

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Ethnic Studies
Adopted by ethnic studies faculty, May 2007; revised May 18, 2011

I. Procedures

a. Preamble

The university's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website

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

Below are specific procedures for the Department of Ethnic Studies.

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 University of Oregon 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. The fall date for assembling the candidate's dossier should not be construed as a publication deadline for tenure and promotion consideration. See II.b.ix for the deadline for completed publication status.

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 (including all tenured faculty in the department for tenure cases and all full professors in the department for promotion-to-full cases) 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. The candidate may also request a written summary of the department head's review after meeting with the dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file; the summary will be redacted to remove any information that might identify reviewers and to preserve the confidentiality of the departmental review process.

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. Guidelines

a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Ethnic Studies. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

b. Research

Excellence in research is required for promotion and tenure, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Expectations in ethnic studies are as follows:

- i. **EITHER** (1) publication of a single-authored peer-reviewed scholarly book with a university or trade press appropriate to the candidate's field **OR** (2) publication of a substantial number of single- or first-authored articles or book chapters (not book reviews, comments, or dictionary or encyclopedia entries) in peer-reviewed academic outlets. (For promotion to full, publication of multiple, high-impact edited or co-edited collections, translations, or critical editions may qualify in place of (1) or (2) above.) Evidence of peer review may be required by the promotion and tenure committee.
- ii. In addition to (1) or (2) above, a candidate must demonstrate some evidence of additional scholarly activity or promise of continuing productivity and some evidence of a growing national or international scholarly presence.
- iii. Quantity of publication is not an absolute standard; the quality and nature of the scholarship are important mediators in its evaluation. Review committees will look to evidence of originality, importance, and impact or promise of impact in the field. Indicators of these factors can include reports from external evaluators, citations of a candidate's published work, and venue of publication.
- iv. External grant funding does not directly figure into research excellence; however, it may contribute indirectly through the publication of articles.
- v. Conference attendance and other professional activities that are signs of professional regard (e.g., editorial activities) may constitute evidence of additional scholarly activity and a growing national scholarly presence.
- vi. Nature of scholarship can also mediate quantitative expectations. Thus, for example, publications requiring extensive archival research or fieldwork that could only be conducted over several years will necessarily take longer to appear in print than other

types of research. If a candidate's scholarly trajectory has changed significantly since the receipt of the Ph.D., the department assumes that the record will show some evidence of delay as a new research agenda gets off the ground; however, the overall expectations for tenure and promotion remain unchanged.

- vii. Faculty members in ethnic studies are encouraged to engage in collaborative research, although this does create a practical problem for evaluation of research. Candidates' statements should therefore elaborate on the role the candidates played in compiling and disseminating collaborative research. Furthermore, it is a good idea to keep documentation of one's degree of participation in collaborative projects.
- viii. The department makes no automatic distinction between electronic and physical publication venues or between journals and book chapters. (Indeed, because of its interdisciplinary nature and the disciplinary focus of the most prestigious journals, edited collections have historically made a greater impact than journals in shaping the field of ethnic studies.) The department looks primarily to two considerations in evaluating publication venues: status in the field (potential impact) and peer review (intellectual rigor). If candidates have questions about the status of electronic publication venues or the status of a journal or press, they should consult their faculty mentors or the head. In addition, since ethnic studies has evolved as a field concerned with impact outside of the academy, trade presses have published many of the best and most influential books. (These presses have also often felt less constrained by traditional disciplinary marketing constraints.) Faculty may choose to publish through trade presses; however, for tenure and promotion reviews, they must demonstrate proof that manuscripts and book chapters have passed through a rigorous, academic peer review process before publication. Untenured faculty are encouraged to consult regularly with their faculty mentor or the department head regarding appropriate publishing venues.
- ix. A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and "in production" in order for it to count towards promotion. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. The associate provost defines "in production" as the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be "in print" or "forthcoming" in order to count towards a faculty's publications. "Forthcoming" means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions or editing of any kind. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of

essays for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended. Generally, it is expected that the book should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the dean in order for the publications to count fully in the dean’s recommendation towards promotion.

c. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is required for promotion and tenure, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Expectations in ethnic studies are as follows:

- i. Multiple indicators of teaching quality will balance one another to provide an assessment of teaching quality. These can include the candidate’s teaching statement, observations of teaching by multiple tenured faculty members across the span of the faculty member’s probationary period, class evaluations by students, syllabi and other course-related materials, evidence of additional mentoring and advising at the graduate and undergraduate levels, and awards for excellence in teaching and mentorship.
- ii. The department looks for excellence at promoting critical thinking about the role of race and ethnicity in society and at encouraging students to articulate their own, independent analyses. Peer review and qualitative evaluations, as a rule, will be more effective at gauging these accomplishments than strictly numerical evaluations.
- iii. Each tenure-track assistant professor 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. 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.
- iv. The department expects faculty members to share responsibility for teaching large lower-division courses and smaller upper-division classes. Faculty also share responsibility for advising majors and minors in the department.
- v. Faculty may also devote time to serving on graduate committees outside ethnic studies, but this is not an expectation for tenure and promotion.
- vi. For promotion to full professor, the department normally expects that candidates will have demonstrated leadership in developing the ethnic studies curriculum.

d. Service

Service plays an essential role in promotion considerations and distinguishes between the requirements for promotion to associate professor and full professor. Expectations in ethnic studies are as follows:

- i. Ethnic studies faculty should contribute to the governance of the department through participation on department committees and regular attendance at faculty meetings. Candidates for full professor should normally have an established record of contributing to the governance of the department at levels above those expected of assistant professors.
- ii. The college and university regularly demand high levels of service from ethnic studies faculty because of their expertise and the unique symbolic value they often hold for the university's diversity mission. These demands, especially but not only in the case of untenured faculty members, are typically much higher than for faculty in other fields. The department expects that, as part of their commitment to the service mission of ethnic studies, its faculty will fulfill some of these requests for service on campus and in the community. Service expectations for tenure are therefore comparatively high, and a faculty member's service record is an important part of the tenure evaluation.
- iii. Service expectations for promotion to full professor are therefore high, and a faculty member's service record is an indispensable part of the evaluation for promotion to full. However, it is in the interests of the individual faculty members, the department, the college, and the university that service loads for ethnic studies faculty should not interfere with either research or pedagogical missions.
- iv. Professional service can also contribute to the evaluation of service for promotion and tenure.
- v. Community service related to one's areas of research or teaching can also contribute to the evaluation of service for promotion and tenure.

e. Special Considerations

- i. Procedures and expectations may vary significantly for faculty members with joint appointments. Those faculty members are encouraged to review tenure expectations and procedures for both of their appointment units. All appropriate efforts will be made to coordinate ethnic studies tenure, promotion, and review procedures with those of other units to ensure equity for jointly appointed faculty members.
- ii. Early tenure decisions are made consistent with the guidelines on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>.

- iii. Publication of instruction manuals, study guides, and textbooks can serve as evidence of teaching and service excellence. Research on education, on pedagogy, and on the teaching of ethnic studies, however, can serve as evidence of research excellence if it meets the requirements of other research (e.g., peer review and impact).
- iv. Candidates may submit a response after the meeting with the dean to be included in the dossier before it proceeds to the university level. This is most often done in the case of a negative review by the department or dean.



Michael James Garcia, Department Head

May 23, 2011