



PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY FOR TENURE LINE FACULTY

The COE promotion and/or tenure policy and procedures contained in this document are presented in four sections. Section 1 presents the seven principles that articulate the underlying assumptions and fundamentals of the college’s promotion and/or tenure policy. Section 2 describes general procedures for promotion and/or tenure, and sections 3 and 4 provide timelines and specific procedures for college administrators and for candidates. The purpose of this policy is to make explicit the COE philosophy, expectations, and timelines surrounding the promotion and/or tenure process.

Contents:	Page:
Section 1: Promotion and/or Tenure Principles	1
Section 2: General Procedures and Principles For Promotion and/or Tenure	6
Section 3: Procedures and Timelines For College of Education Administrators	11
Section 4: Procedures and Timelines for Candidates	16
Appendix A	
A1: Office of Academic Affairs Overview and URL	20
A2: COE Curriculum Vita Template	21
A3: Sample Waiver Letters	22
A4: University form letter for external reviewers	24
A5: UO Promotion and/or tenure Checklist	25

SECTION 1. PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE PRINCIPLES

The COE promotion and/or tenure policy is guided by seven foundational principles that have been derived from a thorough review of promotion and/or tenure policies at comparator universities, policies from other colleges at the University of Oregon, deliberations of the COE Faculty Personnel Committee during the 2001-2002 academic year, comments from other COE faculty, recommendations from the Area Head Council during the 2002-2004 academic years, and review and revision by the COE Department Head Council in 2009.

Principle 1: The COE uses quality and impact as indicators to evaluate scholarly contributions.

Faculty members’ scholarship is evidenced in their contributions to a body of knowledge, practice, and/or methodology to advance understanding and application in their field of study. The quality of a faculty member’s scholarship is determined using multiple indicators compiled in the faculty member’s promotion and tenure dossier including the personal statement, publication record, grant-related work, external and internal reviewers’ evaluations, teaching record, and other pertinent data sources. Quality indicators include the importance of the

research questions being studied, peer evaluation of technical adequacy of research methodology, quality and ranking of journals as determined by disciplinary standards, record in obtaining external and competitive peer-reviewed grants, and professional awards related to scholarly activity. Impact is defined as the spread and effect of the individual's research and scholarship. One measure of impact is the scope and scale of the outlets through which scholarly work is disseminated. The evolution and significance of the faculty member's research agenda is evaluated in terms of its impact on other scholars, the professional community of practitioners, standards of professional practice, the policy environment, and the general public. Every candidate for promotion to either associate or full professor is expected to generate consistently high quality scholarly work that appears regularly in peer-reviewed publications.

Principle 2: The COE criteria for promotion and/or tenure are inclusive to accommodate a wide range of scholarly approaches and research methods.

Different research questions require different disciplinary approaches and/or research methodologies. No one form of inquiry or research method should be presumed to have greater weight than another. Rather, all questions require rigorous and appropriate processes of inquiry. The promotion and/or tenure process does not pass judgment on one form of inquiry over another. Instead, the quality of the scholarship produced (i.e., scholarly rigor) is judged based on the criteria established within that disciplinary tradition. Regardless of scholarly approach, the standards of independent peer review are used in the personnel review to gather evidence for the quality and impact of scholarly contributions. In their personal statement, candidates should provide a sound rationale and context for their scholarly work including explanations of selected research methodologies, research themes and agendas, and choice of methods or outlets of dissemination of scholarly work. Junior faculty members whose research methodology is not the norm for their field of study may need particular guidance and support through formal or informal mentoring.

Principle 3: The COE criteria for promotion and/or tenure represent a balance between being explicit enough to allow a clear and common understanding of the performance standards, but not being so specific as to prohibit reasonable and acceptable modifications or variations.

As a general rule, the normative expectation for faculty in tenure line positions is that they should publish at least two professional products each year, with the majority appearing in high quality journals and with the candidate as the first author in the majority of the publications. Although, the number of articles published in refereed journals is the traditional indicator of scholarly productivity, it is not the only measure. In judging the quality and impact of a faculty member's collective works, judgment criteria should allow reviewers to take into account and contextualize each faculty member's work in terms of research agenda, the nature of the discipline or field of study in which the research is being conducted, and the possibility that a variety of formats and forums may be appropriate for exposition of scholarly work.

Distinctions should be made regarding the difficulty, complexity, scale, and time required to conduct the research and prepare articles for publication. Some programs of study lend themselves to reporting incrementally different findings from the same or similar studies,

whereas others encompass consideration of entirely new phenomena for each study. In addition, attention should be given to disciplinary expectations and the availability of external support. While normative benchmarks for productivity exist (e.g., two peer reviewed articles per year), the candidate must help provide the context for her/his work in the personal statement and evaluators must consider the context and development of the candidate's research agenda in evaluating scholarly productivity. Within these contexts, the criteria for evaluating scholarly productivity include rigor, quality, and impact.

Principle 4: The COE acknowledges the importance of external funding in promotion and/or tenure decisions without creating an expectation that it is required.

Although external funding is valued in the College of Education, obtaining external funds is not a requirement for promotion and/or tenure. Successfully securing external funding usually requires a rigorous external review process in which one competes with leaders in a field. Such competitions may require evidence of deep understanding of a field and the ability to make connections between the theoretical and applied dimensions of a field of study. Most grants are awarded after a peer review process and thus successful funding reflects recognition by peers of new or novel thinking, cutting-edge developments, or innovative solutions to complex problems. As such, external funding contributes positively to evidence in favor of promotion and/or tenure in combination with other measures. Thus, external funding is valued as one indicator of scholarly productivity and success, but the ability to secure external funding should not be used as a substitute for more basic standards, such as quality and impact of the candidate's overall program of research and scholarship. It must also be acknowledged that external funding is differentially available to scholars depending on their interests and area of scholarly activity. Often external funding opportunities are very rare in certain areas and more available in others. Thus, external funding, when it includes rigorous peer review, must be used as one indicator of scholarly activity but should not replace or supplant other indicators.

