UNIVERSITY OF OREGON | College of Arts and Sciences

PREPARATION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE FILES

AY 2024-2025

Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Files

Each department in CAS has detailed promotion-and-tenure guidelines that should be consulted and followed. The purpose of this document is to help you follow University (Office of the Provost) guidelines (https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure) and college expectations and to clarify the timeline.

Who is Responsible for What?

- Departmental Staff: The ASU associate director or the staff member assigned to P&T should track when faculty are becoming eligible for promotion and tenure, ensure that deadlines are met, that files are accurately assembled, and that communications are clear and effective. They should attend relevant workshops and consult the material from the Office of the Provost TTF Promotion and Tenure website for assembling files.

- Head: The head leads the P&T process, in speaking with the candidate, in contacting external reviewers, and in reviewing every part of the file before sending it to CAS. It is not normally acceptable to ask other department members to take responsibility for preparing a case and/or contacting external reviewers, and the head remains responsible for reviewing any file material prepared by another employee. Heads should attend the relevant workshops and consult the Office of the Provost and CAS guidance on the kind of information the complete file must contain.

- Dean: The dean's office carries out its own thorough review of the dossier for completeness and compliance. Corrections are requested from the department, if required. Following this review of the dossier for completeness and compliance, the dean's office releases the file to the college personnel committee (DAC) for its review, recommendation, vote, and report. The CAS Dean, in consultation with the CAS Divisional Associate Dean, reviews the dossier, focusing on the department head letter and DAC report to write a dean-level evaluation of the candidate. The CAS Dean meets with the candidate to review the evaluation letter and the candidate has 10 business days to respond. The dean's office is responsible for submitting the completed dossier to the Office of the Provost. More details available here: https://provost.uoregon.edu/school-or-college-review.

Overall Timeline

- Early Winter Term, Pre-decision AY: Initiate P&T Process.

    - *Confer with candidate*. The department head or program director must contact the candidate no later than winter term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required and discuss the candidate's contributions to the file, including the nature of the confidentiality waiver the candidate prefers: https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure

- *Check on peer reviews of teaching*. If the candidate's file doesn't already contain the required number of these reviews, make arrangements to get them completed as soon as possible: https://provost.uoregon.edu/revising-uos-teaching-evaluations#peer%20review.

- *Notify CAS of the P&T cases you plan to put forward*. If any cases have unusual features, such as changes to standard timing, for example, you should discuss them with your divisional dean. All cases for early promotion must be discussed with and approved by the divisional associate dean.

- *Begin preparing external evaluator checklist.* Collect names of potential reviewers from candidate and create department list. Absolute majority must be selected by unit head. If an external reviewer is suggested by both candidate and department head, it may be listed under the department's list.

- *Request that the candidate assemble updated CV and personal statement* for tenured faculty review before the end of spring term. Please discourage excessively long candidate's statement and committee and head's reports. Candidate statements should *not* exceed the 6-page limit referenced in the CBA and can most often benefit from being shorter, more concise, and more substantive. Statements should be written in clear, concise language that is accessible to a general academic audience. Template available on OtP website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/reviews/guides-forms-templates.

- For promotions to full professor, CAS will provide the prior-promotion CV to the divisional associate dean, head, and candidate. *For promotion to full professor, heads must meet with their divisional associate dean to discuss the case*. The divisional associate dean and the head will consult the prior-promotion CV and the updated CV to be sure there is no overlap between accomplishments counted in the promotion-to-associate-professor CV and the promotion-to- full-professor CV.

- March, Pre-decision AY

  - *Submit an "External Evaluator Checklist"* You must submit the completed checklist on March 1st and receive approval from the director of faculty personnel and policy before contacting any external reviewers; this sometimes requires discussion and can take several days. More information and templates located here: https://provost.uoregon.edu/external-letters-evaluation.

  - *Collect the candidate's CV and statement*. Make these, together with teaching assessments and peer evaluations, available to the department personnel committee.

