

## Department of Religious Studies

### Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

#### I. Procedures

##### A. Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Religious Studies are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

##### B. Department-Specific Procedures

###### i. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review 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 promotion and tenure recommendation and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

###### ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the promotion and tenure 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 review. The contract renewal review 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. The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members

of the department. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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 promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure 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.

### iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

#### a. 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.

#### b. 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.

c. 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 case. 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 divisional dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. 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 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. 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.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold a meeting in late September or early 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 promotion and tenure (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.

e. 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 a recommendation 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 November 1 for both tenure cases and full-professor promotion cases.

## II. Guidelines.

The Department of Religious Studies values excellence in teaching, research, and service. Excellence in one dimension alone may strengthen a case, but by itself will not be sufficient to guarantee tenure and/or promotion. For the purposes of review, tenure, and promotion, the following percentages apply as the expectations at each respective rank:

Assistant: 50% research, 30% teaching, 20% service  
Associate: 45% research, 30% teaching, 25% service

### a. Teaching (30% asst / 30% assoc):

The Department of Religious Studies has a tradition of placing great emphasis on good teaching. The Department also has a tradition whereby faculty at all ranks teach a broad range of courses, from undergraduate surveys, upper-division courses, to specialized seminars.

In assessing teaching quality, the Department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and regular classroom visits by colleagues before and during the tenure or promotion consideration process. Documentation of activities is important. Faculty are encouraged to retain a copy of any syllabus used, and shall have placed one copy of such on file in the Department.

### b. Research: (50% asst / 45% assoc)

In making a recommendation for tenure or promotion at the department, college and university levels, committees give special attention to the activity and achievements of the candidate as a research scholar. Normally, this is measured by their publication record. Though the publications may be on various topics, committees expect to see a coherent plan of research. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate coherence. Committees also place great weight on research and publication trajectory. The Department of Religious Studies expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor to have at the

minimum a book manuscript with a university press (or equivalent), based on original research, that has already been fully accepted for publication (i.e. the manuscript has already gone through the editorial review process, all requested changes have been made, not subject to further revision beyond galley proofing or indexing, the completed manuscript has been unconditionally accepted for publication, and the candidate is able to produce a letter from the publisher to this effect). Along with this completed book manuscript in its final form, the department expects at least a few additional publications, such as an article in a blind peer-reviewed research journal, a chapter in a peer-reviewed edited volume, an edited volume, a peer reviewed digital humanities project, an annotated translation, etc. These additional publications should not duplicate material in the book, but should explore new areas of scholarly research.

**Less preferably**, in lieu of a book manuscript, the candidate may have the equivalent in substantial articles (6 – 8), all of which have been published or have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals with all requested changes made and approved. At least some of these articles must have been accepted by first class, peer-reviewed/refereed journals recognized as such by scholars in the candidate's field of specialty. As above with the book option, these articles would need to be accompanied by a few additional publications, such as a chapter in a peer-reviewed edited volume, an edited volume, a digital humanities project, an annotated translation, etc.

Quality as well as quantity counts. Publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship. Additionally, the record and the candidate's own statement should indicate a program, schedule and objectives of future work.

For promotion from associate to full professor, the department expects the candidate to have accepted for publication a second book or the equivalent in articles, with the same criteria noted above for assistant professors.

Critical editions and/or translations with a strong scholarly component, including a critical introduction, critical scholarly apparatus, and commentary, shall count as original scholarship.

c. Service: (20% asst / 25% assoc)

The Department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the Department; concomitantly, the Department shall ask for service from its untenured members in reasonable and appropriate fashion. But in the final analysis, service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or research. Though untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to serve on one or another college or university-wide committee, they should undertake such duties only on a very limited basis, if at all, and in consultation with the department head. No untenured faculty member will be penalized for declining to serve on committees outside the department.

In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighed more heavily, and the candidate should normally have made an important contribution to the Department, college and university.

Service to the profession, while not a major element in a tenure or promotion decision, is evaluated favorably and may indicate as well that the faculty member has the esteem of their professional peers. The Department recognizes reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, etc., as service to the profession.

### III. Post-Tenure Review

#### A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

#### B. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Religious Studies expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

#### IV. Promotion to Full Professor

Tenure-track faculty are expected to continue developing their research, teaching, and service portfolios in the years following tenure and promotion to associate professor. They are encouraged to build a profile such that they could conceivably apply for promotion to full professor during or shortly after their sixth year post-tenure. For procedures and considerations regarding promotion from associate to full, see Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement with United Academics.

#### V. A Final Word

The tenure process, as the description indicates, is long, complicated and sometimes stressful. However, it contains many procedural safeguards for the well-being of the candidate. The policy of the Department of Religious Studies is to hire people who we predict will be strong candidates for tenure and promotion.