Principle 5: The COE emphasizes the importance of effective teaching and advising in promotion and/or tenure decisions.

Faculty members in the COE have a special responsibility to be effective instructors and models of best instructional practices. A faculty member's pedagogical contributions and success are evaluated based on her/his approach to teaching such as commitment to teaching and its importance in the candidate's professional life, the goals and aims of teaching, the pedagogical methods employed, and efforts toward continuous improvement of teaching. Candidate's contributions are also evaluated in terms of how her/his teaching assignments and course offerings contribute to an academic major and department. Other factors that are usually considered in evaluating a faculty member's instruction include the number of different courses taught, the size of courses (e.g., small seminars, large lecture classes), and the level of the courses (e.g., graduate, undergraduate). Candidates' teaching effectiveness is primarily evaluated in three ways: student feedback, peer evaluations, and a teaching portfolio. University faculty legislation requires that all courses with an enrollment of ten or more students conduct student evaluations of instruction using the online UO Course Evaluation system.

Student evaluations can be a valuable tool for ascertaining students' judgments about the effectiveness of instruction and the quality of courses. However, the limitations of student feedback should be acknowledged. Student evaluations can reflect contextual factors outside the instructor's control. Therefore, when making interpretations of course evaluations, results should be compared to other relevant courses or groups that provide context for interpretation such as courses with the same class size, level (i.e., graduate vs. undergraduate) or class type (e.g., required versus elective, or small seminar versus large lecture class).

Student course evaluations are only one source of evidence of instructional effectiveness. Peer evaluations provide additional information on candidates' instructional accomplishments. Assistant and associate professors should arrange regular peer evaluations of their teaching. Pre-tenure faculty should arrange to have a peer evaluation of their teaching at least once per year. Faculty chosen to serve as peer evaluators should be familiar with the course content as well as methods of effective teaching. Prior to observations, the peer should review the course syllabus, course materials and assignments, and measures used to assess student progress to ensure he or she is familiar with the course goals and the content to be addressed. Following the observation, an evaluative report is developed that describes the results of the peer observation and evaluative review including such issues as instructional purpose, instructional strategies, effectiveness of presentations, quality of content delivered, completeness and currency of readings, texts, and course materials, quality of feedback provided to students, strategies for monitoring student learning and progress, student engagement, and content covered. Faculty should also be proactive in seeking mentoring and support for their instructional activities and professional development including participation in the UO Teaching Effectiveness Program. Mentoring and professional development activities should be documented and included as evidence of the faculty member's efforts to continuously improve his or her teaching. Candidates should not seek promotion and/or tenure if their file indicates continuous problems with teaching and no evidence of accessing improvement strategies and investing in instructional improvement.

Teaching effectiveness can also be evaluated by examining a portfolio of teaching artifacts submitted as part of the candidate's tenure/promotion file. Portfolios often include course syllabi, assignments, tests, the use of evidence-based or innovative instructional strategies, information on new course preparation and/or curriculum development, the use of technology to support teaching and learning, examples of student work or products, or other evidence of teaching practices and instructional effectiveness.

Advising and assisting students is a critical component of a faculty member's instructional activities and is recognized as a component of the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. Descriptions of advising efforts and products that demonstrate student success and improvement are important indicators of quality teaching and advising and should be documented in the candidate's personal statement, vita, and/or other documentation (e.g., advisees' thesis and dissertations as well as advisees' scholarships, awards, and job placement).

Principle 6: The COE acknowledges the responsibility a professional school has to practicing members of its profession, the multifaceted nature of its service and the synergy among service, scholarship, and teaching.

Professional schools are expected to provide service to a larger professional community as well as to produce knowledge that leads to improvements in practice. Students expect faculty to be experts in problems of practice. Service in professional schools encompasses active participation in the professional communities of practice, and practitioners of the profession expect such participation. In addition, faculty in professional schools often have unique contributions to make that are fostered by experience in problems of practice. These contributions can be valuable in service activities at the departmental, college, and university levels and there is an expectation that faculty will contribute in university service activities increasingly as they develop through the ranks of the profession.

Promotion and/or tenure criteria include the expectation that candidates create linkages between their work and the needs of the profession. Research generates knowledge that influences practice. Likewise, a faculty member's research agenda is shaped and influenced by problems of practice and by the issues and priorities of professionals in the field. Furthermore, schools and colleges of education have an obligation to produce evidence-based research that helps identify and validate effective educational practices.

Work with schools, agencies, and state organizations improves the relevance of teaching and currency of course topics. Students judge their classes at least in part by the relevance of the research, theory and practice knowledge presented to them. Thus, maintaining visibility locally, within the state, and in a range of national organizations is important and requires faculty members to devote significant energy to these practice and professional societies. Because the boundaries among the traditionally separate areas of scholarship, teaching, and service tend to blur in professional schools generally, and education colleges particularly, the promotion and/or tenure process acknowledges and supports faculty whose work integrates these sometimes compartmentalized areas.

Principle 7: The COE evaluates faculty by using evidence of the developmental progression of a faculty member's research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

Faculty development is considered to be a continuous process and therefore there is an expectation of a progression of research and scholarship, teaching, and service performance over time. Such maturation is observed in a diverse array of contexts and responsibilities. Differences are expected between the performances of junior faculty members in comparison with senior faculty members.

The COE expects faculty members to show a clear progression in their scholarly productivity. The COE expectation is that faculty will publish approximately two refereed publications a year. Chapters in books and professional presentations complement such productivity. Early scholarly works may be published in less prestigious journals and subsequent work should be published in higher impact journals. As development progresses, greater impact is measured by publishing in high quality journals with high impact ratings or journals that reach a broader audience of researchers, practitioners or policy makers or the publication of books or other larger scholarly works. Progression in national stature should grow from national recognition at the assistant professor level, to an established national signature at the associate professor level, to established national scholarly leadership at the full professor level.