  - *Department personnel committee meets*. Department head provides feedback for improvement of P&T materials to the candidate. In some cases, this feedback may include a suggestion that the promotion process be delayed, if that is an option. If the candidate decides to delay promotion to full, please notify the ASU staff and CAS Dean's office personnel team before June 15th. Guidelines and criteria for promotion to full professor vary in individual unit P&T criteria, but the provost will expect to see at a minimum the criteria outlined in Appendix 2 of the CBA:
    - Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship in the candidate's

discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative activity;
- Effective, stimulating teaching that meets university-wide teaching standards established by the University Senate, to the extent applicable, in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable.
- Ongoing, responsible service and leadership to the candidate's students and department, the university, the community, and the candidate's professional discipline more broadly.
- In each of the areas above, unit-level policies must consider and define contributions that demonstrably promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

A sustained record of scholarly or creative accomplishment and the impact of scholarship or creative work, of effective teaching, and of substantial service to unit, university, and the profession must be evident in the scholarly record no matter how long the review period for promotion to full professor.

In all cases, if there are serious departmental reservations, the department head should discuss the case with the divisional associate dean.

- April, Pre-decision AY

  - *Contact external reviewers*. The head identifies potential external reviewers. The head normally consults with department faculty and may also consult with other experts in the field. The head should also consult with the candidate separately, who may also identify potential reviewers. All external reviewers must meet the criteria described below. External reviewers must be approved by CAS before they are contacted by the unit head using the External Evaluators Checklist mentioned above. The head should also note the type of waiver signed by the candidate and correspond with reviewers accordingly. Unit heads alone are responsible for communicating with external reviewers throughout the promotion and tenure process. The head should inquire with the reviewers about their availability to evaluate this candidate (using the approved UO email inquiry) and be ready to send the candidate file to the reviewers by June 1: https://provost.uoregon.edu/external-letters-evaluation.

  - The Student Experiences of Teaching Report (SETR) can be accessed by ASU staff through cognos.uoregon.edu, Team Content à Departmental Folders à Provost's Office à Teaching Evaluation Reports à Student Experiences of Teaching.

Timeline Summary:

- September 30, Decision AY: CAS Dean's Office to send list of confirmed P&T cases to provost.

- In October, Decision AY: Complete department-level review and reports.

- November 1, Decision AY: ASUs send completed P&T dossiers to CAS Dean's Office.

- December 1, Decision AY: ASUs send completed Promotion to Full dossiers to CAS Dean's Office.

- Mid-Fall Term—Winter Term, Decision AY: Review in CAS (DAC + dean), files sent to provost as reviews are completed.

- Early Winter Term, **File Prep AY**: Department head confers with candidates going up for promotion the following academic year, checks peer reviews, and notifies CAS Dean's Office of P&T cases it plans to put forward.

- Mid-Winter Term, **File Prep AY**: Department head reviews external evaluator guidelines and submits checklists on March 1st to CAS Dean's Office director of faculty personnel and policy for review and approval.

- March 15, Decision AY: CAS Dean's Office submits dossiers to the Office of the Provost.

- Late Winter Term—Early Spring Term, Decision AY: Review at University level (FPC + provost).

- Early Spring Term, **File Prep AY**: Candidates complete letter of waiver. Department head contacts approved external evaluators.

- June 1, Decision AY: Candidates will be notified of their promotion decision by the Office of the Provost.

Collecting Material for the File

- Letter of Waiver

The candidate should decide early in the P&T process (by mid –March and before any external reviewers are contacted) which waiver they prefer and must sign and date the appropriate document: https://provost.uoregon.edu/waiver-statements. External reviewers must be notified about the contents of the waiver that the candidate has signed. You must use the standard wording for this letter (available on the Provost's website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/external-letters-evaluation).
Any changes in the wording must be approved in advance by the divisional associate dean and the Office of the Provost. Use of nonstandard letters may in some instances require that a new set of external letters be solicited. Candidates may choose freely from among the three available waiver options.

- Candidate's CV and Statement

    - *Again, please note*: For promotion to full professor, the head must meet with the divisional associate dean prior to launching the case. The divisional associate dean, the head, and the candidate should consult the prior-

promotion CV and all CV addenda to be sure there is no overlap between accomplishments counted in the promotion-to-associate-professor file and the promotion-to-full-professor CV.

