

**DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS:  
PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE  
May, 2011**

**Overview**

Tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Oregon depend upon excellence in scholarship and teaching, as well as satisfactory service in the department, university, and larger community. Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate that they possess national or international prominence in scholarship and must excel in teaching and service, including significant contributions to department, university, and/or professional governance. Tenure-track faculty are hired with the department's confidence that they are capable of fulfilling these expectations. The following guidelines first outline the procedures involved in professional evaluations over the probationary years. They then describe the criteria for achieving a successful tenure decision and promotion to associate professor in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The final section outlines the department's expectations for promotion from associate to full professor. The guidelines do not attempt a complete account of all rules and departmental customs, and this document should be read in the context of conversations with the Department Head and appropriate members of the faculty and administration. In addition, the following is essential reading: the *Timetable and Guidelines for Recommending Promotion and/or Tenure for Faculty Members*:  
<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-timelines>.

**Promotion and Tenure to Associate Professor: Procedures**

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide> and reproduced here. The specific procedures for the Department of Linguistics do not differ from those outlined by Academic Affairs.

Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor is 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 spring term of the third year for faculty members who do not enter with prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a "contract renewal review." This review involves a personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a report 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 usually lead to a three-year contract extension, which will take the junior faculty member 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. If the contract renewal review raises questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period, the faculty member may be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal review 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.

## The Promotion and Tenure Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion and tenure during the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in unusually meritorious cases 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 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 promotion and tenure 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, 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 must discuss the timing of a leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure process 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.

## External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the promotion and tenure case is to be considered (usually the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the probationary period), the Department Head will consult with members of the department 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 conflicts of interest are not asked to be external reviewers. There must be at least five letters from external reviewers in the submitted file. The university requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list, rather than from the candidate’s. 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 of the tenure-decision year.

## Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver or non-waiver letter in the spring term *prior* to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access to the file fully, partially, or not at all. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options.

## 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 accomplishments and future plans in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Office of Academic Affairs

indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The personal statement should offer a detailed account of the candidate's scholarly profile, including clear delineation of which projects are completed, forthcoming, or in-progress. When the profile includes dissertation work, it is crucial to provide specific information about the nature and extent of revisions and additions that have occurred since the Ph.D. The statement should include a section describing the candidate's 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 must be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, non-specialist university colleagues, and university administrators.

### 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:

(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, including "in production" or "forthcoming" work (an unpublished work may be described on the C.V. as "in production" or "forthcoming" if it has been accepted in its final form; there must be written affirmation [an email is acceptable] from the editor of a press for a book, the editor of a journal for an article, and the book editor for a book chapter, as to its full acceptance 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 beyond those required by the publication process); 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; and (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 (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 when new information becomes available.

### Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term of the year prior to the tenure-decision year (usually the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the probationary period), the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of a minimum of three tenured faculty of eligible voting rank to review the candidate. If the Head determines that participation from scholars in other units is appropriate, he or she may select committee members from among tenured faculty in 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 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 promotion and tenure. 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 Linguistics, both associate and full professors vote in promotion to associate professor and tenure cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

### Department Meeting and Vote

The department will hold a meeting of tenured faculty in late October or early November to consider the committee's promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion of the report and the case, the tenured faculty shall vote by signed, confidential ballot whether or not to recommend promotion and tenure. When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final result. The anonymity of individual votes will be maintained, although 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.

### 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.), and an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure. The Department Head's opinion may or may not agree with the department vote.

### Submission of the Promotion and Tenure File

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.

### College and University Procedures

Once the file reaches CAS, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty members 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 consideration of the file. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC then votes on whether the candidate should be recommended to the Dean for promotion and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

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 to associate professor

and tenure or promotion to full professor. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the Dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the Dean indicates his or her position, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to his or her recommendation. 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. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in January, February, or March.

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 consideration of the file). 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 recommended to the Provost for promotion and, if appropriate, tenure.

Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost's office. The Provost makes the final 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 1<sup>st</sup> (or before May 1<sup>st</sup> if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15<sup>th</sup>.

