

**Department of Women's and Gender Studies**  
**Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines**

**Section 1. General Procedures and Guidelines**

**1.1 Overview of General Procedures and University Guidelines:**

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 WGS are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

**1.2 Department-Specific Procedures**

**1.2.1 Annual Review and Third Year Review:**

**1.2.1.1 Annual Review:** 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 require of the faculty member an updated *curriculum vitae* and a statement of progress and goals for the coming year in the areas of research, teaching, service, and contributions to equity and inclusion submitted to the department head in early spring. These reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing toward a favorable tenure decision and to offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion.

**1.2.1.2 Contract Renewal/Third Year Review:**

The third year review and contract renewal requires the candidate to submit a more detailed statement of progress to date, providing a context for understanding the CV, and placing achievements in research, teaching, and service into a coherent narrative. It should clearly address the department's third-year expectations.

For a midterm, or third year contract renewal in WGS, the review committee normally includes three tenured faculty members, appointed by the department head. When appropriate, a third member may come from WGS affiliated faculty. The review committee should be appointed in winter term and will conduct its review in late winter term. All members will sign their report.

The third year 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. 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. 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 members of the candidate's division and related institutes. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head (usually with significant input from the senior members of the appropriate division), 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.

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 to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings identified in the contract renewal process.

### **1.2.1.3 Review for Promotion and Tenure**

#### **External Reviewers:**

After the review committee has met and appointed a chair, the chair of that committee will consult with faculty members in the department and prepare a list of possible external reviewers who the committee chair will invite to evaluate the research record of the candidate. External reviewers should generally occupy positions in comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. However, an associate professor can serve as a reviewer for an assistant professor seeking promotion and tenure and even for a candidate for full professor, if that reviewer clearly represents an essential voice in the critical evaluation of the candidate's scholarly/creative practice. Dissertation advisors, coauthors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

Subsequently and independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external reviewers to the department head. The candidate is encouraged to suggest the most qualified people in their field, including those that may not be obvious choices to non-specialists. If the candidate suggests a reviewer who independently appears on the department list, that reviewer is NOT considered to have been suggested by the candidate. The candidate also may indicate potentially objectionable reviewers.

If declinations to review or disclosure of overly close relationships with the candidate result in less than a clear majority of letters fitting this description, then more letters

should be sought immediately. All letters received must be included in the dossier, however.

### **Internal Reviewers:**

The candidate may request that the committee 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/program. This review is prepared by the director(s) of the institute/center/program, in consultation with senior members and will be submitted along with the candidate's complete file in the spring quarter preceding the decision.

### **Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report:**

**Promotion and Tenure Committee:** During the winter quarter preceding the year in which a tenure decision will be made, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of three tenured faculty members, at least two from the department, for the purpose of the review. When appropriate, a third member may come from the list of WGS affiliated faculty members. For promotion to full professor, the committee must be comprised of full professors only.

This committee will be charged with selecting external reviewers; ensuring the completeness of the candidate's dossier; submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion; recommending a decision to the department based on their evaluation.

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;
- 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. Both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

### **Department Meeting and Vote:**

The committee report will be made available to voting members at the beginning of fall quarter. External letters will be made available to voting members as they are received.

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). Only tenured faculty members are allowed to vote on tenure cases. Further, unless there are extenuating circumstances and approval for an exception has been granted by the provost or designee, only those tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought are allowed to vote – i.e., only tenured associate and full professors vote on the granting of tenure and/or promotion from assistant to associate professor, and only tenured full professors vote on promotions to full professor. Faculty members who are on leave will be allowed to vote providing they review all materials and attend the mid-to late October meeting to consider the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Only tenured faculty members will be allowed to review the promotion and/or tenure file.

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the office manager and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the office manager in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost.

The department head does not vote at this stage.

#### **Department Head's Review:**

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement, which may include a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship and collaboration; evidence of civic engagement; impact of creative work; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The department head's decision regarding the case for promotion and tenure may or may not agree with the department vote.