- *Candidate's CV*: Early in the process (by March), it is extremely valuable for the head or other senior colleagues to review the CV with the candidate or to provide a model of a well-ordered CV. There is now an optional CV template on the Office of the Provost's website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/reviews/guides-forms-templates. Because disciplinary conventions for the abbreviated reporting of scholarship vary widely, candidates should take care to create a CV that will be understandable to colleagues in a range of disciplines. To that end, we recommend using a standardized CV format for the purpose of P&T review, even if candidates want to retain an individualized one for other purposes. Whatever format is chosen, organization of the CV should be based on these principles:

    1. Peer reviewed publications are the primary consideration. For major scholarly or creative accomplishments not in print form, please consult the divisional associate dean about presentation on the CV.

    2. There should be a clear distinction between published and unpublished materials. Works that have been fully accepted for publication (that is, are "in press" with no further author revisions beyond reading the copy-edited manuscript or page proofs) may be listed among publications if the file includes letters from press and journal editors attesting that the work is fully complete and "in press" or "in production." These letters (emails are fine) should precede the most recent iterations of the CV in the CV section of the promotion file.

       In contrast, work that is "in progress" may not be listed among publications, *even if it has been accepted for publication*, and should instead be listed in a separate Works in Progress category.

CV Section	**Status**	**Documentation**
Publications	Published	Bibliographic Citation
	In press, in production	Editor's letter that work is in production with no further author revisions required

Works in Progress	Accepted for publication but not in press Not accepted for publication	Date of anticipated publication No documentation necessary, but word count can be helpful

1. All materials should be identified by the categories they fall into (Books, Articles, Websites, Poems, Short Stories, Public Readings, Conference Papers or Conference Proceedings, Book Chapters, Reviews, Other). Moreover, the CV should be straightforward in identifying publications that have been reprinted—for instance, a journal article that then appears in an edited collection. These are not separate publications, and it's best to have one citation that lists such a publication and the various places and dates of its appearance.

2. Any material that is not peer reviewed should be listed separately and indicated as not peer reviewed.

3. CVs must give the dates and positions for all academic appointments in an "Employment" section.

4. The department head must indicate disciplinary standards on co-authorship as part of their evaluation of the candidate. For publications that are exceptions to disciplinary standards, the nature of that exception should be indicated.

5. Publications in each category should be listed in reverse chronological order–that is, beginning with the most recent–and complete citation information, with inclusive page numbers for published articles and chapters and word counts for digitally published or unpublished manuscripts and for books, should be given for each of them.

6. The CV must be signed and dated by the candidate, and if CV revisions or addenda are submitted, each one must be signed and dated. An accompanying email from the candidate constitutes a valid signature and date in the case of an electronic submission.

- *Candidate's Statement*: This should provide an introduction that offers an overview of the candidate's work and its place within the discipline or field. The statement should be organized into separate discussions of Research or Creative Work, Teaching, and Service, and it must include a discussion of the candidate's contributions to equity and inclusion, either in a separate section or within the relevant individual sections. For guidance on "Equity and Inclusion in Personal Statements for Reviews of Bargaining Unit Faculty," see the Division of Equity and Inclusion website:

https://provost.uoregon.edu/discussion-contributions-equity-and-inclusion and https://inclusion.uoregon.edu/content/equity-and-inclusion-personal-statements-reviews-bargaining-unit-faculty.

- Review Materials

  The CBA identifies three categories among the review materials requested from the candidate: Materials for scholarship, teaching, and service. The scholarship/creative practice and teaching materials are required by the Office of the Provost.

  The relevant scholarly or creative material is provided to external reviewers by the department. Be sure that the entire scholarship/creative practice material is made available to reviewers. If you're concerned about the amount of material, work with the candidate as they are assembling their scholarship/creative practice material to create an effective collection of significant scholarship or creative work.

  Contributions in scholarship or creative work, teaching, service, and equity and inclusion should be discussed in the candidate's statement, and candidates may also submit additional materials in teaching, service, and equity and inclusion for the supplementary file to be evaluated by internal committees if they wish.

- Reviews of Teaching

  - *Peer Reviews*: Ordinarily, there should be a minimum of three peer teaching evaluations for each P&T or promotion case, and the Office of the Provost strictly enforces this requirement. Ideally, these reviews should be assigned to colleagues and written over a span of years, with at least one recent review included in the file. Each review should be signed and dated by the reviewer and read and signed by the candidate. For associate professors, peer reviews should be conducted every other year. If you currently have no peer reviews for a candidate up for promotion and/or tenure next year, we highly recommend scheduling at least one class visitation immediately, even in the fall of the decision year.