### **Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Criteria**

This section outlines the accepted criteria for a departmental recommendation for promotion and tenure in Linguistics. The criteria provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for the promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

#### **Research**

Excellence in scholarly research, consistent with the guidelines articulated by the UO Office of Academic Affairs (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>), is crucial in all professional evaluations of tenure-related faculty at the University of Oregon. Consequently, promotion to associate professor and tenure in the Department of Linguistics requires a high level of accomplishment through publication in the candidate's field of research. Faculty are expected to work actively on projects intended for publication and to publish regularly in books, journals, and other scholarly venues that bring their research to the attention of appropriate professional audiences.

In the area of research, promotion to associate professor and tenure in the Linguistics Department depend most importantly on the quality and significance of the candidate's research record as judged by members of the tenured faculty and by a panel of outside evaluators who are experts in the candidate's fields of research. In cases where the formal evaluation by tenured faculty in Linguistics and the outside evaluators produces a negative assessment of the quality of the research profile, a positive promotion and tenure recommendation is unlikely at the departmental level, regardless of the quantity of publishing activity included in the tenure dossier. Alternatively, in cases where the evaluation results in a strong affirmation of the quality and significance of the candidate's research, the department may recommend promotion and

tenure, whether or not the quantity of published scholarship meets departmental expectations. While the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the promotion and tenure process, the quality of the candidate's research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.

In terms of the quantity of excellent research productivity, Linguistics refers to a "rule of thumb" expectation that a productive researcher will be producing the rough equivalent of two refereed articles or refereed book chapters per year. Obviously, however, each individual file must be assessed in its own terms. Clearly, some publications are of higher stature than others. In some cases, a single article-length publication -- especially in a premium venue -- may be considered equivalent to two or more "rule of thumb" article-length publications. Similarly, important work might for various reasons appear in more specialized venues with circulations reaching an appropriate specialized audience. The department evaluates the publication record in terms of the quality and importance of the individual publications rather than simply counting and ranking publication venues.

Publication can take other forms than journal articles and book chapters. An authored book generally reflects as much work as multiple "rule of thumb" articles. Again, different books may vary widely in substance, and each book will need to be individually evaluated for its contribution to the research profile. Edited collections (i.e. the candidate is an editor of a collection of articles in a book or special journal issue) are also considered important contributions to the field, though obviously a record of original research cannot depend entirely on such contributions.

Publication in informal series, unrefereed conference proceedings, and so forth, will ordinarily count considerably less than formal refereed publications, though they may still contribute to the evidence of an active program of research and publication. Substantive encyclopedia or handbook chapters do not primarily reflect original research, but are good evidence of general scholarship and the invitation to write such chapters is indicative of the prominence of the candidate in the field.

In order for work to count towards promotion and tenure, it must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and "in production." This condition is essential with book manuscripts. "In production" indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). In order for articles or book chapters to be considered complete and therefore "forthcoming," they must be accepted for publication and require no further revisions of any kind, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). For tenure files that contain scholarly material that is not yet in print, documentation from university presses, journal editors, or book editors attesting that the manuscripts in question are "in production" or "forthcoming" is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" or "forthcoming" will be considered "work in progress. 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 towards promotion.

Additional considerations that factor into a positive promotion and tenure recommendation at the departmental level are as follows:

Co-authored work: There are several different models of research and publication. In the humanities, scholarly work is normally single-authored. In laboratory sciences, research is

conducted by teams, and publications reporting the research normally list several authors. Other models of co-authored publication include collaboration by two or three scholars, and collaborative work involving a faculty member and a student. All of these models occur within linguistics, and within our department. It is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion will specify the extent of their contribution to any co-authored work which is submitted as part of their dossier. Simple place in the order of the authors' names is not considered adequate for evaluation purposes. Participation in collaborative work is considered comparable to primary authorship if the candidate fully participated in all stages of the project from project inception to writing and revisions, as is frequently the case when a faculty advisor publishes with a student. Clearly, a work in which the candidate for promotion played a relatively small role will count less in the assessment of research productivity than one which is primarily his or her work. Nonetheless, multiple works of this sort may be considered equivalent to a primary-authored work.