In teaching, faculty members' development can be observed in the increasing complexity of their syllabi and teaching goals (e.g., knowledge transfer, development of expertise, elimination of misconceptions). Faculty teaching should reflect a diversity of pedagogical strategies (e.g. didactic instruction, small group learning, web-based instructional materials). Faculty strategies for monitoring student learning should reflect the use of a number of different formative and summative assessment and feedback approaches (e.g., individual projects, class presentations, tests, blackboard applications, other web-based instructional materials, peer critique). The use of these instructional and evaluative strategies should become more sophisticated and improve over time. Also, an improvement in student course evaluation reports and peer observation reports is generally expected as faculty members progress in their development as instructors. Faculty members are expected to increase their graduate advising, mentoring, service on student degree committees, and chairing of dissertations over time as well.

Faculty member's leadership role in his/her department, the college, university, and profession is expected to expand progressively over time. For example, assistant professors may serve initially on department/college committees, and national committees, and serve as ad hoc reviewers for journals; associate professors may serve on or chair a college/university committee, serve on journal boards, chair national committees, and be elected to leadership roles in professional organizations; and full professors are expected to fulfill significant college, university and professional leadership roles (e.g., Department Head or Associate Dean leadership role, chair a significant college/university committee, serve as a journal editor, be elected to a major office in a national professional association).

SECTION 2: GENERAL PROCEDURES AND PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Adhering to Procedures and Timelines - For both candidates and administrators, it is essential that college and university timelines and procedures are followed closely. The promotion and/or tenure review process is complex and each step depends on the successful completion of the previous steps. If procedures are not followed or if timelines are not met, the process can be delayed or undermined. In an extreme circumstance, it is possible that a candidate's file will be delayed until the following year if procedures and/or timelines are not followed correctly.

*Curriculum Vita*_- The candidate must prepare a current and complete curriculum vita (CV) that is signed and dated. It is important that the CV is well organized and follows certain conventions. A template describing the suggested organization of the CV appears in Appendix A. Activities and accomplishments should be listed in chronological order, usually from most recent to least recent. Different types of scholarly activity should be separated and clearly labeled. It is particularly important to distinguish between peer-reviewed publications and other forms of scholarly work using separate headings in the CV. It is also important to describe work that is in the midst of the review and publication process correctly. A publication should only be listed as "in press" if the review process has been completed. When a letter from the editor is included in the dossier establishing that work is in press, the work counts as a completed publication.

External Reviewers - A requirement for promotion and/or tenure reviews (excepting the third-year, pre-tenure review) is the evaluation of the candidate's file by external reviewers. The intent of external review is to secure independent evaluators who can provide a broad national

perspective in evaluating the candidate's accomplishments; specifically evaluating the candidate's file against the standards for promotion and tenure used at the reviewer's institution. These reviewers should be established scholars at AAU or other comparable, comprehensive research universities.

The candidate and the Department Head independently create a list of external reviewers. The candidate should create a list of no more than four potential external reviewers with complete contact information and provide this list to the Department Head no later than March 15 of the year prior to submission of the dossier. The candidate should indicate on the list the nature of his/her relationship to the proposed reviewer (e.g., "co-author," "never met," etc.). Candidates may also indicate one or two individuals they choose not to have review their work. External reviewers cannot be a former supervisor, dissertation advisor, or a close colleague. Reviewers must hold a faculty appointment from an AAU member or other institution comparable to the UO (see institution list at <http://education.uoregon.edu/feature.htm?id=2526>). Generally reviewers should be tenured full professors. Sometimes reviewers at the Associate Professor rank are acceptable for cases considering a promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor when the reviewer possesses particularly relevant expertise.

The candidate does *not* contact the reviewers. Selection of the list of 8-10 potential external reviewers is performed by the Department Head in consultation with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. After external reviewers are contacted, a final list of no fewer than 6 external reviewers is chosen. The Department Head manages all communications with the reviewers.

Dossier - The dossier contains all materials necessary for the evaluation of the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure. It is the responsibility of the Department Head and administrative staff to compile and organize the dossier but it is the responsibility of the candidate to supply needed materials and documentation for construction and compilation of the dossier. The dossier is composed of three files. The first is the primary file that contains the materials that will be reviewed in detail by reviewers at each step of the university process. The primary file is composed of 11 sections for applications for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure or for promotion to Full Professor. For third year, pre-tenure review applications, the file is composed of 8 sections (see description of section contents below).

The second file in the dossier contains supplementary materials documenting the candidate's instructional activities. This file contains a listing of all courses taught including enrollments, copies of all student course and instructor evaluations, signed student comments, peer evaluation letters, and sample course materials such as syllabi, assignments, and assessments.

The third file in the dossier is composed of supplementary materials documenting the candidate's scholarly activities and professional growth. This file should contain a copy of all publications, papers, reports, and products that show the entire body of the candidate's scholarly work. A brief statement by the candidate should be included in the file that summarizes the relative standing of journals and outlets, whether peer review is used, and context or explanations for patterns or themes in the pattern of the candidate's scholarly record.

The first primary file advances through each step of the review process for evaluation at each level. Usually, files two and three are maintained in the departmental office and do not advance through the evaluation process. Files two and three must be maintained and made available to any reviewer seeking more detailed evidence from the dossier until the promotion and/or tenure process is completed.

Additional Procedures and Information for Candidates

Locating Information and Getting Support - There are several sources of information to support faculty in engaging the promotion and/or tenure review process. The UO Faculty handbook provides information in chapter VI (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/faculty-handbook-2007-0#>). The UO Office of Academic Affairs provides a great deal of information on policy and procedure on its web site (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure>) and also conducts annual workshops on promotion and tenure. Candidates in the college of education can also contact the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for information or support or to participate in the college's faculty mentoring program, or the college's web site for information on promotion and tenure (<http://education.uoregon.edu/feature.htm?id=2525>).

