, the committee will ask the candidate to submit a list of potential external referees to the Committee Chair. The candidate is not required to proffer a list of potential reviewers, but the candidate may indicate potentially objectionable reviewers.

External reviewers should generally occupy positions in 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, coauthors, 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 at least five letters for external reviewers in the submitted file. A clear majority of those reviewers must come from the department’s reviewer list. If the department’s list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate’s list of recommended external referees, the overlapping 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 and submit to the Committee Chair a personal statement summarizing his or her research, teaching, and service activities in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement will become part of the candidate’s dossier, described below. The statement should describe the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments, current research agenda, and future plans. 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 avoid technical jargon and be easily understood by multiple 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. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement will ordinarily suffice.

vi. Dossier

The dossier is collection of papers documenting all facets of the candidate's achievements relevant to tenure and promotion. It comprises a three-ring binder and an accompanying folder. During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate's dossier.

The three-ring binder must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers (item 10 below), 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 also should indicate the length of all writing listed and which journals or books are refereed.
2. A signed and dated candidate's statement.
3. A signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter.
4. A list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the registrar.
5. Syllabi and other course materials.
6. 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.
7. Signed student comments.
8. Peer evaluations.
9. A list of all materials sent to outside evaluators.
10. Letters from external reviewers (and, as appropriate, internal reviewers).
11. Biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

The accompanying folder contains:

12. 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; that is, there must be written affirmation [email is acceptable] 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. This affirmation must include 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.

Individuals' dossiers vary by the nature of their achievements. Other possible materials in the dossier may include evidence of awards received, a table summarizing citation counts or

journal impact indicators, documentation of significant service contributions, copies of non-refereed publications, audio or video files, etc. A recent Dean's Advisory Committee recommends against including testimonials from alumni and current students.

The dossier is managed by a staff person in the Sociology Department appointed and overseen by the Office Manager.

The dossier should be updated during the tenure and promotion process with substantial achievements, such as an article accepted by a refereed journal, an award received, or a grant won. The Department Head will forward such updates to the appropriate level above with a brief explanatory memo and the candidate's revised *curriculum vitae*, signed and dated.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Committee Chair and Department Head documenting 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.

At any time during the tenure and promotion process, the candidate should feel free to address questions about the progress of his or her case to the Department Head.

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, in consultation with the candidate, appoint a three-person promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. For promotion to Full Professor, the committee will comprise Full Professors only. If there is an insufficient number of faculty of appropriate rank 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 is charged with:

1. selecting reviewers (see item iii above),
2. ensuring the completeness of the candidate's dossier,
3. submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion, and
4. recommending a decision to the Department based on their evaluation.

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 quantitative student evaluation scores, qualitative students' 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.

viii. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department Head will call 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), following procedures outlined in the department's Constitution and By-Laws. 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.

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Office Manager, 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 Office Manager in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost.

The Department Head does not vote at this stage.

ix. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes his or her own opinion in a separate statement, which may include a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles, extent of coauthorship, significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The Department Head's opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure 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 CAS Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which comprises 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 members read the file and write a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC members vote on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the Dean.
2. From the DAC, the files goes to the Dean who independently 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.

At this point, 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 DAC's and Dean's letters are added to the file, it CAS and goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee elected to represent the faculty in all seven colleges at UO, including CAS and professional school. 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. FPC's vote is advisory to the Provost.
4. Once the FPC's letter is added to the file, it goes to the Provost's office. The Provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision; 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 provides 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. Guidelines

A. Preamble

These guidelines outline the general criteria governing tenure and promotion decisions in the UO Department of Sociology. They provide a specific departmental context within the general University framework for decisions governing promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure and governing promotion from Associate to Full Professor. Should guidelines or policies change over time, the one in force at the time of hire or at the time of the last promotion generally will apply to a candidate's file.

B. General Criteria Governing Particular Promotions and Reviews

To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the Sociology Department requires that a candidate's record, taken as a whole, demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and service.

i. Research

Excellence in research is required, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. A crucial aspect of the departmental assessment of a candidate's research is the evaluations and recommendations of the external reviewers. The department will evaluate a candidate's research using the following criteria: (1) its quality (the importance of the issues being addressed, and the findings and conclusions reached); (2) its impact (the reception the candidate's scholarship has been given by relevant academic and scientific communities); and (3) its quantity (the amount of published scholarly output.) Among indicators of quality and impact are the citation record, the status and readership within sociology, a sub-discipline or neighboring professions of the journals in which the material has been published, or of the presses by which books have been published.

The department considers all refereed publication outlets (article, book chapter, or book manuscript) to be valuable scholarly contributions, but also recognizes that certain non-refereed publications can be demonstrated by the candidate to be equivalent in quality to those published in the prestigious refereed outlets. The department also recognizes that it is often quite difficult, if not impossible, to discern whether book chapters are truly subject to "blind" review, and therefore may rely upon other indicators of quality in such instances.

The University requires such a manuscript to be "forthcoming" or "in production" (also called "in press") in order to count toward a faculty's publication record for promotion. "Forthcoming" means that the manuscript is complete (i.e., no revisions required) and has been accepted by a publisher for publication. "In production" means that is ready to be printed, i.e., the author has

reviewed page proofs, returned them to the publisher, and no further editing of any kind is needed by the author. Each “forthcoming” or “in production” publication should have letter to this effect from the editor of the publishing house, the journal editor, or the person compiling the volume of essays. Generally, in order for such publications to count fully towards promotion, the University expects books to be “in production” and articles or book chapters to be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the Dean.