  - *Evaluation of Teaching*: As you review colleagues whose teaching record spans the old and the new teaching evaluation systems and new colleagues whose teaching will be evaluated entirely within the new system, please follow guidance from the Office of the Provost carefully in your reviews (for more detailed guidance and relevant documents, please consult the provost's website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/revising-uos-teaching-evaluations).

  - Both the personnel committee's letter and the head's letter must indicate whether the candidate's teaching does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectation on each of the categories of
    a) professional teaching, b) inclusive teaching, c) engaged teaching, and d) research-informed teaching, separately. These reports must also provide an

overall assessment of teaching quality, taking all four categories into consideration and any "additional positive factors" as outlined in the MOU. Their letters must also describe which evidence they used and how they integrated evidence from different sources to arrive at each decision.

- Teaching will meet expectations when it is professional, inclusive, engaged, and research- informed. Teaching quality will be evaluated by unit heads and personnel committees according to these four standards. Quantitative summary data cannot be used as the sole standard for assessing teaching quality. Instead, evaluators will consider supervisor reviews, peer reviews, and faculty self-reflections, in addition to student comments and other materials provided in the candidate statement or teaching Material.

- Personnel committees and unit heads may use this this optional template for the Evaluation of Teaching section of their promotion letters.

- Promotion review considers all aspects of an individual's teaching: classroom instruction, including large and small classes; small group courses or activities and individual tutorials; graduate seminars; curriculum and program development; graduate student, or professional student supervision; academic advising; etc. Materials on teaching should be placed in either the primary file or in the supplementary file as indicated on the Provost's website.

- These materials must be prepared by the ASU staff, not the candidate.

Internal and External P&T Committees

- Internal Committee Membership and Charge: In accordance with your unit's governance document, the departmental committee should consist of faculty members who are at or above the rank aspired to by the candidate; appropriate faculty members from relevant units may also serve if there are not enough ranking colleagues in your unit. The internal committee's report should honestly assess both strengths and weaknesses of the case. There is a 6-page limit for this report in CAS. Their evaluation of the case will be discounted by subsequent levels of review if it appears to be advocacy for the candidate, rather than an objective evaluation. For guidance from the provost about the departmental review committee and process, see https://provost.uoregon.edu/department-review.

- External Letters: *A minimum of five letters is required*, and they should be from persons who are credible evaluators of the candidate's scholarly work. An absolute majority of external reviewers must be selected independently by the department. CAS recommends that heads initially contact 8 reviewers and only send out more if they get denials. The unit head should aim for no more than 6 letters in the file.

- External evaluators must be individuals at peer or aspirational institutions with areas of expertise similar to that of the candidate; these referees should be at or above the rank to which the candidate hopes to be promoted.
- External referees may have interacted professionally with the candidate but should not have a personal relationship with the candidate that will jeopardize the independence of the review. Any relationship must be explained in the biographies of the reviewers. Certain categories of reviewers should be excluded because they are not at "arm's length": Ph.D. advisors *and committee members*, research collaborators and co-authors during the period of review being considered, former close colleagues from their previous institution, a friend who now happens to be the president of the national organization in their field, etc.
- However, if there is a compelling reason to make an exception, the divisional associate dean should be consulted ahead of time, and an explanation should be given in the file. The remaining referees should be balanced, such that subsequent committees can be confident that they are receiving a competent and independent review from appropriate individuals.
- Reviewers should not work in unrelated areas of scholarship but need not be in the candidate's exact specialty, especially if it is a somewhat narrow subfield and the subfield sparsely populated. In fact, multiple letters from specialists in an extremely small subfield (a dozen or fewer scholars) with close working relationships to the candidate may appear to offer too much of an insider perspective or may be viewed as lacking objectivity. It is advisable to choose a range of reviewers in such cases, some from the specialization and some from the wider disciplinary context of the field.
- If you received an extremely short letter from a reviewer (a few sentences or a brief paragraph), you'll need to request some elaboration. Likewise, if you receive a merely celebratory letter that fails to discuss the merits of the case critically, you'll need to request a critical assessment of the candidate's scholarly or creative Material and impact. This is critical in cases where there are only five letters.