The department head's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is November 1.

### **1.3 Joint appointments:**

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that faculty holding appointments in more than one department or school are entitled to an MOU “specifying expectations for promotion and tenure review and identifying how the tenure and promotion process will be handled among the units.” This MOU must be “approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member and the Provost or the Dean(s) associated with the units.” All new faculty members with joint appointments should have an MOU generated at time of offer and/or when joint appointment is identified after hire.

## **Section 2. Guidelines**

**Overview:** These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in WGS. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in

research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40: 40: 20, respectively.

The University of Oregon requires excellence in research for promotion and tenure, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. WGS recognizes that terms like “rigor” or “excellence” can often mask poorly defined evaluative measures tied to systems of power that have historically excluded white women, women and men of color, and other underrepresented members of the professoriate from the tenured or full professor ranks. As a field, WGS recognizes divergent and diverse contributions and works to account for what the National Women’s Studies Association describes as “plural forms of research, teaching, and service that occur in multiple locations, and not just the traditional forms” (NWSA, 2016, 9). Our guidelines strive to create well-defined and transparent evaluative measures.

The field of women’s and gender studies encompasses multiple disciplines and methodologies and often combines theoretical and methodological approaches and methods from more than one discipline to produce original research focused on gender and sexuality from a multitude of perspectives. Because the university historically has been structured primarily along traditional disciplinary lines, interdisciplinary research and teaching can be particularly challenging to review in personnel cases. Faculty members trained as interdisciplinary scholars in WGS are often evaluated by scholars trained in traditional disciplines, which can result in different expectations around tenure and promotion. One purpose of these guidelines is to anticipate these issues and insure fair and equitable standards for candidates as well as to provide general expectations of the candidate for each stage of review, promotion, and tenure and other considerations pertaining to promotion and tenure.

## **2.1 Third-Year Review:**

### **2.1.1 Scholarship and Creative Work:**

WGS scholarship, research, and creative work may embrace multiple genres, languages, and collaborations within and beyond the academy. WGS recognizes and values multiple forms of scholarship, from traditional written products to artistic and creative work, like film, performance, digital media, collaborative editorial work, archival research. Increasingly, scholarship in the field is produced in online journals, blogs, op-eds, policy reports, social media, and community action projects. While the below describes three possible paths toward tenure, the department recognizes that scholars may combine elements of each of these paths as well.

#### **2.1.1.1 Journal Articles and Book Chapters:**

If faculty members plan to stand for tenure based on articles/chapters, this evidence will include publication of peer-reviewed book chapters and/or journal articles, as well as any additional articles/chapters in preparation or under review. Further evidence of progress toward tenure and promotion can include a published or in-progress edited collection and/or acceptance for publication of part of the dissertation and/or a separate study in a journal or edited collection. Assistant professors are encouraged to consult with senior faculty and with the department head early in their careers about the venues most appropriate for their scholarship.

### **2.1.1.2 Creative Work and Performance:**

If faculty members plan to stand for tenure based on creative work, this evidence will include published reviews of productions or performances, videos, published art work, screenplays, documentaries, etc. within the previous two and a half years, with additional material in preparation or under review. The following work is considered a proper fit for this category: writing and production of videos and films; creation and exhibition of photographic, film/video, and multi-media works; publication in creative writing; publication in popular markets, books and magazines and/or internet; editing, design, cinematography, and production of media products in all forms; public presentations based on the candidate's current and published work; and invited presentations to festivals, conventions or other venues where such dissemination provides an opportunity for substantive review. Judging of contests and festivals, related to the creative work of the candidate, is also considered in this category.

### **2.1.1.3 Book Manuscripts:**

If candidates plan to stand for tenure with a published book, evidence in the third year could include **one** of the following:

- Substantial progress toward completion of a book manuscript based on the dissertation and a book proposal. The candidate's third-year statement should detail changes and/or additions to the dissertation in its conversion to a book manuscript.
- Substantial progress toward completion of a new book manuscript separate from the dissertation, including a book proposal. The candidate's statement should include detailed plans for its completion, with the understanding that press review should ideally begin in the fourth year.

