Guidelines for Review, Contract Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure in Women’s and Gender Studies

January 2011

I. Overview of General Procedures and University Guidelines

a. Preamble

The University’s promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website
http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide
Below are specific procedures for the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews require of the assistant professor an updated CV and a statement of progress in the areas of research, teaching, and service, submitted to the Head in early spring. These reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and to offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion.

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member’s record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process. The third year review and contract renewal requires the candidate to submit a more detailed statement of progress to date, providing a context for understanding the CV, casting achievements in research, teaching, and service.
into a coherent narrative. It should clearly address third-year expectations of the Department (detailed in Section II below).

The review committee for a third year contract renewal in WGS normally includes three tenured faculty members, at least one from Core 1, appointed by the Head. When appropriate, a third member may come from outside the Steering Committee. The review committee should be appointed in winter term and will conduct its review in early spring term. Their report will be signed by all members.

ii. Review Period for Tenure and Promotion

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the Department Head who may also consult with the Dean and the Provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

iii. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate
the candidate’s record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department’s list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate’s list of recommended external referees, these referee’s names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

iv. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate’s teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the Director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

v. Candidate’s Statement

The candidate is required to submit a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. If applicable, candidates should explain the meaning of co-authorship and author order in their field, as well as the significance of any awards, fellowships, or distinctions they have received. The candidate’s personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate’s area of research. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues. Final copies of statements and the CV are to be delivered to the Head by the third week in April, along with copies of all published work since their appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor and any other materials they wish to be included in the tenure file. Also due at this time is a signed letter from the candidate indicating a desire to retain or to waive rights of access to confidential letters of recommendation and evaluation. The candidate may also submit copies of unpublished manuscripts if (1) the candidate wants these included as part of the tenure review, and (2) they represent work accepted for publication or currently under review for publication. Additional
material that might be requested from the candidate can include, but is not limited to, documentation of publication status and evidence confirming academic peer review of publications.

vi. Dossier

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate’s dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, “forthcoming” or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications; “forthcoming” work may also be included (an unpublished work may be described on the c.v. as “forthcoming” if it has been accepted and is in production; there must be written affirmation [may be email] from the editor of a press for a book, an editor of a journal for an article, and a book editor for a book chapter, as to the full acceptance of a contribution and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate’s statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

vii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of three tenured faculty, at least two from the Steering Committee, to review the candidate. When appropriate, a third member may come from outside the Steering Committee. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the Department Head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments.
departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Associate Dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate’s case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate’s work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees’ assessment of the candidate’s work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. Both Associate and Full Professors on the Steering Committee (Core 1 and 2) vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only Full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

viii. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to Full Professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

ix. Department Head’s Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The Department Head’s statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for Full Professor cases.

x. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should
consult the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/ for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the Dean’s review after the meeting with the Dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

xi. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean’s Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate’s department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the Dean.

2. After the file leaves the DAC, the Dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the Dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the Dean’s office for a meeting. In the meeting, the Dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

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

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost’s office. The Provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the Provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The Provost’s decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the Provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

xii. Additional procedures for reviews may be spelled out in the MOUs of the individual faculty for WGS, which has a number of faculty who hold joint appointments.
II. Guidelines and expectations for promotion and tenure in Women’s and Gender Studies

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate’s promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

WGS encompasses multiple disciplines and methodologies and often combines theoretical and methodological approaches and methods from more than one discipline to produce original research focused on gender and sexuality from a multitude of perspectives. Because the university historically has been structured primarily along traditional disciplinary lines, interdisciplinary research and teaching can be particularly challenging to review in personnel cases. One purpose of these guidelines is to anticipate and help to minimize these challenges.

These guidelines provide general expectations of the candidate for each stage of review, promotion, and tenure and other considerations pertaining to promotion and tenure.

Third-Year Review

1. Research
By the mid-point of the third year of faculty members’ probationary periods, they should show clear evidence of progress toward the research expectations for tenure.

*Journal Articles and Book Chapters*
If faculty members plan to stand for tenure based on articles/chapters, this evidence will include publication of peer-reviewed book chapters and/or journal articles within the previous two and a half years, with additional articles/chapters in preparation or under review. Assistant professors are encouraged to consult with senior faculty and with the Head early in their careers about the venues most appropriate for their scholarship.

*Book Manuscripts*
If candidates plan to stand for tenure with a published book, evidence in the third year could include one of the following:
(1) Substantial progress toward completion of a book manuscript based on the dissertation and a book proposal. The candidate’s third-year statement should detail changes and/or additions to the dissertation in its conversion to a book manuscript.
(2) Substantial progress toward completion of a new book manuscript separate from the dissertation, including a book proposal. The candidate’s statement should include detailed plans for its completion, with the understanding that press review should ideally begin in the fourth year.