Preparing for Review - Preparation and organization can make the promotion and/or tenure process easier and less stressful. Candidates should establish files to collect documentation during the first year of appointment and update files at least annually. Learning about the promotion and review process will make it much easier to comply with requirements, accomplish necessary tasks in a timely fashion, and minimize the burden of creating the dossier later on.

Changing the Schedule - In unusual circumstances, the timeline for promotion and/or tenure can be altered. Occasionally, candidates may apply for early promotion but this step should be carefully considered and only attempted after consultation with the Department Head, Dean, and Provost. It is also possible to "stop the clock" on promotion and/or tenure by taking an unpaid leave of absence for personal or professional reasons including leaves without pay for child-bearing or other family related needs. As in alteration of timelines for early promotion, delaying the process requires careful consultation with the Department Head, Dean, and Provost. Additional information on changes in schedule appear on the UO Office of Academic Affairs website.

Personal Statement - The personal statement provides an opportunity for the candidate to provide context for the body of work being presented in the dossier. The UO Office of Academic Affairs recommends that the personal statement be no more than 5 pages in length (single spaced, 12-point font). The personal statement is sent to external reviewers and later becomes part of the candidate's dossier that will be reviewed at the department, college, and university levels; therefore, the personal statement needs to serve several purposes. For external reviewers, the personal statement provides an introduction to the candidate and her/his professional history and a foundation and explanation for the reprints provided to the reviewers. For all review audiences, the personal statement provides insight into the candidate's personal philosophy, research agenda, instructional orientation, and commitment and involvement in professional service. The statement should include scholarly and professional activities, accomplishments, goals, and plans and should detail both recent activities and the candidate's long-term goals as an

independent scholar-teacher. The candidate should specifically address the areas of research, teaching, and service and discuss how these activities are integrated. In crafting the personal statement, the candidate should avoid technical jargon and keep in mind that it is intended for a broad audience of evaluators who may not be familiar with the candidate's field of study as the dossier moves beyond the department and college. The statement must be signed and dated by the candidate.

Additional Procedures and Information For Administrators

Management of the Promotion and/or Tenure Process - The Department Head shoulders much of the responsibility for ensuring that the candidate progresses successfully through the promotion and/or tenure process. The Department Head receives support from and will work with the college's Administrative Program Assistant and from the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to oversee and coordinate the promotion and/or tenure process. Department Heads are encouraged to orient new faculty to the process during the first year of appointment and to work with candidates strategically each year to plan and prepare for the promotion and/or tenure process during each annual review. Early attention to the development of the candidate and the preparation of materials and documentation can greatly facilitate the process.

The Department Head is responsible for requesting and accumulating outside letters of evaluation, for identifying the relationship of all referees to the candidate, and for ensuring that the file of written evaluations and recommendations from within and without the university presents a fair and complete picture of the activities and accomplishments of the candidate under consideration.

Teaching Evaluations and Evidence of Instructional Activity - It is the responsibility of the Department Head and departmental staff to collect and compile evidence of instructional activity and teaching effectiveness for the candidate's file. These materials must not be prepared by the candidate. UO Faculty Senate legislation requires the use of the UO Course Evaluation Report in the evaluation of faculty. Summaries of student evaluations should be included in the dossier including a list of all courses taught, class size, percentage responding, data for comparison with the rest of the departmental staff, and departmental policies on administering the surveys. Reports of student evaluations should also include statistical analysis of student evaluations including means, medians, and standard deviations for all questions. Both solicited and unsolicited student letters should also be included although they are not required. Each student letter must be signed and dated by the student. All available teaching data and summaries should be included in file two as part of the dossier, not just a selection of the material.

Although the primary responsibility for compiling and organizing course and instructor evaluations rests with the department, when the candidate has previously worked at another institution, the candidate must take a more active role in the preparation of this documentation and must ensure that the Department Head and staff have all information needed to compile a complete dossier.

Peer Evaluation - UO Faculty Senate legislation requires "at least one peer evaluation for each assistant professor during each of the three years preceding the promotion/tenure review.

Associate professors are to have peer evaluations conducted for at least one course every other year. Reports of all available peer observations and evaluations should be included in the file” (1996). However, the expectation in the College of Education is that Assistant Professors will have at least one peer evaluation of teaching per year beginning in the first year of appointment. Feedback can be most helpful early in the candidate's instructional career. Associate professors are to have peer evaluations conducted for at least one course every other year. Reports of all available peer observations and evaluations should be included in the second supplementary file in the promotion and/or tenure dossier.

Peer evaluation should also focus on more than an observation of teaching. A thorough evaluation and assessment of course materials including syllabi, course content, texts and readings, assignments, examinations, activities, and assessment methods can provide valuable additional information on the instructional activities and effectiveness of the candidate. Faculty should be aware that workshops in support of the peer evaluation process are regularly offered by the Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP) and the UO Office of Academic Affairs.

Other Evidence of Instructional Activity - Dossiers for promotion and/or tenure should also contain complete information on other indicators of the candidate's instructional activity. Supplementary materials in the second file in the dossier should include summaries of grading records, sample syllabi, course assignments and activities, and other evidence that establishes the rigor and substance of the candidate's instruction.

Instructional activity is also evidenced in the mentoring and advising activities of the faculty member. The dossier should include a list documenting the candidate's service as a student advisor, and as a member or chair of graduate student examination or degree committees. Information should also be provided on students at all levels (i.e., undergraduate, Master's, doctoral, post-doctoral) who have carried out independent studies, readings, or independent research/scholarship with the candidate, including indication of the candidate's role in student studies. Indicate the years in which degrees were received and current place and status of employment if available. Add commentary that gives perspective on the candidate's activities and accomplishments in mentoring students, joint publication with students, or other mentoring activities.