- <u>Information for External Reviewers:</u>

  - Heads must accurately communicate the review period under evaluation, outlining receipt of credit for prior service when applicable. Check the letter of offer for an accurate date. Generally, scholarship accomplished while at the University of Oregon, or, in the case of promotion to full professor, since the appointment to associate professor, is privileged in the P&T process, and this should be made clear to the reviewers.
  - In cases of promotion to full professor, the review includes the entire period since the candidate was awarded tenure (whether at the UO or elsewhere) and thus can vary widely from six to twenty years or more. Even if the post-tenure-review period is very long, the entire period

should be considered but with primary consideration to work done during the past six years. *The candidate should have a five- or six-year period of recent, continuous scholarly or creative activity for a strong promotion case.*

- Reviewers should receive a copy of the unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, so they have precise information about the stated standards and expectations for promotion and tenure in that unit. They should be asked to evaluate the candidate with reference to those guidelines.
- If the tenure clock has been formally stopped during the review period for any reason (e.g., for the birth or adoption of a child, illness, Covid extension, or other leave without pay), both internal and external reviewers should be informed that the appropriate time period over which the candidate's work should be evaluated does not include any such periods of leave. That is, the candidate's productivity should be judged by the effective length of the actual review period (while the clock is ticking) not the total time passed since the beginning of the review period.

- Biographies of External Reviewers: Short biographies of all external reviewers who have contributed letters to the file are required. Two or three sentences should suffice to convey why this person is an appropriate reviewer: the person's rank and institution; areas of expertise and major achievements; *and an explicit indication of the reviewer's professional relationship to the candidate, if any*. The biographies should be prepared by the department head or, at the least, by a faculty member familiar with the case and should be consistent with what the reviewers have said about their relationships with the candidate. External letters that speak of many years acquaintance with the candidate is incompatible with a bio that says "no known relationship." The unit heads may use this this optional template for biographies of external reviewers.

- Departmental Vote: Department votes on candidates should be held only after the file has been assembled and all voting members have reviewed it. Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines detail which department members vote in different types of cases. Votes should be recorded in signed, secret ballots; these are kept by the ASU associate director, or the staff member assigned to P&T support and are not made part of the file. Aggregate votes only are to be recorded in the file (in the Voting Summary page of the dossier). The individual votes may be requested by the dean, however, and if they are, the Dean's Advisory Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee, and provost's staff will have access to this information.

  All eligible voters in the unit are expected to participate in major personnel reviews and must be accounted for. Record votes of 'Yes,' 'No,' 'Abstain,' 'Recuse,' or 'Absent.'

- Department Head's Report: In addition to conveying the department's assessment of the case, the head's report should do the following to facilitate the next review steps, which are by colleagues increasingly distant from the

candidate's academic specialty. There is a 3-page/900-word limit in CAS. The head's report should provide a summary of unit process/evaluation and independent recommendation. It should not repeat other reports. There is an optional head's report template on the Office of the Provost's website.

- Explain any unusual features of the departmental vote: *Explanations are needed for abstentions, recusals, and for the absence of votes from any faculty*.

- Explain multiple-authorship conventions: In those disciplines in which co-authorship of research is common, it is essential that the candidate's statement, as well as department head's and promotion committee's reports, explain how the list of names translates to contributions. This includes, as appropriate:
  - the kinds of contributions that individual authors have made (e.g., overall intellectual leadership of a big project *vs* design and execution of a particular part of it by a colleague or student)
  - the significance of the order in which authors are listed
  - the co-authors' rank or relationship to the candidate (*e.g.* former advisors/mentors, senior faculty colleagues, junior faculty colleagues, post-doctoral fellows, Ph.D. students, or undergraduate students)
  - the frequency of single *vs* multiple authorship in the candidate's sub-field and the department's standards with respect to co-authored work

