
Materials presented are for general informational purposes only and do not constitute official University rules, policies or practices or interpretations or summaries of such rules, policies or practices. No warranties or representations are made as to the accuracy of any information presented. Any discrepancy between the information presented here and the official rules and policies of the University of Oregon is not intended to and does not alter or amend the official rules and policies.



Promotion to Full Professor

Ken Doxsee
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

April 7, 2016



Overview

- 🔺 Process and Timetable
- 🔺 Candidate's Responsibilities
- 🔺 Department Responsibilities
- 🔺 Factors That Influence the Review of a Case File
- 🔺 Q & A



Collective Bargaining Agreement

❖ Article 20, Section 21

❖ “Process and timelines ... same as those for promotion to associate professor and tenure,” with two notable exceptions

❖ Unsuccessful consideration does not lead to terminal notice

❖ Election of criteria under which to be reviewed limited to preceding 6 years



Election of Criteria

If there has been a change in the written criteria for promotion within the preceding 6 years, the candidate may choose (and should establish in writing) which criteria document will apply.



Collective Bargaining Agreement

- ❖ Decision to undergo review not addressed (cf required notification of tenure candidates)
- ❖ Department/unit criteria expected to cover this promotion
- ❖ Service expectation specifically addressed
 - ❖ “Significant service demonstrating leadership and commitment both within and outside ... unit”
- ❖ Faculty who are not members of the bargaining unit - Intention is for all to undergo the same review process



Promotion Process and Timetable

Winter/Spring
of previous year



Preliminary Work



Decision to proceed with promotion review



Candidate's contributions to the process



Identification and solicitation of external reviewers



Department Review



Personnel Committee: usually report and vote



Vote by voting faculty (signed, secret ballot)




Department Head: report and recommendation

Early Fall



P&T Process and Timetable (cont'd)

Fall/Winter School/College Review

 Personnel or Advisory Committee (elected): report and vote

 Dean: report and recommendation

Winter / Spring University Review

 Faculty Personnel Committee (elected): report and vote

 Provost: review and decision

May 1



Expectations for Promotion

- ❖ A record of concrete achievement in research or creative practice, teaching, and service ...
- ❖ ... demonstrating a convincing likelihood of a continuing long-term career of academic excellence

Expectations for Promotion (Cont'd)

🔺 Scholarship TRAJECTORY

🔺 Activity vs. accomplishment

- 🔺 Completed vs. ongoing

- 🔺 Peer review and kinds of adjudication

- 🔺 Clarity in vita and statements

🔺 New discovery/creation vs. interpretive, teaching, and/or service contributions

🔺 Peer evaluation

🔺 (Inter)national reputation appropriate for AAU/R1 institution and your discipline



Expectations for Promotion (Cont'd)

- ❖ Clearly meet/exceed criteria for research / creative practice
 - ❖ Quality and impact of work
 - ❖ Extent of publication or other refereed accomplishment
- ❖ Clearly meet/exceed criteria for teaching
- ❖ Clearly meet/exceed criteria for service
 - ❖ Significant, demonstrating leadership and commitment within and outside department or unit
- ❖ Contributions to institutional equity & inclusion



Timing

- ❖ Unsuccessful consideration does not lead to terminal notice
- ❖ Clearly deficient research / creative practice, teaching, or service will result in denial of promotion
- ❖ Cultural “Norms” / “Readiness”

Time and Productivity Issues

❖ Early promotion vs. “timely” cases

❖ “Standard” review is for promotion following sixth year as Associate Professor

❖ Credit for prior service

❖ Expectations for early cases

❖ Outside offers not a basis for early decision (but could suggest a viable case for early evaluation)

❖ Historically, merely reaching minimal expectations not an effective basis for early promotion

❖ Recommend focus on “on-time” promotion





Time and Productivity Issues

⚡ Time vs. productivity parameters

⚡ Total record does not always equal relevant record

⚡ Materials for review should cover entire post-tenure period

⚡ However, evaluation is not simply an “integration” of this period

⚡ Time since last promotion

⚡ Time since hire (credit for prior service)

⚡ Last six years

⚡ Longer-term Associates (10+ years)



Candidate's Responsibilities

- ❖ Waiver / non-waiver letter
- ❖ Curriculum Vitae (signed and dated)
- ❖ Candidate's statement (signed and dated)
- ❖ Suggestions regarding external reviewers

Candidate's Responsibilities (cont'd)

❖ Supplemental material

❖ Scholarship portfolio

- ❖ All publications or other professional or creative accomplishments (returned after case is completed)

❖ Documentation of publications in press (or professional equivalent)





❖ Teaching portfolio

❖ Service portfolio



Waiver / Non-Waiver

Options

-  Entirely closed
-  Closed except for internal letters
-  Open except for external letters
-  Entirely open (default)



Waiver / Non-Waiver (cont'd)