Teaching Advocate - An evaluative summary of instructional activity should be prepared by the Department Head or a senior faculty member but never by the candidate. Some departments appoint a teaching advocate several years before the promotion and/or tenure dossier is prepared. The advocate can provide advice and mentoring to the candidate and also ensures that evaluations and documentation are conducted and collected. In the summer before the dossier is submitted the teaching advocate summarizes and analyzes student and peer evaluation reports and other evidence of instructional activity and accomplishment and prepares a detailed summary of the candidate's body of instructional work. This report is used to provide information for the Department Head's letter and can be included in the dossier.

Internal and External Reviewers - An important part of the promotion and/or tenure process is the evaluation of the dossier by both internal and external reviewers. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to manage the complex process of selecting reviewers, making contact and

securing agreement to write a review letter, ensuring that letters are returned on time, and summarizing and synthesizing review letter content in the Department Head's letter. Review letters are perceived by many as important in that they represent an independent perspective on a candidate's accomplishments. It is *critical* for the Department Head to carefully monitor and guide the process to ensure that reviewers meet the expectations and qualifications for evaluators and that the process is completed smoothly and completely. The Department Head should seek two to three letters from University of Oregon faculty who have worked with or are familiar with the candidate's research, teaching and/or service contributions. Each reviewer is asked to write an evaluative letter to be included in the candidate's file. Generally, internal reviewers should be Full Professors. Occasionally, in the review of a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor, a reviewer who is at the rank of Associate Professor may be acceptable when she or he has particularly relevant expertise.

As described above, both the candidate and the Department Head create lists of potential external reviewers. The Department Head usually seeks input from knowledgeable colleagues at the University of Oregon and elsewhere about faculty who are knowledgeable and accomplished in the same or a similar area of study and research as the candidate. Potential reviewers must be from an institution comparable to the UO and must hold a faculty rank equal or higher to that being considered in the promotion and/or tenure review.

Department Head Letter - The Department Head prepares a letter for the candidate's dossier that is expected to accomplish two purposes: a) provide a clear summary of the department faculty evaluation and recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure, and b) provide the Department Head's personal evaluation of the case. The letter should describe the candidate's conditions of appointment and any special circumstances surrounding the appointment, the departmental review process, who is eligible to vote on the particular candidate, a summary of the faculty discussion and a report on the faculty vote including rank and status (tenure line or NTTF) of those voting. Departmental votes on tenure cases must be by secret ballot with only the totals revealed to the departmental faculty. The Department Head letter must explain any abstentions or reasons for faculty who were absent from the vote.

The Department Head letter should also include an appraisal of the candidate's scholarship, instructional activity, and service that is independent of the departmental or any other reviews of the candidate. The letter should provide a clear recommendation for promotion and/or tenure and does not need to coincide with the vote of the department faculty. The Department Head's letter carries more weight when it presents a balanced analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and is not simply advocacy of the candidate's case. Often the Department Head can provide important information that can help other reviewers of the candidate's file to understand details of the candidate's instructional or research record. Careful analysis presented in the Department Head letter can also help to resolve discrepancies in the letters from external reviewers. Thus the Department Head's letter is a critical piece of information in the dossier that helps to evaluate the file, summarize reviewer's recommendations, and provide analysis and context to support consideration of the candidate's application. The Department Head's letter must be signed and dated.

SECTION 3. PROCEDURES AND TIMELINES FOR COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

The following procedures and timelines should be followed in preparing candidate files for promotion of tenure line faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor and/or the award of tenure. Procedures and timelines for third year review and for promotion of tenure line faculty from Associate to Full Professor are somewhat different and are described in separate sections below. In Section 4 timelines are listed for the candidate omitting steps and deadlines that do not directly apply to the candidate. In all sections below the listed timelines are approximate and may vary slightly so they do not fall on a weekend. Otherwise all faculty and staff should strive to adhere closely to the listed deadlines.

Academic year before file is submitted (typically year 5)

- November 1 The Department Head prepares a list of candidates planning to submit a file for promotion and/or tenure in the following academic year. The list along with each candidate's updated curriculum vitae is sent to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
- November 15 The Department Head confers with the Associate Dean and Dean on plans for promotion and/or tenure of candidate(s).
- December 15 Candidate meets with Associate Dean to discuss promotion and/or tenure process.
- March 15 Candidate and Department Head independently prepare lists of suggested external reviewers.
- April 1 The Department head selects 8-10 potential external reviewers and two to three internal reviewers. The prospective list of reviewers is submitted to the Associate Dean for approval.
- April 15 Department Head contacts external reviewers to ask if they are willing to review the candidate's file and write a letter of evaluation. The Department head keeps a written record of the contacts and responses. The list of external reviewers is finalized by May 1. Final list of reviewers is submitted to the Associate Dean.
- July 15 The Department Head and Associate Dean approve materials for reviewers.
- July 15 Candidate submits all materials to Department Head for review and approval. Materials include a current, signed and dated curriculum vita, a personal statement of no more than 5 pages, and up to 4 reprints or examples of scholarly work.

At this time, the Department head obtains a signed letter from the candidate indicating whether the candidate waives his/her rights to review the documents in his/her tenure and/or promotion file. Examples of waiver letters appear in Appendix A.

- July 25 All materials for external review are submitted to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for approval.
- August 1 Review packet is sent to external reviewers. Packet must include a) Department Head cover letter (see template in Appendix A), b) candidate's personal statement, c) candidate's signed and dated curriculum vita, d) up to four examples of scholarly activity, e) confidentiality waiver, f) a copy of the COE Tenure and Promotion policy. Reviewers must return their letters no later than September 30.
- August 31 The Department Head and/or staff compiles the candidate's teaching evaluations. The candidate's file should include: a) a list of all courses taught at the university and other institutions of higher education as appropriate including year, term, title, number of students and associated Course Evaluation Report or results, b) all signed written student evaluations and c) a copy of the CER summary sheet for each course.

