

TTF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
Clark Honors College, 2017

**Purpose and Summary.** This document, reviewed and adopted by the faculty of the University of Oregon Clark Honors College, sets forth all policies and procedures for tenure and promotion in the College. It is intended to serve as a guide for all tenure-track faculty and for those faculty who are eligible for promotion in rank. It also is a policy statement for use by the University of Oregon's elected Faculty Personnel Committee, which advises the UO Provost on matters of tenure and promotion. Following a statement of philosophy of the College, this document offers two sections. The first offers the guidelines for research, teaching and service in the process of tenure and promotion in the Clark Honors College. The second section elaborates on matters of specific policy and process. Candidates for promotion and tenure should also be aware of University guidelines and suggestions, listed at this UO website link: <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/promotion-tenure>

**Philosophy of the College.** The Clark Honors College is a rigorous, highly selective, small liberal arts college nested within in a top-tier AAU research university. CHC provides an environment to develop learning that enables students to contribute as active, engaged scholars making a difference in our world, through curricular and pedagogical rigor based in intensive mentoring and advising for academic excellence. The core identity of the Clark Honors College is interdisciplinary. CHC courses stress critical thinking, analytic writing, persuasive argument, and inquiry across traditional disciplinary boundaries. The college supports immersive research experiences and disciplinary training within the departments of the university; classes within the college itself are designed to be open to students of all majors and to create challenging conversations. The college curriculum fosters interest in diverse cultures and approaches to learning. The CHC values tolerance and inclusivity and strives to achieve both in its community and curriculum.

While the Clark Honors College represents a long tradition of liberal arts education, it is also a distinctive institution. As a small college within a major research university, the CHC brings together broad, interdisciplinary liberal arts teaching with cutting-edge research, and the synthesis of great teaching and research is the basis of everything the college does. While the college places emphasis on critical reading, writing, and discussion, in the mode of the liberal arts college, it also stresses the centrality of research in the undergraduate experience.

The Clark Honors College provides a curriculum that fosters rigor, depth, and creativity in the intellectual enterprise of its students. The CHC education exposes students to the breadth of humanistic and scientific inquiry. It helps them to develop skills of interpretation, analysis, and expression, and it challenges them to conduct original research under the mentorship of faculty in their fields of choice. The CHC curriculum stresses breadth and interdisciplinary understanding. It considers the public dimension of scholarship a key goal in liberal education and a core virtue in civic life.

It follows then, that the College desires a faculty body whose academic training, professional experience and research interests are in harmony with the wide range of its course offerings and the academic opportunities that this diversity will provide.

## Section I

### **Research, Teaching, and Service Guidelines for Academic Tenure and Promotion at the CHC**

The granting of indefinite tenure to a faculty member acknowledges high level performance as well as confidence in his or her future work and contributions to the College. It affirms that a faculty member has met or surpassed the expectations that the College and the University place on its permanent professoriate. Faculty members being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure are expected to demonstrate excellence in both teaching and research and to contribute to service within the College and outside it.

This section outlines the standards for attaining tenure in the College. These standards also apply to the granting of promotion of rank.

**Standards and expectations.** The academic diversity of the College is such—some of the fields represented are History, Rhetoric, Literature, Biology, Earth Science and Jewish Studies—that it requires some variation in the approaches to evaluation of candidates. However, the College does expect that all candidates for academic tenure present a record that reflects acknowledged strengths in the traditional areas of research and scholarly work, in teaching, and in service to the university, community and national and international organizations. Evaluations of research, teaching, and service are allotted proportional weights of 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively, for promotion to Full Professor and 50%, 40%, and 10%, respectively for promotion to Associate Professor.

Scholarship. The College gives special attention to the activities and achievements of the candidate as a scholar. Normally, excellence in research is measured by a publication record that is judged to be significant by peers at the university and experts at other institutions. Such a judgement, allied to citations and participations in conferences, is also external evidence of the international impact of a candidate's research. The research will also be evaluated in terms of a trajectory, with significant completed research weighed along with research in progress and clear plans of research for the future. Scholars are evaluated with respect to the disciplinary standards of the field or fields of the faculty member's scholarship.

The candidate's personal statement should describe the development, future direction, and significance of a coherent scholarly program. The following work is considered as part of a faculty member's scholarly productivity by the College: scholarly books at established, reputable presses, and invited chapters in such books; publication of work in major refereed or peer-reviewed journals; publication of books by other scholarly and trade presses; publication of articles in interdisciplinary and generalist journals and periodicals; competitive grants and fellowships; competitively selected paper presentations and publication of the same; other invited research presentations; creative works; development of electronic resources such as

scholarly databases; and invitations to serve on journal editorial boards. In faculty members who mentor undergraduate and graduate researchers, the following is also valued by the College: excellence of the candidate's research group, invitations to serve on granting agency study sections and panels, and the pursuit and receipt of outside financial support. Scholarly work, however, will be judged on its own merits, not on the funding that it may or may not receive.

