

**Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**  
**Department of Political Science**  
(Updated Winter 2011)

*Signed J. Southwell  
5-16-11*

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>. This document includes the specific procedures and guidelines for the Department of Political Science.

**Part I: 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. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Workshop**

During the fall term of each year, the Department Head in Political Science, along with other senior faculty, will conduct a workshop that will inform new faculty of the promotion and tenure procedures and guidelines,

### **IV. External Reviewers**

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

### **V. 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.

### **VI. Candidate’s Responsibilities**

By May 15<sup>th</sup> of the spring term prior to tenure and/or promotion consideration, the candidate must provide:

1. Waiver or non-waiver letter.
2. Vita, signed and dated.
3. All published and forthcoming materials and works in progress that the candidate wishes to have considered. Include copies of letters of acceptance for forthcoming materials.
4. If this information is not already in the vita, please provide: A list of all Post-doctoral Fellows, Ph.D., Master's, and undergraduate students who have carried out independent research/scholarship with the candidate. Indicate the years in which degrees were received and current place/status of employment, if available. A list of all supervised dissertations, theses, and undergraduate honors theses.
5. The candidate is also required to prepare a personal statement by this same date. 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.

## **VII. 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.

### **VIII. 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.

### **IX. Department Meeting and Vote**

1. In general, the department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the department head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the department

head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

2. The department head will distribute the committee report to faculty eligible to vote in sufficient time to ensure that they have the opportunity to conduct a fair review. Other relevant materials will also be available to eligible faculty. Promotion and tenure files cannot be seen in whole or in part by any faculty ineligible to vote on it. The only form of access to such files available to faculty ineligible to vote will be in the form of a redacted committee report read aloud at the department meeting convened to discuss the report.
3. Faculty ineligible to vote are welcome to attend the departmental meeting convened to discuss the committee report and contribute to the discussion of the redacted version of the report. After discussion of the redacted version of the report, faculty ineligible to vote will be excused and the meeting will move to a second stage devoted to a discussion of the complete file.

#### **X. 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.

#### **XI. Degree of Candidate Access to File**

As noted above, the candidate must submit a signed waiver letter by May 15<sup>th</sup>, 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.

#### **XII. 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, receives 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 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>.

## **Part II. Guidelines**

### **I. Preamble**

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Political Science. 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.

### **II. General criteria governing particular promotions and reviews:**

#### **1. Promotion to associate professor**

Candidates should be aware that, in addition to quantity, quality, and impact, their work may be evaluated in terms of the visibility, appropriateness, and prestige of the publication outlets. It is expected that a successful candidate will have demonstrated research beyond the dissertation work.

In order to achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, 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 at 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.

The contract review, typically at the end of three years, is a very important process that should be conducted with care. It is designed to give a junior faculty member clear feedback on directions that are, and are not, appropriate in the interests of making a successful promotion case. The department expects that an assistant professor will have shown substantial progress toward the research expectations for promotion and tenure by having submitted a book manuscript or several articles or book chapters for publication by the time of this contract review. The promotion committee should pay careful attention to the recommendations that were given to a candidate by this earlier review.

In general, a candidate for promotion and tenure must have demonstrated a strong record in both scholarship and teaching, and an appropriate record of service. A very strong record in any of those areas does not compensate for deficiencies in any of the others. The Department recognizes that the granting of tenure indicates confidence that the candidate will continue as a strong scholar and teacher throughout his or her academic career.

## **2. Promotion to full professor**

For promotion to full professor, the criterion is one's overall contribution to research, teaching, and service excellence. The amount of research should not be qualified by time in rank; the issue is whether the candidate has for the past several years been publishing high quality, important scholarly work. To be considered eligible for promotion, an associate professor must have an accomplished record of outstanding teaching, both in the classroom and in other aspects of teaching; an outstanding record of scholarly research (including significant work beyond that on which tenure and promotion to associate professor was based); and a substantial record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department. In order to achieve tenure and promotion to full professor, candidates must establish a meritorious and externally recognized record of service. Tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance at 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 performed for units outside the department (i.e., college, the university, the profession, and the larger community) constitute an important benefit to the university and contribute equally to the service component of the profession dossier.

Exceptions to these criteria are appropriate only when achievements in one area are truly extraordinary by national and international standards, in which case achievements should

normally reflect sustained contributions over a long period. For example, a superb teacher (reflected by fundamental contributions to pedagogy; nationally or internationally recognized development of innovative curriculum; recognition with national, international, or University teaching awards, etc.), with modest accomplishments in other areas, could merit promotion. Similarly, a superb scholar (reflected by path breaking contributions to the field) with modest accomplishments in other areas, may also merit promotion. Although typically subordinate to teaching and research, extraordinarily effective service (reflected by creative and sustained contributions to important functions of the University) is also an important consideration. In all cases, significant minimum standards remain in each area.

### III. Specific Criteria for 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: its *quality* (the importance of the issues being addressed, and the findings and conclusions reached); its *impact* (the reception the candidate's scholarship has been given by relevant academic and scientific communities); and its *quantity* (the amount of published scholarly output.) Among indicators of quality and impact are the citation record, the status and readership within political science, 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 nonrefereed 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. 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.

A research 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 towards promotion.



#### **IV. Specific Criteria for Teaching**

Excellence in teaching is required. 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.

#### **V. Specific Criteria for Service**

Academics must provide service to their department, and are expected to serve their college, university, and profession. The committee must evaluate the quality of a candidate's contributions to departmental, college, university or professional committees, and to other administrative functions that are normally performed by academics. To this end, the committee should solicit letters from individuals around the campus who are in a position to comment on the candidate's role and performance in such work.

As citizens, academics may, of course, play a variety of roles in the wider community. Of particular importance for evaluating service, however, is service to the wider community that

draws on an academic's professional expertise in some manner. This might include, for example, giving talks relating to his or her academic field, giving expert testimony, or playing an advisory role on commissions.