Academic year in which file is submitted (typically year 6)

- September 15 Dean sends list of those in college being considered for promotion and/or tenure to the UO Office of Academic Affairs.
- September 16 In consultation with the Dean and the Associate Dean, Department Heads confirm members of the COE Faculty Personnel Committee for the upcoming academic year.
- September 30 The Department Head has received all internal and external evaluation letters
- October 1 With assistance from the college's Administrative Program Assistant, assembly of the candidate's file is completed and made available for Department review. Most candidate's files contain 11 separate elements including: (a) curriculum vita, (b) personal statement, (c) duties and responsibilities, (d) letters from internal and external reviewers and brief bios for the external reviewers, (e) statement of waiver, (f) conditions of appointment, (g) summaries of teaching evaluations, (h) department faculty vote and recommendation, (i) Department Head's letter, (j) FPC's vote and letter, and (k) Dean's letter. Elements a through g are included in the file by September 15. Elements h through k are added as the file moves through successive reviews by the department faculty, Department Head, FPC, and Dean. A detailed description of each element can be found at: <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-virtual-file>.
- Four identical copies are assembled by the Department Head and departmental staff, utilizing the UO File Checklist (see Appendix A).
- October 1 The dean provides the candidate information concerning the state of the candidate's file (e.g. the general content of the reviewers' letters). If letters are

generally positive, the process can move forward. If the letters are generally negative, the candidate has options. Candidates under consideration for tenure (assistant to associate with tenure) may develop a written response that can be added to the file. Candidates under consideration for promotion may add a response to the file or can choose to delay the process.

- October 1 The Department heads notify the Department faculty about review and voting procedures.
- October 3-10 Department faculty members review the candidate's file and complete a written ballot. The vote is confidential and not shared with the candidate. The Department Head compiles the result of the Department faculty vote. Ballots are due no later than October 10.
- October 23 The Department head completes a letter of evaluation that reflects the Department faculty discussion and vote broken down by rank and tenure/non-tenure status of the voters. This letter and the Department faculty vote are added to the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file.
- November 14 The COE Administrative Program Assistant provides completed candidate files to the COE Faculty Personnel Committee on October 24. The committee reviews each candidate's file, votes and writes a letter of evaluation that reflects the committee's discussion and vote. The committee letter and voting summary are added to the file.
- November 15 The Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than November 28.
- November 29 The Associate Dean and the COE Administrative Program Assistant send 3 copies of the completed file to the UO Provost's office. The Dean's office retains 1 copy for COE records.
- Winter/Spring As files arrive, the UO Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the file, votes, and writes a recommendation for the Provost.
- May 1 The Provost reviews files as they are received from the UO FPC and makes the decision about promotion and/or tenure. There is a single notification date for all candidates on or about May 1.

Pre-Tenure Review of Tenure Line Faculty

An untenured COE faculty member in a tenure-line position is required by the University of Oregon to stand for a formal, pre-tenure review. Typically, this review is conducted during the third-year of an initial three-year contract at the rank of Assistant Professor. This review is designed to reflect and approximate the major elements and standards of the tenure and promotion process that the faculty member will be required to satisfy at a later point, typically

three-years after the pre-tenure review. In line with this requirement, a pre-tenure review will be initiated at the department level, include a review by the Dean of the College of Education, and conclude with a decision by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Provost of the University of Oregon.

The review process and procedures are very similar to the review for promotion from assistant to associate professor described above. The key differences are a later and abbreviated timeline and a condensed review process that omits reviews of the file by external reviewers, the COE Faculty Personnel Committee, and the UO Faculty Personnel Committee.

It is particularly important in the pre-tenure review to provide evaluative and diagnostic information to the candidate. Faculty and administrators evaluating year three candidates have a responsibility to clearly communicate areas of weakness or deficiency in a candidate's activities and accomplishments to provide timely notice and opportunity for improvement.

Academic year in which pre-tenure review file is submitted

November 1 The Department Head requests documents and information from the candidate to prepare the file for review. Documents include a current, signed and dated curriculum vita, a personal statement no more than 5 pages long, a representative sample of no more than 4 recent publications or examples of scholarly work, copies of instructional materials including course syllabi, and other course materials.

January 15 Candidate submits all materials to Department Head for review and approval. Department Head and staff compile other evidence of instructional activity including UO student course evaluation reports, reports of peer observation and evaluation, and student written comments. Materials are assembled to create the candidate's dossier composed of the same three files described above.

January 25 Assembly of the candidate's dossier is completed. Typically the candidate's primary file contains 8 separate elements including: (a) curriculum vita, (b) personal statement, (c) duties and responsibilities, (d) conditions of appointment, (e) teaching evaluations, (f) department faculty vote and recommendation, (g) Department Head's letter, and (h) Dean's letter.

Elements *a - e* are included in the file by January 25. Elements *f - h* are added as the file moves through successive reviews by the Department faculty, Department Head, and Dean. Three identical copies are assembled by the Department head and the department Administrative Program Assistant.

January 25 The Department Head notifies the department faculty about review and voting procedures. The candidate's file is made available to department faculty for review.

February 10 Department faculty members review the candidate's file and complete a written ballot. The vote is confidential and not shared with the candidate. The

Department Head compiles the result of the department faculty vote. Ballots are due no later than February 10.

February 24 The Department Head completes a letter of evaluation that reflects the Department faculty discussion and vote broken down by rank and tenure/non-tenure status of the voters. This letter and the Department faculty vote are added to the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file.

March 15 The Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than March 15.

The Dean's letter will be read by the faculty member. The faculty member will sign that he or she has read the letter. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, the faculty member has the right to submit a dissenting letter along with the Dean's letter to the Provost.

March 18 The Associate Dean and the COE Administrative Program Assistant send 2 copies of the completed file to the UO Office of Academic Affairs. The Dean's office retains 1 copy for COE records.

May 1 The Provost reviews the file. The decision of the Provost of the University of Oregon is considered binding and the final step of the pre-tenure review process. The decision results in the issuance of a memo describing the continuation status of the faculty member for a specified number of years.