- Put the candidate's contributions in context:
  - explain where the research fits into the field and in what way it is influential
  - outline expectations regarding external funding for research—both within the field or subfield, and within the candidate's department)
  - provide standard measures of quality or appropriateness for venues of published work (publishing houses or series for books, journal rankings for articles)
  - describe the standard course load and teaching expectations in the department (including norms for class sizes), the candidate's contribution to the department's teaching mission, and any extenuating circumstances that affected the candidate's teaching record (e.g., teaching assignment policies, special releases as a result of research awards, etc.)
  - describe the candidate's contributions to institutional equity and inclusion

- Be explicit about the status of unpublished work:
  - For the UO in general, and for CAS more specifically, an article or book manuscript is properly considered for promotion if, and only if, there is (1) a commitment to publish by a journal or press, reflected in a contract or editor's letter, a copy of which is included in the file; and (2) the manuscript has been completed and requires no additional revision beyond copy editing; this must be confirmed through the inclusion in the file of a letter from the editor verifying the article's or book's status as "in production" or "in press." For these reasons, we request that the file

does not label a work "forthcoming" but rather relies on the more precise terms "in progress," "in press" or "in production."
    - If a tenure case depends on a book, but the manuscript does not meet both of these criteria, the case will likely encounter serious difficulty. Cases of promotion to full professor that depend on a book should be delayed if the manuscript does not clearly meet these criteria at the time the file is submitted.

- Be honest in assessing both strengths and weaknesses of the case. Your evaluation of the case will be discounted by subsequent levels of review if it appears to be advocacy for the candidate, rather than an objective evaluation.

Assembling the File

An outline of the file elements/content is published on the Office of the Provost's website https://provost.uoregon.edu/pt-file-elements. Unit heads should pay particular attention to these areas.

- Voting Summary: This summarizes the departmental vote and notes any unusual features. Specify number of eligible voters and number of actual voters (and remember to include explanations for any eligible voters who did not vote). If those voting included all faculty (depending on department's P&T Guidelines), break down votes by tenured and non-tenured faculty.

- Unit Promotion & Tenure Criteria: This includes a link to unit promotion and tenure policies and election of criteria, if applicable.

- Correspondence with External Reviewers:

    - *Invitations & Responses*:
        - Be sure that a complete and accurate "List of materials sent to reviewers" precedes the external letters in the file. These materials must come from the period under review, and that period should be clearly indicated to the external reviewers and to other reviewers who will examine the file subsequently. This list must provide the title of each article, book, unpublished manuscript, and any other materials sent to the reviewers. Be sure to identify the versions (signed and dated) of the statement and CV that were sent to the external reviewers.
        - The file must include a sample copy of each type of letter sent to the external reviewers. These letters include: the initial inquiry of availability; a detailed letter explaining the review itself; a letter of thanks when the review is submitted. These letters should be placed in the "External Letters" section following the record of correspondence with the outside reviewers. Required templates located here:

https://provost.uoregon.edu/external-review-letters-sample-language-082024.

- Documentation for all declines must be included in the file; place a copy of each email or letter of decline at the end of the "Evaluation Letters" section.
- If the external reviewer sends their letter electronically and it is not signed, be sure that it is accompanied by the transmittal email (this email constitutes a legal signature).

- Unsolicited and Student Letters: Unsolicited letters or emails from colleagues, community members, or students may be placed in the "teaching materials" section of the supplemental file if they are signed and dated.
- Signatures and dates: All the following should be signed and dated (an accompanying email from the candidate constitutes a signature and date in instances of electronic submission):

1. Candidate's Statement
2. Candidate's CV (each version) and all CV addenda
3. Promotion/Tenure Committee Report
4. Department Head's Report
5. External Evaluator Letters

Updating the File

- Updating the File: Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the department head about the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (including acceptance, "in production," and appearance, with the necessary documentation from press or journal editors) throughout the promotion and tenure process. Each submission should be signed and dated, and it is helpful to attach a brief explanation to ensure that its significance will be understood by reviewers outside the department. The department head should notify the divisional associate dean as such information becomes available. The candidate may update the file at any time up until the provost's decision about the case.

- OtP encourages revisions to the CV be submitted as signed and dated addenda that clearly outline the revision to the previous CV. The file must contain *all* versions of the candidate's statement and CV (and CV addenda) that have been submitted for the case; newer versions (each signed and dated) can be added, but the older versions must remain with the file.