Publication outlets: Research in linguistics is published in a wide range of venues, probably more than in many other disciplines. Research may be published in disciplinary fora (journals such as *Language* or *Functions of Language*), in area-studies outlets (e.g. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, *Bulletin of the School of Asian and African Studies*), or in interdisciplinary venues (e.g. a volume on migration patterns which might include contributions from historians and archaeologists as well as linguists). While particular value is placed on publication in top-tier journals, there are many possible reasons why some kinds of research are more appropriately published in less well-known specialist or regional outlets. It is expected that the departmental personnel committee and the department head will make every effort to evaluate the particular fora in which a candidate's work has appeared (often relying in part on the evaluation of the outside referees). A candidate can help to ensure proper evaluation of a file by including information about publication venues other than mainstream linguistics journals.

Electronic only publications will be evaluated by the same standards as other publications. That is, publication in a refereed e-journal has the same status as publication in a similarly prestigious refereed print journal. Regardless of the medium, published scholarship that has been peer reviewed possesses more significance in the tenure decision than scholarship that has not been peer reviewed.

Grants: Grants do not substitute for publications; however, grant writing can indicate research activity and so will contribute to the perception of promise during evaluation.

Textbooks: Textbooks and teaching materials are usually better considered as part of the teaching rather than the research record. In exceptional cases, a textbook might be counted as research productivity if it includes new, previously unpublished knowledge or other significant innovation. Any textbook or similar material submitted as part of a promotion case must be accompanied by an explanation of why it should be considered as evidence of research as opposed to teaching productivity.

Promise: While publication of a substantial body of quality work is the primary goal to be pursued during the probationary period, it is essential for junior faculty to establish a research trajectory that provides evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity. Such evidence may take the form of published or forthcoming articles, success in grant-related activity associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans. Conference presentations also qualify as evidence of continued scholarly activity, although conference talks carry far less weight than publications and research grants in the assessment of scholarly productivity.

## Teaching

Teaching is a critical area for professional evaluation, and a candidate must meet the department's standards of excellence in teaching to be promoted and tenured.

The Linguistics Department sees excellence in teaching as comprising four related areas: (1) classroom teaching, (2) course and curriculum development, (3) thesis and dissertation advising, and (4) mentoring, general advising, and other individual and small group activities.

A core teaching activity is classroom teaching. Faculty can vary in how much teaching they do (i.e., how many courses per year), and in how it is distributed (undergraduate vs. graduate, service courses vs. major courses vs. seminars, etc.)

A second area, usually connected with actual classroom teaching, is curriculum development. Faculty may develop new courses, or in the course of teaching established courses may develop new materials, innovations, techniques, etc. which can be shared with other faculty.

A third crucial area of teaching is thesis supervision and service on thesis/dissertation committees, for undergraduate honors theses, M.A. theses, or Ph.D. dissertations. Though chairing or co-chairing a committee is significant, committee membership also may involve substantive mentoring of the student and is highly valued.

Other formal activities include formal readings courses. Linguistics faculty are often involved in organized but semi-official readings or work groups with groups of graduate and/or undergraduate students. Another teaching activity is the supervision and training of GTFs; this should be part of the teaching responsibility of the faculty member in charge of the course.

Teaching evaluation: Objective evaluation is more easily accomplished for some of these areas than for others. In evaluating teaching, we consider the following:

1. Course and materials development.
2. Peer evaluation of teaching. We weigh peer evaluations of teaching highly, as this is the most direct measure of quality of teaching and teaching competence.
3. Student evaluations. This most directly measures student satisfaction rather than teaching competence per se. Student satisfaction is in itself a desirable thing and recurrent student dissatisfaction is considered carefully. "z-scores" are not considered heavily as they are statistically unreliable with small class sizes, combine GTF and faculty evaluations, and evaluate an individual's score only relative to already high departmental standards.
4. Candidate's statement of teaching activities, teaching philosophy, and goals.

## Service

In order to achieve promotion to associate professor and tenure, candidates must establish a record of satisfactory service to the department, the university, the profession, and the larger community. The department attempts to limit committee assignments for untenured faculty, but all tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance of



official department meetings is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department.