Promotion to Full Professor

It should be noted that the timing of the decision to apply for promotion to Full Professor may vary more than the typical six year timeline from appointment as an Assistant Professor to application for promotion and/or tenure as an Associate Professor. While there is usually a span of at least six years from appointment as an Associate Professor to application for promotion to Full Professor, faculty may choose not to apply for promotion. However, once a decision has been made to apply for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, the same procedures and timelines as the process for promotion from Assistant to Associate professor are applied with the following exceptions.

As described in Section 1 of this document, there are expectations for development and maturation of a faculty member's activities and accomplishments as she/he becomes more experienced in the profession. As a result it is important in the documentation and review of files for promotion to Full Professor to demonstrate increasing levels of responsibility and impact in the faculty member's work. When internal and external reviewers are chosen for a file considering promotion to Full Professor, all reviewers should hold the rank of Full Professor at their institution. All timelines presented above for the promotion and/or tenure of Assistant Professors should be followed for the promotion of Associate Professors up until the early October departmental review and vote. The timelines presented below should be followed for the remainder of the process.

- November 5 The Department head completes a letter of evaluation that reflects the Department faculty discussion and vote broken down by rank and tenure/non-tenure status of the voters.
- November 10 The Department Head letter and the Department faculty vote are added to the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file. The completed file is made available to the COE Faculty Personnel Committee by the COE Administrative Program Assistant.
- November 30 The COE Faculty Personnel Committee reviews each candidate's file, votes and writes a letter of evaluation that reflects the committee's discussion and vote. The committee letter and voting summary are added to the file.
- December 1 The Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than January 8.
- January 14 The Associate Dean and the COE Administrative Program Assistant send 3 copies of the completed file to the UO Provost's office. The Dean's office retains 1 copy for COE records.
- Spring The UO Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the file, votes, and writes a recommendation for the provost.
- May 1 The provost reviews the file, makes the decision about tenure and/or promotion, and informs the candidate.

SECTION 4. PROCEDURES AND TIMELINES FOR CANDIDATES

This section presents a streamlined description of the procedures and timelines for promotion and/or tenure that emphasizes only the steps relevant for the candidate to complete. There is no new information in section 4 not contained in section 3.

Academic year before file is submitted (typically year 5)

- November 1 By this date the candidate provides an updated CV to her/his Department Head to initiate the process.
- December 15 Candidate meets with Associate Dean to discuss promotion and/or tenure process.
- March 15 Candidate and Department Head independently prepare lists of suggested external reviewers. Department Head then chooses 8-10 potential external reviewers.
- July 15 Candidate submits all materials to Department Head for review and approval. Materials include a current, signed and dated curriculum vita, a personal statement of no more than 5 pages, and up to 4 reprints or examples of scholarly work.

Candidate provides the Department head with a signed letter indicating whether the candidate waives her/his rights to review the documents in the promotion and/or tenure promotion file. Examples of waiver letters appear in Appendix A.

August 31 Candidate supplies the Department Head and/or staff with any instructional materials needed to compile the dossier.

Academic year in which file is submitted (typically year 6)

October 1 Assembly of the candidate's file is completed and made available for Department review. Most candidate's files contain 11 separate elements including: (a) curriculum vita, (b) personal statement, (c) duties and responsibilities, (d) letters from internal and external reviewers and brief bios for the external reviewers, (e) statement of waiver, (f) conditions of appointment, (g) summaries of teaching evaluations, (h) department faculty vote and recommendation, (i) Department Head's letter, (j) FPC's vote and letter, and (k) Dean's letter. Elements a through g are included in the file by September 15. Elements h through k are added as the file moves through successive reviews by the department faculty, Department Head, FPC, and Dean. A detailed description of each element can be found at: <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-virtual-file>.

October 1 The Dean provides the candidate information concerning the state of the candidate's file (e.g. the general content of the reviewers' letters). If letters are generally positive, the process can move forward. If the letters are generally negative, the candidate has options. Candidates under consideration for tenure (assistant to associate with tenure) may develop a written response that can be added to the file. Candidates under consideration for promotion may add a response to the file or can choose to delay the process.

May 1 The Provost reviews the file, makes the decision about promotion and/or tenure and informs the candidate.

Pre-Tenure Review of Tenure Line Faculty

The review process and procedures are very similar to the review for promotion from assistant to associate professor describe above. The key differences are a later and abbreviated timeline and a condensed review process that omits reviews of the file by external reviewers, the COE Faculty Personnel Committee, and the UO Faculty Personnel Committee.

Academic year in which pre-tenure review file is submitted

November 1 The Department Head requests documents and information from the candidate to prepare the file for review. Documents include a current, signed and dated curriculum vita, a personal statement no longer than 5 pages, a representative sample of no more than 4 recent publications or examples of scholarly work,

copies of instructional materials including course syllabi, and other course materials.

January 15 Candidate submits all materials to Department Head for review and approval. Department Head and staff compile other evidence of instructional activity including UO student course evaluation reports, reports of peer observation and evaluation, and student written comments. Materials are assembled to create the candidate's dossier.

January 25 Assembly of the candidate's dossier is completed. Typically the candidate's primary file contains 8 separate elements including: (a) curriculum vita, (b) personal statement, (c) duties and responsibilities, (d) conditions of appointment, (e) teaching evaluations, (f) department faculty vote and recommendation, (g) Department Head's letter, and (h) Dean's letter.

Elements *a - e* are included in the file by January 25. Elements *f - h* are added as the file moves through successive reviews by the Department faculty, Department Head, and Dean. Three identical copies are assembled by the Department head and the department Administrative Program Assistant.

March 15 The Dean reviews the file and writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the file no later than March 15. The Dean's letter is read by the faculty member. The faculty member will sign that he or she has read the letter. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, the faculty member has the right to submit a dissenting letter along with the Dean's letter to the Provost.