The College is supportive of collaboration and interdisciplinary work.

Above all, the candidate's publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship. The record should also indicate continuing scholarly activity, attendance and participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future productivity including a broadening of scholarly range.

In general, the Clark Honors College expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Humanities or Social Sciences to have either a published book or a completed book manuscript that has been accepted for publication at a recognized or first-rate academic or university press, consistent with the stated expectations of their department(s) of disciplinary affiliation. When specified in the promotion criteria of the appropriate disciplinary department at UO, promotion and tenure through the publication of peer-reviewed articles may also be available.

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Natural Sciences is expected to publish scientific articles in established, peer-reviewed journals. The publication record is evaluated on the basis of the quantity and quality of publications, as well as the relative contribution of the candidate to the publication, where lead authorship or mentorship of a leading student author is weighted more heavily than a minor contribution to a multi-authored paper. The input of external reviewers in the candidate's discipline will be used to compare their productivity to the expectations in the subdiscipline for quantity and quality of publications.

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 up to but not including copyediting, must be complete.

Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be "in print" or "forthcoming" in order to count towards a faculty member'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. Parallel criteria are applied to electronic publications.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor the College expects the candidate to have accepted for publication a second book or the equivalent in articles, according to the specific requirements and practices of the candidate's discipline.

Teaching. The College values excellence in teaching. It expects a dedication to effective teaching, which involves curricular preparation, instruction, evaluation, mentoring and advising of students. The College values teaching that is attentive to the racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic diversity in the student body and that fosters an inclusive classroom environment.

Evaluation of teaching includes combined input from peers, students, and the faculty members themselves. To properly assess teaching performance, the College takes into account: the candidate's description in the personal statement of courses taught, pedagogy, advising, and mentoring; peer review of classroom teaching; student evaluations, both quantitative and narrative; record of mentoring and advising of students; teaching portfolio (which may include syllabi, samples of students' work, class planning, assignments, self-assessment of teaching performance, and other material); and other evidence of success in teaching-related activities, including course and curriculum development and awards.

*Peer evaluation of classroom teaching.* Serious, candid peer evaluation is weighted heavily in the overall assessment of teaching quality. The College is committed to a system of regular classroom visits for tenure-track faculty and for candidates seeking promotion, and encourages effective use of the university's Teaching Effectiveness Program.

University regulations require at least one peer evaluation of teaching in each year preceding promotion for assistant professors and every other year for associate professors. It is the responsibility of the Dean to see that such visits are made regularly enough, and according to University guidelines, to measure the candidate's teaching, and that visitors' reactions are shared with the candidate in a constructive spirit. Tenure-related faculty may request such visits at any time. Evidence of outstanding teaching will strengthen a tenure case but will not be sufficient by itself to ensure either promotion or tenure. Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching will certainly jeopardize promotion or tenure.

For evaluation periods of more than one year, courses to be peer-reviewed should be a mix of lower-division and upper-division courses chosen by the Dean or representative in consultation with the faculty member. Peer-reviewers of tenure-track faculty should be tenured and of the same or higher academic rank than the faculty member being reviewed. The reviewers should be chosen by the Dean or representative in consultation with the faculty member.

For more guidelines, resources and templates, please refer to <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/peer-review-and-evaluation-teaching>

*Student evaluation.* Whenever teaching is being evaluated it is especially important that student evaluations of teaching are not used as a standalone indicator of teaching quality for any official university purpose. Student evaluations include: (1) Opinions as evidenced from the standard student evaluation computer-scored forms. (2) Signed written statements from students on course evaluations. (3) In some instances, letters solicited from former students. Student evaluations from HC 199H CHIP classes are not considered in the evaluation of faculty teaching as the groups are led primarily by student CHIP leaders.

For more guidelines, please refer to

<https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/student-evaluation-teaching>

*Advising and mentoring.* Faculty members are expected to provide high quality advising and mentoring of undergraduate students in the college. All HC faculty must make themselves available to advisees during regular office hours, providing advice on coursework, degree requirements, the thesis process, and other aspects of the student educational experience. Evidence of quality advising and mentoring may include written evaluations from peer and external evaluators, written testimony from current and former students, and evidence of student success among advisees.

Some Honors College faculty participate in the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate research; for those who do, the expectation is that this mentoring will be of high quality and span the entire research process, developing students' research skills through the trajectory of a research project. The faculty member should help the student to design research questions, to implement appropriate methods to answering those questions, to analyze results, and to write scholarly work for publication. Evidence of the quality and impact of mentoring work may include a tabulation of numbers and duration of theses or dissertations supervised, as well as the same accounts as are used in the evaluation of quality advising: peer and external evaluator accounts, accounts from mentored students, and evidence of student success after degree completion.

Service. The criteria for promotion and tenure include institutional service such as College committees, Centers, Programs or Institutes with which faculty are affiliated, University committees, and service to the profession. The faculty play an important role in the governance and policies of this university, and the University expects participation of its faculty members.

