Promotion and/or Tenure Guidance

#7: The Supplementary File

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

September 30, 2014
prepared by Kenneth M. Doxsee
Office of Academic Affairs

Promotion and/or Tenure Guidance

#7: The Supplementary File

The supplementary file provides additional evidence relevant to the consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The materials contained in the supplementary file will be returned to the candidate following final action on the promotion and/or tenure review. Thus, in order to provide a record of what materials were made available to reviewers, we recommend that a table of contents for the supplementary file be prepared and included as the final page in the primary dossier. This need not be exhaustive, but might include a full list of any publications or recordings included in the scholarship portfolio and summaries of other items contained in the file – *e.g.*, "photographs of candidate's artistic creations," "program notes from candidate's performances," *etc*.

Please provide in the supplementary file the following documentation.

a. ***Full curriculum vitae for external reviewers (if provided).*** The formal request for external evaluation should include a request to provide a curriculum vitae (CV). Any CVs received in response to this request should be included here, not in the primary file, which should provide only a brief biographical sketch of the reviewers, as detailed in a previous guidance document. If a reviewer does not provide a CV, it is not necessary to reiterate the request; simply provide those CVs that were received.

b. ***Scholarship portfolio (required).*** The scholarship portfolio, which is provided by the candidate, presents comprehensive evidence of the candidate's professional activity – *i.e.*, scholarship, research and creative activity – and appropriate evidence of the candidate's national or international recognition or impact. The portfolio typically includes such evidence as copies of published books and manuscripts, recordings of performances or productions, photographs of works of art, installations or exhibits, program notes, *etc*. It is both permissible and advisable for the candidate also to include evidence of work in progress in order to assist reviewers in ascertaining the likelihood for future productivity and success. Such materials will typically be at an advanced stage; most commonly included are manuscripts currently under review.

If the scholarship record includes as an indication of completed scholarship (as opposed to work in progress) a book that has not yet been published, the file must include 1) a copy of the signed contract for publication, and 2) a copy of the completed manuscript, which must be in final form – *i.e.*, not subject to further revision beyond galley proofing or indexing.

c. ***Signed written student evaluations of teaching (required, if available).*** The online teaching evaluation system provides evaluation packets, including a quantitative summary pages and written student comments, for each course taught by the candidate. (The instructor has access to *all* student comments; the Department should have access *only* to those student comments that were signed.) Inclusion in the supplementary file of the entire packet for each course, including the quantitative summary pages, is acceptable and often preferred, in that it facilitates file preparation and more clearly identifies the courses for which written student comments apply. Evaluations carried out prior to Winter term, 2008, received hand-written student comment sheets – those that were signed should be included here. *Please ensure that the following requirements are met:*

1. *written student comments are **not** included in the primary dossier;*

2. *only **signed** student comments are included in the supplementary file; and*

3. ***no** summary or evaluation statements associated with the review quote from unsigned evaluations.*

d. ***Teaching portfolio (optional, but highly recommended).*** The teaching portfolio, which is provided by the candidate, should be representative, not comprehensive. Candidates often include sample course materials such as syllabi, exams, homework assignments, *etc*, in order to illustrate their approaches to and innovations in teaching. Other materials, such as websites for courses and other presentations of teaching efforts and innovations, may also be included.

e. ***Service portfolio (required).*** The service portfolio, which is provided by the candidate, should provide evidence of the candidate's service contributions to his or her academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession and the community. (Note that a candidate is not expected to have contributed service at all of these levels.) As this portfolio is a relatively new addition to the promotion and/or tenure review process, more extensive guidance is provided here – but note that each portfolio (scholarship, teaching, and service) should have been provided by the candidate well before the process has reached the stage of departmental review. (The CBA calls for the department head to request these materials from the candidate during the Winter term of the year preceding the full review.)

Additional guidance for the service portfolio was prepared and disseminated as part of the CBA implementation effort. For your convenience, that information is reproduced here.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement between United Academics and the University of Oregon describes requirements associated with non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) review and promotion and tenure-track faculty (TTF) review and promotion in Articles 19 and 20, respectively.

The submission of a *Service Portfolio* is required for TTF files for promotion and/or tenure, and, if applicable, for NTTF promotion files. The *Service Portfolio* documents the candidate's contribution to the university, profession, and community. The portfolio should not be comprehensive of all that is listed in the "Service" category on the CV, but rather provide evidence of the candidate's service. Each candidate's appropriate level of service will differ based upon his or her professional responsibilities as defined by the candidate's job description and the unit workload policies.

The *Service Portfolio* may contain several examples of service to the university, which can include university committees, elected bodies, advisory groups, task forces, and/or other activities serving the university's mission. The *Service Portfolio* may also contain examples of service to the profession and community.

Documentation of service can be included, such as white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation.

The *Service Portfolio* may include a short narrative elaborating on the candidate's unique service experiences or obligations. Candidates may wish to comment on the significance and quality of their work and provide a rationale for the choice of examples in the portfolio, the significance of those choices, the role played by the candidate, and the amount of time devoted to the activity.

Unlike the primary dossier, which is retained for ten years (as called for by State records retention law), the materials in the supplementary file are returned to the candidate following final action on the promotion and/or tenure review. Many of the materials included in the supplementary file are provided by the candidate, to whom these materials – which may include copies of published books and manuscripts and/or recordings of performances or productions – should be returned. However, the supplementary file generally also includes confidential materials, in particular, the CVs of the external reviewers. Thus, careful review is required before returning any materials to the candidate, to ensure no inadvertent disclosure of confidential information.

Guidance document #8 will address department-level reviews, recommendations, and reports, as well as final preparation and submission of the dossier for the next stages of review.