### **2.1.2 Teaching:**

By the mid-point of the third year, faculty members will normally have taught lower- and upper-division courses. They should also have advised majors and minors in the department. If the candidate serves on graduate level committees, this will count toward tenure.

Because Women's and Gender Studies as a field takes an overtly critical approach to knowledge and power, women's and gender studies scholars often confront significant resistance in their classrooms. In assessing their teaching, in particular, the department must be mindful that teaching evaluations may reflect students' discomfort with challenges to their customary ways of thinking about their social worlds, especially in the context of required courses. In addition, significant scholarship has indicated that women and people of color tend to score lower on standardized evaluations. WGS thus will place strong emphasis on alternative modes of evaluating teaching, like annual observations of teaching by tenured members of the department, written comments by and correspondence from students, and syllabi and other course materials.

### **2.1.3 Service:**

By the mid-point of the third year, faculty members should have a record of contributing to the governance of the department through participation on department committees and regular attendance at faculty meetings.

Many faculty members in WGS hold joint appointments. When assessing contributions to service, the department must take into account the additional forms of service faculty members perform in serving as citizens in two separate units.

WGS scholars frequently engage in institution building both within and outside the department. Faculty members' contributions to forms of institution-building that are vital for the field, the university, and local institutions will be valued in evaluating candidates for third year review and for promotion to associate and tenure.

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

### **2.2.1 Research:**

#### **2.2.1.1 Quality of Research:**

The quality and nature of the scholarship are critical to evaluation for promotion and tenure. The candidate's review committee will look to evidence of originality, importance, and impact or promise of impact in the field. Indicators of these can include reports from external evaluators, citations of a candidate's published work, and venue of publication. The department makes no automatic distinction between journal articles and book chapters, instead making its evaluation of quality and impact according to a holistic evaluation of each piece of scholarship.

#### **2.2.1.2 Quantity of Research:**

A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor in WGS may represent their research in either a book and a couple of articles (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field) or exclusively through the publication of a series of articles.

**2.2.1.2.1 Single-authored book and single-authored or co-authored articles:** If the candidate produces a single-authored scholarly or creative book, in general WGS expects the book to have been published or accepted for publication with a university press or other press with a solid reputation in the field. Candidates for promotion should understand that Academic Affairs requires that a book manuscript be "in production" in order for it to count towards promotion. "In production" means that all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, must be complete.

In addition to the book, WGS expects the candidate to have published a couple of single or co-authored articles (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field).

**Articles and book chapters:** If the candidate produces exclusively articles and book chapters, in general 6-10 articles will be expected depending on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field.

**2.2.1.2.2 Additional evidence of activity and productivity:** We will also look for evidence of additional scholarly and/or creative activity and promise of future productivity, and

evidence of a growing national scholarly or artistic reputation, such as presentations at national conferences, invitations to present at academic institutions, review of manuscripts for journals or presses, participation on journal or press editorial boards, receipt of external research grants or postdoctoral fellowships, published book reviews, inclusion in conference proceedings, organization of panels, roundtables, or workshops at national venues, inclusion of faculty research, scholarship, and creative work on syllabi, and receipt of external research or art awards.

### **2.2.1.3 Other Research Considerations:**

**2.2.1.3.1 Miscellaneous publications:** Publication of instruction manuals, study guides, and textbooks can serve as evidence of teaching and service excellence. Research on education, pedagogy, and the teaching of Women's and Gender Studies can serve as evidence of research excellence if it meets the requirements of other research (e.g., peer review and impact).

**2.2.1.3.2 Collaborative work:** Collaborative work is frequently more challenging than individual scholarship. WGS faculty members are encouraged to engage in collaborative research. Candidates' statements should elaborate on the role the candidate played in creating, compiling, and disseminating collaborative research.