- ⚡ Your decision – you should feel no pressure on this
- ⚡ A letter is required in all cases – department will prepare for you from an available template after your decision
- ⚡ Timing: waiver/non-waiver letter must be signed before external letters are solicited



Vitae

- ❖ Full profile (including teaching and service)
- ❖ Education: Include graduation dates, mentor's names
- ❖ Distinguish peer-reviewed publications from other research or writing activity
 - ❖ Present the complete bibliographic citation in the style appropriate to your field's principal journal(s)
 - ❖ Provide full lists of co-authors in the published order



Vitae (cont'd)

- ❖ Appropriately sort work in areas other than conventional publication (e.g., performances, exhibitions, etc.)
- ❖ Recommended: reverse chronological order


Vitae (cont'd)

❖ Manuscript/accomplishment status

- ❖ In press: galleys + commitment to publish (volume or date?)
- ❖ Accepted: all revisions complete, but not yet in press
- ❖ Accepted with revisions: revision + editorial decision required
- ❖ Revise and resubmit: additional review anticipated
- ❖ Submitted: no review yet completed

Vitae (cont'd)

“The Book”

-  Signed contract, manuscript complete and accepted, with no further revision (copy edit/galley proof can be pending)

Go	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Between the covers before external reviewers are contactedIn press with galleys that can be circulated and contract for publication in hand
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Completed ms plus contract
Wait	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Complete ms but no contractPartial ms with or without contract

Vitae (cont'd)

- ❖ Conferences and other appearances
 - ❖ Event, date, location
 - ❖ Distinguish peer-reviewed
 - ❖ Distinguish international
 - ❖ Recommend reverse chronological order
 - ❖ Consider placement of local contributions (e.g., guest lectures – teaching or service section?)

Candidate's Statement

- ❖ Short: perhaps 5-6 pages
- ❖ General vs. professional readership
 - ❖ Balance; display your ability to teach
- ❖ Accomplishments, current activities, and future plans for research, teaching, and service
- ❖ Evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion

<http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/node/264>



Candidate's Statement (cont'd)

- ❖ Significant focus on research and teaching; somewhat less so on service
- ❖ Consider using the statement to help the reader understand anything “unusual” in your record
 - ❖ Co-authorship contribution, author order
 - ❖ Gaps

Suggested External Reviewers

- ❖ Guidance document available from Academic Affairs website
- ❖ Candidate suggests / Department selects
- ❖ Independent preparation of suggestions
 - ❖ If appears on both lists, *not* marked as suggested by candidate
- ❖ Recommendation to candidate: suggest well-qualified reviewers unlikely to be identified by your colleagues



Teaching – Department Responsibilities

- ❖ List of courses taught
- ❖ Summary table – quantitative evaluations (including class size, percent response)
- ❖ Departmental comparison data
- ❖ List of teaching awards
- ❖ Sample evaluation form
- ❖ Copies of all quantitative summaries
- ❖ Copies of all signed qualitative comments
- ❖ Peer evaluations
 - ❖ At least one every other year since tenure




Teaching – Candidate's Responsibilities

- ❖ List of supervised students, sorted by kind and including dates and role (e.g., chair, advisor, committee member)
 - ❖ Postdoc, doctoral dissertation, masters thesis, honors thesis
- ❖ Teaching portfolio
 - ❖ Syllabi, innovative materials (including electronic), etc.
 - ❖ Illustrative, not exhaustive



Service – Candidate's Responsibilities

Service Portfolio

-  Evidence of service contributions to department (center, institute), school or college, university, profession, and the community

<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/promotion-tenure>



Factors That Influence the Review of a Case File

⚡ Timing

⚡ Early cases

⚡ Focus on “on time” or “right time” nature of review

⚡ Parental leave or leave without pay

⚡ Stops the clock for one year

⚡ Does not preclude coming up as originally scheduled



Factors That Influence the Review of a Case File (cont'd)

- ⊠ Time since last promotion
- ⊠ Time since hire/credit for prior service
 - ⊠ New Appointments with Promotions
- ⊠ **TRAJECTORY** – especially the last six years
- ⊠ Publications that contributed to tenure and promotion should not be considered again in the next promotion
- ⊠ Urge no 11th hour book status



Department Head's Role in Minimizing Complications

- ❖ Ensure department criteria explicit, transparent, and communicated
- ❖ Ensure regular input and evaluation
- ❖ Ensure regular and substantive peer review of teaching
- ❖ Advise delay if appropriate
- ❖ Advise evaluation if appropriate



Department Head's Role in Minimizing Complications

- ❖ Select strong and appropriate set of external reviewers
- ❖ Focus on record, not on person
- ❖ Prepare detached and analytical department head's report and recommendation
- ❖ Address time course of work, not just sum of work
- ❖ Ensure that confidentiality is respected
- ❖ Be timely



Q&A

Ken Doxsee
doxsee@uoregon.edu
6-2846