Untenured faculty members are expected to participate in College governance and share in committee work, although assessment of service contributions plays a minor role in the College's evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of indefinite tenure.

In contrast, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighted more heavily. The evaluation for promotion to full professor should involve a clear demonstration of leadership in substantive service activities. Furthermore, this increased level of commitment to professional service should extend beyond the College, to the University and/or professional (external) level. Significant service to the profession is expected to demonstrate the excellence and importance of the faculty member's role in their disciplinary community. Community service in one's capacity as a scholar will also be taken into account. Evaluation will take into account the extra service obligations of faculty holding administrative appointments such as Associate Dean or Department or Program Head.

## Section II

### **Procedures**

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website: <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/promotion-tenure>.

The Honors College coordinates and prepares its own promotion and/or tenure files for all CHC faculty. Files submitted to UO Academic Affairs include a personnel committee report prepared by a joint committee of CHC faculty and faculty from the disciplinary department or program, external as well as internal reviews of the candidate's scholarly productivity, a report on the CHC faculty deliberations and vote, a report from the CAS Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC) or its equivalent for the relevant College or School, and a report from the CHC Dean.

Below are specific procedures for the Honors College and a summary of procedures used in the College- and University-level reviews.

### **A. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal**

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Dean. 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 personnel committee report (a committee with two members from the College and two from the faculty member's research discipline), a College vote, and review 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.

### **B. 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 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: <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu>. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the Dean who may also consult with the Provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

### **C. Promotion-and-Tenure Committee and Report**

During the winter term, prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, and in consultation with both the candidate and the appropriate disciplinary Department Head, the Dean will form a hybrid personnel committee composed of disciplinary and CHC faculty—typically four, with at least one from the College and the rest from the disciplinary department(s) or program(s). One member of the College serves as Chair, and the committee will strive to include at least one CHC faculty member from the same discipline—or at least area (natural science, social science, or humanities)—of the candidate.

This committee will be charged with recommending names of scholars for solicitation of outside review letters by the CHC Dean (see item D. below). After review of all material in the file, the personnel committee will submit a report, using the standards of scholarship set forth in the faculty members’ scholarly discipline and those established in the CHC for teaching and service. Copies of both the CHC standards for promotion and those of the relevant department(s) will be included in the promotion-and-tenure file. 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 candidate’s teaching portfolio, the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of College, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the College regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is made available in the Dean’s office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the College meeting. Both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor. The CHC Associate Dean will record the vote, which will be by signed and secret ballot.

### **D. External Reviewers**

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure or promotion case is to be considered, the Dean will ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to consult with members of the College and with members of any research institute/center, program or department 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 Dean; at this time the candidate may also indicate objectionable reviewers. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors or the

equivalent from research centers or other academic institutions who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, research collaborators, co-PIs on grants, 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 College's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five, but preferably six, letters in the submitted file. If the College's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referees' names will count as College-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked if they are willing to participate in the review process in early Summer, and, if willing, are requested to submit their letters by late September or early October.

### **E. Internal Reviewers**

The College may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. Because of the College's interdisciplinary nature, and because faculty members are always affiliated with one or more disciplinary units, the Dean and/or the candidate may choose to include an internal review. This review is prepared by the Director of the institute/center, or Head of program or department, in consultation with its senior members.

### **F. Candidate's Statement**

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a 3-6 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 and a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow College faculty 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.

### **G. 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, but preferably six, 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; there must be written affirmation, which may be via email, from the editor of a press for a book, an



editor of a journal for an article, or 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 other than copyediting); 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.S., 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 Dean 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 Dean should notify the CAS, or any relevant College or School, Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

#### **H. College Faculty Meeting and Vote**

In general, the College 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 Associate Dean, and the College faculty 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 Associate Dean in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Dean does not vote. The Associate Dean only votes in cases of promotion to the same rank held by the Associate Dean or below.

#### **I. Dean's Review and DAC**

After the College vote, the Dean writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession or discipline (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.), and an explanation of the College's criteria for evaluating research, teaching, and service. The Dean'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 submitted to the College hosting the candidate's discipline; in most cases this will be the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Advisory Committee. 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.

The DAC is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the College 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 DAC communicates the tally of the vote, which is considered a recommendation to the Dean of CHC.

The CHC Dean then submits a report with his/her recommendation, based on the materials accumulated in the file to this point, to Academic Affairs and the University's Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). In all other respects, promotion and/or tenure cases will follow standard University procedures.

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

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <https://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.

#### **K. College and University Procedures**

After the CHC Dean writes his/her letter indicating whether s/he supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure, 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.

After the file leaves the designated DAC (CAS, AAA, or other UO college), it goes to the University of Oregon Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the College is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost's office. The Provost studies the file and ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision; all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the Provost may invite the candidate for a meeting. The Provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated directly to the candidate.