**2.2.1.3.3 Additional publishing venues:** In addition to traditional publishing outlets (academic presses and journals), WGS scholarship may be produced in such forums as online journals, blogs, op-eds, policy reports, peer-reviewed publications, performances, community action projects, grant applications, consulting, lectures, conference presentations, curriculum transformation projects, field-defining statements, social media, and alliance work. As media continue to change, there may be other case-specific contingencies that merit consideration.

### **2.2.2 Teaching:**

The department expects faculty members to share responsibility for teaching lower- and upper-division classes. Faculty members also share responsibility for advising majors and minors. They may also serve on graduate committees outside WGS, but this is not an expectation for tenure and promotion.

Multiple indicators will balance one another to provide an assessment of teaching quality. These indicators include: the candidate's teaching statement; observations of teaching by multiple tenured faculty members across the span of the faculty member's probationary period; signed quantitative and qualitative class evaluations; syllabi and other course-related materials; evidence of mentoring and advising at the graduate and undergraduate levels; and awards for excellence in teaching and mentorship.

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.

We expect on balance that consideration of these factors will indicate that the faculty member is responsible to their teaching obligations and students, and that the faculty



member demonstrates strong teaching capabilities overall with evidence of excellence in some of the areas of evaluation.

### **2.2.3 Service:**

While service to the department, college, university, profession, and community is essential for faculty members, WGS encourages its assistant professors to moderate their external service until achieving tenure and promotion to associate professor. In particular, WGS faculty members should contribute to the governance of the department through participation on department committees and regular attendance at faculty meetings. WGS anticipates its faculty will fulfill some requests for service on campus and in the community. While this is not required for tenure and promotion, the department will consider favorably this extra-departmental service load in its evaluation of candidates.

## **2.3 Post-Tenure Reviews:**

### **2.3.1 Research:**

During post-tenure reviews before promotion to full professor (e.g., in the third, sixth, or ninth year after tenure), the expectation is that an associate professor will demonstrate evidence of progress toward the research requirements for promotion to full professor.

### **2.3.2 Teaching:**

In addition, tenured faculty members should continue to grow as teachers and demonstrate leadership in the development of the WGS curriculum.

### **2.3.3 Service**

Compared to assistant professors, the department expects tenured faculty members to perform both more service, as well as service above the department level.

## **2.4 Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor:**

### **2.4.1 Research:**

#### **2.4.1.1 Quality of Research:**

Standards for the quality of publications for promotion to full professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

#### **2.4.1.2 Quantity of Research:**

Post-tenure publication of a single-authored scholarly book with a university press or other press possessing a solid reputation in the field and a couple of articles (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field)

**or**

publication of articles and book chapters in peer-reviewed academic outlets plus a co-authored book

**or**

Publication of a substantial number of articles or book chapters in peer-reviewed academic outlets

**or**

Publication of multiple edited or co-edited scholarly collections, translations, or critical editions, or evidence of significant creative work

**and**

Evidence of additional scholarly or creative activity and promise of continuing productivity,

**and**

Evidence of a national or international scholarly or creative presence, including some of the following: presentations at national and international conferences, invitations to speak at academic institutions, reviewing manuscripts for journals or presses, participation on journal or press editorial boards, receipt of external research grants or postdoctoral fellowships, invited book reviews, or receipt of external research awards.

## **2.4.2 Teaching:**

**2.4.2.1** Expectations for and evaluation of teaching for promotion to full professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Candidates for promotion to full professor will also be expected to demonstrate increased involvement in advising and mentoring undergraduate students. If the candidate serves on graduate level committees, this will count toward promotion to full professor.

**2.4.2.2** 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 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.

## **2.4.3 Service:**

Academics must provide service to their department, and are expected to serve their college, university, and profession. In particular, candidates for full professor should have a record of contributing to the governance of the department at a level above that of assistant professors, through participation and *leadership* on department committees and regular attendance at faculty meetings. In general, the department expects tenured faculty members to perform a greater level of service both at the department level and at the university, professional, and the community level.

## **2.5 Post-Tenure Review Process**

### **2.5.1 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.

### **2.5.2 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, WGS 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/VO 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.