*Additional Research*
In addition to either the article/chapter or book path toward tenure, further evidence of progress toward tenure and promotion can include a published or in-progress edited
collection and/or acceptance for publication of part of the dissertation and/or a separate study in a journal or edited collection.

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

We will evaluate teaching based on annual observations of teaching by tenured members of the Steering Committee (i.e., Core 1 plus Core 2 faculty), class evaluations by students, and syllabi and other course materials.

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

Since burdens of service in a small Department of faculty who do interdisciplinary work are substantial, the Department will consider favorably the service load in evaluating candidates for a 3rd year review and for promotion to associate and tenure.

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

Quantity of Research:
A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in WGS may represent their research in either a book and a couple of articles, or exclusively through the publication of a series of articles.

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

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

We will also look for evidence of additional scholarly activity and promise of future productivity, and evidence of a growing national scholarly reputation, such as presentations
at national conferences, invitations to speak at academic institutions, review of manuscripts for journals or presses, participation on journal or press editorial boards, receipt of external research grants or postdoctoral fellowships, published book reviews, inclusion in conference proceedings, organization of panels, roundtables, or workshops at national venues, and receipt of external research awards.

Other Research Considerations
1. There may be instances in which a scholar’s discipline requires them to produce scholarly work published in a non-traditional manner. WGS will consider for tenure and promotion creative work or performance.
2. Publication of instruction manuals, study guides, and textbooks can serve as evidence of teaching and service excellence. Research on education, pedagogy, and the teaching of Women’s and Gender Studies can serve as evidence of research excellence if it meets the requirements of other research (e.g., peer review and impact).
3. WGS faculty members are encouraged to engage in collaborative research. Candidates’ statements should elaborate on the role the candidate played in compiling and disseminating collaborative research.
4. Electronic publication may be an appropriate form of scholarship, but candidates should take care their publication venues follow the same criteria as traditional academic books and journals. Electronic publication is an emerging and rapidly changing area and will therefore require periodic re-examination for its impact on tenure and promotion standards. The following guidelines are particularly relevant for the review of scholarship digital form: a) Peer Review: Peer review is crucial. We expect reviewers to systematically compare this work with other scholarship in the field, just as we would for traditional publications. Because digital publication is still quite new, special care should be devoted to the selection of reviewers knowledgeable about the range and current direction of electronic publications, as well as traditional publications, in the field is under consideration, b) Permanence: Reviews of electronic publications should offer information about the visibility and durability of the venue in which electronic scholarship appears, c) Candidates may submit a brief, written explanation of how their electronic work compares to traditional scholarship in their field.
5. There may be other case-specific contingencies that merit consideration.

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

Multiple indicators will balance one another to provide an assessment of teaching quality. These indicators include: the candidate’s teaching statement; observations of teaching by multiple tenured members of the Steering Committee across the span of the faculty member’s probationary period; signed quantitative and qualitative class evaluations; syllabi and other course-related materials; evidence of mentoring and advising at the graduate and undergraduate levels; and awards for excellence in teaching and mentorship.
The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty member with the rank of associate or full professor during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review.

We expect on balance that consideration of these factors will indicate that the faculty member is responsible to her/his teaching obligations and students, and that the faculty member demonstrates strong teaching capabilities overall with evidence of excellence in some of the areas of evaluation.

3. Service
While service to the department, college, university, profession, and community are essential activities for faculty members, the WGS Department encourages its Assistant Professors moderate their external service until achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In particular, WGS faculty members should contribute to the governance of the Department through participation on Department committees and regular attendance at Steering Committee meetings. WGS anticipates its faculty will fulfill some requests for service on campus and in the community. While this is not required for tenure and promotion, the Department will consider favorably this extra-departmental service load in its evaluation of candidates.

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

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

3. Service
Compared to assistant professors, the Department expects tenured faculty members to perform both more service and service above the department level.

D. Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor
1. Research

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

Quantity of Research

(1) Either post-tenure publication of a single-authored scholarly book with a university press or other press possessing a solid reputation in the field or publication of a substantial number of articles or book chapters in peer-reviewed academic outlets or publication of multiple edited or co-edited scholarly collections, translations, or critical editions, and
(2) Evidence of additional scholarly activity and promise of continuing productivity, and
Evidence of a national or international scholarly presence, including some of the following: presentations at national and international conferences, invitations to speak at academic institutions, reviewing manuscripts for journals or presses, participation on journal or press editorial boards, receipt of external research grants or postdoctoral fellowships, invited book reviews, or receipt of external research awards. These three components are weighted in decreasing order.

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

The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty member with the rank of full professor every other year until promotion to full professor.

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