Committee assignments and other service responsibilities outside the department can serve as an important benefit to the university and are relevant to the service component of the dossier. Satisfactory participation in departmental governance, however, is paramount.

Professional service beyond the university is relevant to the promotion and tenure review and might include delivering public lectures to community groups, serving on governing committees of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for journals and university presses, performing other editorial responsibilities with a research journal, or reviewing grant proposals. Community service and outreach activities are also relevant to the service component of the dossier. While professional and community service activities bring important benefits, such activities carry significantly less weight in the promotion and tenure recommendation than research, teaching, and departmental and university service.

We believe that service is a critical component of a faculty member's profile, and it makes a substantive contribution to the overall health and functioning of the department, the university and the profession. Faculty governance is the most basic cornerstone of academic freedom, so service on important university committees protects the teaching and research possibilities of all faculty. We recognize that service at one level may be a benefit to another level as well; for example, establishing cross-disciplinary networks through university service enhances the viability of the department, through greater access to resources and information, increasing exchange of students, etc.

The following guidelines are meant to help evaluate the service contributions of faculty members. For tenure, only moderate service to the department is expected. For promotion to Full Professor, service to the department, university, and field is expected. Service to the community will also be highly valued if conducted.

Service to the department: A service profile at the departmental level will be highly valued if it shows commitment to core functioning of the department, as well as a serious time commitment. Examples of departmental service that are highly valued include student advising (undergraduate and graduate) and student admissions. Additionally, service work related to the American English Institute (AEI), a unit located within the department, will be valued as service to the department, as well as service in departmental endeavors in other areas, such as our joint programs with Hanyang University.

Service to the University: A service profile at the university level will be highly valued if it performs vital functions of the university, furthers the mission of the university, or enhances the profile of the department within the university. Examples of university service that are highly valued include service on the DAC, FPC, University Senate, Curriculum Committee, or Library Committee. Service on other, ad hoc university committees such as executive committees, steering committees, and institute boards may also be highly valued.

Service to the field: A service profile at the national and international level within the field of Linguistics will be highly valued if it enhances the visibility and prestige of the department and/or performs a function that is critical to the health of the profession as a whole. Examples of professional service that is highly valued include peer-reviewing manuscripts for journals, publishing houses, grant applications and conference abstracts and papers. Journal editing,

conference organizing, service (beyond simple membership) on national and international professional organizations are also considered valuable service to the field.

Service to the community: A service profile at the level of the community will be highly valued if it provides a needed service or enhances the profile of linguistics in the community at large. Examples of service to the community that are highly valued include general community education (e.g. high school senior project mentoring and outreach) and preservation and revitalization work with endangered languages (including the training of native speakers to work with their own language communities). Community service may also take the form of teacher training, workshops and lectures for the public, the preparation of pedagogical materials, and literacy endeavors.

Other forms of service: The development and maintenance of publically available resources such as on-line dictionaries, databases, and software are valuable for language communities, research, and teaching. For these reasons, development of such projects will count towards community outreach, service to the field, or service to the profession. On occasion, such work may also contribute to the totality of a research or teaching profile.

### **Promotion to Full Professor: Procedures**

The university's procedures for promotion to full professor are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>. There is no fixed probationary period leading to promotion to full professor, but faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the associate professor rank. Early promotion to full professor is warranted in exceptional cases, or in rare instances where called for in written hiring agreements. The Linguistics Department's internal procedures for promotion to full professor (regarding, for example, the selection of outside evaluators, rights of access to the promotion file, the selection of a departmental committee, meeting and voting protocols, etc.) mirror those of the promotion to associate professor, with the exception that only the department's full professors participate in the promotion recommendation.

### **Promotion to Full Professor: Criteria**

It is expected that associate professors in the Department of Linguistics will continue to excel in all three areas of professional activity after the tenure decision. The standards for research and teaching in the evaluation of promotion to full professor are essentially the same, though with an expectation that the teaching will reflect greater experience and that the research will have a broader level of recognition within the field. There is generally an expectation of substantial service commitment for promotion to full professor both in the areas of service to the department/university (e.g. committee membership) and to the field (e.g. editorships, grant and manuscript refereeing, conference organizing).