External grant funding is also considered quite meritorious, but is not required for promotion and/or tenure. Conference attendance and other professional activities are valued for their professional regard and their contribution to subsequent research publications.

The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor with indefinite tenure is the establishment of a significant research program, distinct from unrelated research projects. Scholarly contributions are evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field (for example, work that opens new lines of investigation), and future promise. The work needs to be programmatic or progressive. Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion would be a series of publications or a monograph that illustrates the development of a coherent research theme or themes. This theme would be recognized as significant by peers and external referees and would tend to be identified with the faculty member being evaluated if continued over time. The specific aspects of the scholarly work that peers and referees may regard as significant will of course vary from scholar to scholar but could include the development of a perspective or approach that represents an advancement from that used in dissertation work, and through citation can be seen to be contributing to the overall advancement of the field.

ii. Teaching

All dimensions of teaching are important, and multiple, convergent evaluations are essential in to assess excellent performance in teaching. Excellence in teaching may be defined as the process by which instructors’ attributes and teaching techniques motivate students to learn in ways that substantially and positively influence how they think, act, and feel. Excellent teachers possess subject-matter expertise, use appropriate pedagogical techniques, communicate effectively, are student centered, and assess students systematically.

The indicators of quality of teaching, in no particular order, include:

1. Quantitative summaries of class evaluations. The department requires that all classes be evaluated every term, and the record should therefore reflect all classes taught by a candidate during the relevant period.
2. Qualitative student evaluations. The department must maintain all non-anonymous class evaluations for all classes.
3. Course materials and assignments. The department pays attention to factors such as the clarity and fairness of class requirements and any evidence that the class reflects current scholarship relevant to the subject matter in question. The department may evaluate the fairness of examinations, and the quality of a professor's grading.
4. Peer Reviews. The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty member with the rank of associate or full professor during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty member with the rank of full professor every other year until promotion to full professor.

5. Number of students taught. Size *can* be an indicator of a professor's having developed a following among students.
6. Evidence of graduate teaching and mentoring—for example, numbers of thesis and dissertation committee memberships as well as general availability for mentoring graduate students. The committee may solicit graduate and undergraduate student input.
7. Evidence of undergraduate advising and mentoring.

In general, the department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of high quality teaching, and the committee should attempt to be as inclusive of such indicators as possible in its evaluation of the teaching record.

iii. Service

The general criterion used in evaluations of the service contribution of faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure is the satisfactory participation in departmental maintenance, university governance, and academic infrastructure building. The specific level of service activities is determined by the rank of the faculty member. The specific UO criteria we emphasize include participation in:

- departmental administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities;
- college or school administration and committees or activities; and
- university or state system administration and committees or activities.

Where appropriate, a faculty member may also be credited with providing:

- academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university; or
- academic service on behalf of public bodies.

We expect faculty members to make appropriate contributions to the maintenance and development of their academic communities. In common with many other departments and programs, our intention is to limit the service loads of junior faculty as much as possible. However, the department's role in several interdepartmental programs on campus sometimes makes it difficult to control demands placed on faculty members from sources outside of our department. Junior faculty, in particular, should consult with the Head and senior faculty when considering service outside the department.

The specific criteria we use to determine whether satisfactory service contributions have been made is based on consideration of typical profiles of faculty at different ranks. For promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure, satisfactory performance would include:

- participation on departmental committees (e.g., search committees, graduate admissions, undergraduate advising), but probably not administrating (“chairing”) such committees in the first few years;
- participation on committees of university interdepartmental committees where appropriate; and
- participation in professional activities, including, for example, the organization of sessions at meetings and the completion of editorial and review service, but not necessarily at the level of elective or appointed office on disciplinary committees or editorial boards.

For promotion from associate to full professor, satisfactory performance would include:

- administration of a major departmental committee, such as a search, graduate admissions, personnel committee, or service as the graduate or undergraduate advisor;
- participation in general university governance, with some form of elective office (e.g., University Senate or Graduate Council) being desirable, or participation in the administration of an interdepartmental program; and
- significant service to the discipline, including the organization of regional or national meetings, editorial board service, or holding elective or appointed office in a professional organization.

C. Promotion to Full Professor

Eligibility for promotion to Full Professor requires a candidate's record, taken as a whole, to demonstrate outstanding achievement in research, teaching, and service.

Specifically, for promotion to Full Professor, an Associate Professor must show a research record significantly beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor; an outstanding record of teaching both in the classroom and in mentorship; and a substantial record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department.

Other facets of a scholarly career that may influence a promotion-to-full decision may include elected and appointed positions in professional associations or at the University, invited talks, editorial activities, institutional peer reviews, mentees' successes, and related activities that signal high academic and professional reputation in the nation, the world, or both.

As indicated previously, the procedures for conducting faculty reviews for promotion to Full Professor follow the same patterns as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The department recognizes that the arc of academic productivity varies across the life cycle and seeks to award it properly, but such variation should follow promotion to Full Professor. Post-tenure reviews apply the same criteria as for the previous promotion, with the exception that it is not ordinarily necessary to solicit assessments of scholarship from external reviewers. Further, documentation must illustrate that these continuing academic contributions are of outstanding quality. For example, the results of one's administrative work might show effective, enduring institution building. Innovative curricula resulting from efforts to upgrade instruction with new technologies could be published in appropriate books or journals, adopted by appropriate national or international institutions, or receive recognition with local, national, or international instructional awards.