Special Situations

- Candidate with MOU or hire with unusual expectations: Candidates who do not have typical TTF responsibilities should have a signed and dated MOU that

documents expectations that will govern job performance and evaluations. Place under Conditions of Appointment section.

- Head standing for promotion: If a department head is standing for promotion, there are two options for handling the head's letter: (1) an outside department head is invited to write the summary letter (consult with your divisional associate dean about selecting the outside head); or (2) the divisional associate dean may attend the meeting when the case is discussed and votes are cast and write an administrative summary (not an evaluation or recommendation) of the discussion and vote. The head's letter should not be written by an associate head or other department member.
- Exceptionally close relationship to the candidate: If a department head is a key collaborator with or mentor of a candidate, or has some other relationship with a candidate other than that which would be normal for a department head, then the head should consult early in the process (Winter of the pre-decision year) with the divisional associate dean about how to handle this situation.

Sources of Information

Your departmental P&T policy must be included in each candidate's file.

General university instructions for the preparation of promotion and tenure cases can be found at the Office of Provost website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/preparing-promotion-tenure-files. Another essential resource is the Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2022-2024 https://provost.uoregon.edu/collective-bargaining-agreements. In addition to these resources, we strongly encourage you to attend the heads' trainings offered by the Office of the Provost that cover our personnel review and promotion-and-tenure processes in detail.

APPENDIX: DEPARTMENT HEAD'S CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING PROMOTION AND TENURE FILES

FILE CHECKLIST and VOTING SUMMARY	
__	Names of all external reviewers are listed and spelled correctly, with date sent and date received listed
__	Names of reviewers who declined or did not respond are also listed
__	Indicate if reviewers were selected by department or candidate
__	The total number of faculty *eligible to vote* on a particular case should be recorded (not the number who ultimately voted) as well as the actual numbers of votes (Yes, No, Abstain, Recuse, Did Not Participate)
__	If there are eligible voters who did not vote, you must explain why they didn't vote in person or in absentia
__	Make sure the department vote is recorded accurately (per unit guidelines) and check that the vote corresponds with information in Head's letter
UNIT P & T CRITERIA	
__	Include unit P&T criteria
DEPARTMENT HEAD'S EVALUATION	
__	Evaluation should be signed and dated, as should be all added information
__	Must provide an independent assessment of the case – department heads should not be on the department personnel committee, nor should they vote in the department vote
__	Should provide a summary of the department discussion of the case (strengths and weaknesses) preceding the department vote
	Should provide any necessary context that is not yet part of the record. You are the last person in the candidate's discipline to provide an evaluation of the case. Key pieces of information that are often missing in the record are:
__	The standard teaching load in the department and an explanation of any course reductions the candidate received in the review period. Also, explain when and why partial-credit courses have been counted as part of the standard teaching load. The "Candidate Teaching History" template on the provost's website.
__	If the department doesn't have specified publication quantities, be explicit about how the department evaluates productivity quantitatively and qualitatively. Provide context on department standards and practices for determining whether a candidate meets productivity expectations. For example, helpful statements could refer to past successful P&T cases: "Successful candidates in the recent past have had 6-8 articles published during the review period where half or more are in a top field journal or well-regarded general interest journal." It's important that your context does not suggest evaluation criteria that are inconsistent with your P&T criteria and/or which have not been used to judge candidates in the past.
__	Provide more context on the quality of publication outlets when needed.