May 1 The Provost reviews the file. The decision of the Provost of the University of Oregon is considered binding and the final step of the pre-tenure review process. The decision results in the issuance of a memo describing the continuation status of the faculty member for a specified number of years.

Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion of tenure line faculty from Associate to Full Professor follows the same procedures and timelines as the process for promotion from Assistant to Associate professor. While there are some differences in deadlines for administrative personnel and review committees, from the candidate's perspective there are no differences in the timelines.

APPENDIX A

A1. UO OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

A2. COE CURRICULUM VITA TEMPLATE

A3. SAMPLE WAIVER LETTERS FROM CANDIDATE

A4. SAMPLE FORM LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

A5. PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE CHECKLIST

APPENDIX A1. OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

The UO Office of Academic Affairs provides detailed guidelines for faculty tenure and promotion. The Main site URL is <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure>. The site contains a guide with information on the following:

- Scholarship

- Expectations
- Developing a Scholarly Program
- Preparing for Publication, Performance or Exhibition
- Managing Your Time and Priorities
- Building a Professional Reputation
- Recordkeeping
- Questions you should ask

- Teaching

- Expectations
- Recordkeeping
- Questions You Should Ask
- Potential Problems

- Service

- Expectations
- Managing Your Time and Priorities

- Evaluation

- Probationary Years (tenure track appointments with no credit for prior service)
- Annual Reviews (spring of years 1, 2, & 4)
- Third Year Review (spring of year 3)
- Promotion and Tenure Review (beginning spring of year 5 with decision by spring of year 6)
- Post Tenure Reviews

APPENDIX A2. COE CURRICULUM VITA TEMPLATE

Identifying Information

Name, address and contact information, date vita has been updated

Current Position(s)

Indicate location, time/year in position, position description.

Educational History

Indicate name of schools, degrees and dates granted; doctoral dissertation title and Master's thesis.

Professional and Teaching Experience

Indicate location, time/year in position, and description of activities.

List of Courses Taught

Publications

List refereed journal articles in chronological order; do not include in preparation.

List articles in non-refereed journals in chronological order.

List books and monographs in chronological order.

List book chapters in chronological order.

List reports and other publications.

Presentations

List international invited followed by non-invited.

List national invited and national conferences.

List regional invited and non-invited.

External Funding

Indicate: name and type of grant, awarding entity, award period, amount of award, role in the project (e.g., principle investigator) and brief description of the project.

Awards and Honors

Indicate year and nature of each award.

Professional Organizations

Indicate: name of the organization, years of participation, and roles in organization.

Service

List national service (e.g., professional organizations, journal reviewing).

List state service.

List university service.

List area/major service.

APPENDIX A3. SAMPLE WAIVER LETTERS FROM CANDIDATE

SAMPLE NON-WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate], and of the possibility of waiving this right for certain categories of material.

I wish to retain my legal right of access to all materials in my file.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

SAMPLE FULL WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate]. However, it is my view that referees' evaluations should be kept confidential.

Consequently, I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all referees in conjunction with my promotion [and or tenure] review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

You should feel free to inform prospective referees that I have submitted this waiver and agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

SAMPLE PARTIAL WAIVER LETTER FROM THE CANDIDATE

In this example, the candidate waives the right of access to external letters, but retains full access to letters from individuals affiliated with the UO.

Dear [whoever is assembling the file]:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351065 (Sect. 3,4,5,6) effective 1995, to the full evaluative tile being prepared for consideration of my

case for promotion [and/or indefinite tenure, as appropriate]. It is my view that external referees' evaluations should be kept confidential.

I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all referees external to the University of Oregon in conjunction with my promotion [and or tenure] review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

I wish, however, to retain my legal right of access to all letters submitted by individuals affiliated with the University of Oregon.

You should feel free to inform prospective external referees that I have submitted this partial waiver and have agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

Sincerely,

[Candidate]

APPENDIX A4. SAMPLE FORM LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Date

Name

Institution

Address

City, State Zip

Dear _____ :

_____, of the _____, College of Education, University of Oregon, is being considered for promotion from _____ to _____. Such promotions are made only after consulting specialists in the appropriate discipline, both at the University of Oregon and nationally.

You have been recommended as a national scholar who can provide an evaluation of Dr. _____'s professional achievements and contributions. We appreciate your willingness to provide this evaluation and recognize the commitment involved. Our process requires that we request three products from you:

1. Evaluation Letter: Please write a letter outlining what you know about Dr. _____'s scholarship, research accomplishments, publications, and stature within the profession. To assist in your evaluation we have also enclosed the UO College of Education's Promotion and/or Tenure Policy. A comparison of Dr. _____ with others in the field would be appreciated. Please clearly indicate whether you believe that Dr. _____ would meet the requirements for promotion (and tenure) at your institution.
2. Vita: Please include a copy of your professional vita.
3. Brief Biography: Please include a brief paragraph indicating your current professional position and any professional collaboration or interaction you have had with Dr. _____.

Oregon law permits full access by a faculty member to his or her personnel file; however, Dr. _____ has voluntarily waived in advance the right of access with the expectation that this waiver will enable referees to prepare thorough and candid letters. Since this waiver has been reviewed for its legality, I can assure you the University will not disclose your letter to the candidate, although we cannot predict whether a challenge in court might result in such a disclosure. With the waiver, however, Dr. _____ retains the right to request a substantive summary of all evaluative remarks written in a manner to avoid disclosure of any referee's identity.

I have enclosed a curriculum vita, personal statement, and copies of relevant publications by Dr. _____ for your evaluation.

It will be of great help to us if we receive your evaluation letter, vita, and biography before September 30, since we are now preparing all the necessary documents for Dr. _____'s file. Your evaluation letter will be placed in the formal promotion file of the candidate and reviewed by (a) the departmental faculty, (b) the college faculty personnel committee, (c) the department head, (d) the dean, (e) the University of Oregon faculty personnel committee, and (f) the provost. Your participation in this promotion evaluation is a significant contribution and is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Department Head,

Enclosures