__	For candidates following the "book model," does an article that covers the same ground as a chapter in the book count as a separate achievement, or is it expected that the articles should be on different subjects or offer a substantially different analysis of a subject from related chapters in the book? Be explicit about the extent to which these elements may overlap.
__	For multiple-authored books and articles, explain how the discipline identifies first, second, third, etc. authors and equal authorship.
__	Evaluation of service often consists of only a list of service assignments. Make sure to assess the quality of the service provided by the candidate.
__	Include reference to the candidate's contributions to equity and inclusion, which the candidate must address in their statement.
DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE EVALUATION	
__	Personnel Committee evaluation should be signed and dated by all committee members or an electronic signature in cases of absence
POST-TENURE REVIEWS	
__	Post-tenure reviews from the review period must be included in the file for Promotion to Full cases.
EVALUATION LETTERS	
__	Sample of all correspondence with external evaluators: initial inquiry sent to reviewers and any other letters or email exchanges with the reviewers that are related to the case, charging letter with the scholarship packet, thank you letter upon receipt of evaluation
__	List of materials sent to reviewers (C.V., personal statement, P&T criteria, list of scholarship Material documents); be sure materials are from appropriate review period
__	Biographical sketches of reviewers who provided a review, noting relationship between candidate and reviewer. Confirm that sketches reflect what the reviewers have written in their letters about their relationship to the candidate.
__	Avoid claiming "no known relationship," which rarely accords with the statements about relationship in the letters themselves
__	External reviewer letters, signed and dated or an electronic email signature in lieu of an actual signature
__	Declination to review letters or emails must be included in each case, following the external reviews in the dossier
__	Any unsolicited and student letters should be in a separate marked section in the teaching section of the supplemental file
CANDIDATE C.V.	
__	C.V. should be signed and dated, as must be any new material submitted throughout the process
__	All materials should be identified by categories: Books, Articles, Websites, Book Chapters, Reviews, Conference Papers, Conference Proceedings, Other
__	For promotion to full professor, C.V. should make clear what was credited in the prior promotion to associate professor; there should be no double credit
__	C.V. should distinguish between published and unpublished materials (and should not use "forthcoming" please consult the CV guidance on the Provost's website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/resource/reviews

__	Material that is not peer reviewed should be listed separately and so indicated
__	Publications in each category should be listed in reverse chronological order, i.e., beginning with most recent and complete citation information, with inclusive page numbers given for published articles and chapters and word counts for digital publications, unpublished manuscripts, and books.
__	Works that are "in press" or "accepted for publication" may be listed with publications if the file includes letters (or emails) from press and journal editors indicating this status.
__	Works that are "in progress" may <u>not</u> be listed with publications but in a separate "works in progress" category.
__	Do not refer to publications as "forthcoming" since its meaning varies widely. Publications should be identified as "published" (with appropriate bibliographic citation), "in press," "in production," or "accepted for publication" (with documentation and expected date of publication), or "in progress" (any work that is not yet in production or in print). These should appear in appropriate sections of the CV

CV Section	Status	Documentation
Publications	Published	Bibliographic Citation
	In press, in production	Editor's letter that work is in production with no further author revisions required
Works in Progress	Accepted for publication but not in press	Date of anticipated publication
	Not accepted for publication	No documentation necessary, but word count can be helpful

__	Any recent letters from editors should be placed ahead of the most current version of the C.V.
CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT	
	Should be organized into separate sections by
__	Research – an overview and description of how the candidate's research contributes to their discipline in a way that is accessible for people who are not in the discipline
__	Teaching, which includes advising activities, both graduate and undergraduate
__	Service
__	Equity and inclusion
__	Should be signed and dated, as should any added material. Candidate's Statement guidance is on the Provost's website: https://provost.uoregon.edu/reviews/guides-forms-templates.
LETTER OF WAIVER	
__	Should include a signed letter of waiver
STATEMENT OF DUTIES	
__	Should include a list or actual statement of duties.
CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT	
__	Should include a copy of the most recent RTO if available
__	For new hires, a copy of the offer letter and tenure-clock extensions (if applicable).
__	Include addendums and any position MOUs

TEACHING EVALUATIONS
Should include courses taught and teaching data since the last promotion date
As you review colleagues whose teaching record spans the old and the new assessment systems and new colleagues whose teaching will be evaluated entirely within the new system, please follow guidance from the Office of the Provost carefully in your reviews. https://provost.uoregon.edu/pt-file-elements.
Can include list of teaching awards as well as a list of supervised dissertations, theses, and undergraduate honors papers
Note: Signed student testimonials, if you receive them, should be placed in the supplemental file
Assistant professors should have one peer review before the mid-term review, and one during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's tenure review. (minimum of three for P/T cases – signed and dated)
Associate professors must have a peer evaluation every other year
If the file does not contain at least three peer evaluations for P&T cases, one or more should be scheduled as soon as possible.
SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
Teaching Evaluation Section should contain any qualitative evaluations from students
The Scholarship material, Teaching material, Service material, and Equity and Inclusion material should contain appropriate information. Service and Equity and Inclusion materials are optional.