

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

May 2016

Section 1. General Procedures and Guidelines

1.1 Overview of General Procedures and University Guidelines:

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.

1.2 Compendium of Procedures

1.2.1 Annual Review and Third Year Review:

1.2.1.1 Annual Review: Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head. These annual reviews require of the assistant professor an updated *curriculum vitae* and a statement of progress in the areas of research, teaching, and service, submitted to the department head in early spring. These reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing toward a favorable tenure decision and to offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion.

1.2.1.2 Third Year Review:

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, and placing achievements in research, teaching, and service into a coherent narrative. It should clearly address the Department's third-year expectations.

For a midterm, or third year contract renewal, in WGS, the review committee normally includes three tenured faculty members, appointed by the department head. When appropriate, a third member may come from WGS affiliated faculty. The review committee should be appointed in winter term and will conduct its review in late winter term. All members will sign their report.

The third year review 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 to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings identified in the contract renewal process.

1.3 Review Periods

- 1.3.1 Midterm Reviews:** The timing of the mid-term review generally is established at the time of appointment, usually during the last year of the faculty member's initial contract.
- 1.3.2 Assistant Professor:** An assistant professor is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service.
- 1.3.3 Associate Professor:** Associate professors are considered for promotion to full professor when they meet the criteria described in Section 2 below, often in a similar time frame as the assistant to associate decisions.
- 1.3.4 Accelerated reviews:** For either type of promotion, 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 and/or creative work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process.
- 1.3.5 Delaying an accelerated review:** 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 and/or creative work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon.
- 1.3.6 Stopping the tenure clock:** 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.

1.4 Third Year Review:

A successful review is one prerequisite for contract renewal. Review decisions will be made and communicated at least one month before the end of the initial contract. The department head will contact the faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request essential materials for the review.

During the winter term the department head will collect summary reports from the student evaluation process and a recent peer evaluation of teaching. The department head will also establish a committee of tenured faculty. The faculty committee will submit a report assessing the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion.

The department head will prepare an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion and provide their report and recommendation to the faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive materials or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The

department head will then submit the cumulative evaluation file to the appropriate dean by March 30th.

The dean will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. The dean will prepare a summary report and recommendation. The dean will share the summary report and recommendation to the faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 days from the date of receipt to provide responsive materials or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file.

As early as March 1 but by no later than April 15 the dean will submit (electronic submission is preferred) the summary report and recommendation, the department head's evaluation report and recommendation, the faculty committee report, the faculty member's vitae, statement and responsive material, as well as the contract renewal RTO (if appropriate to the case) to the senior vice provost as the provost's designee. The senior vice provost will consider the cumulative recommendations received and then decide the terms and duration of any subsequent appointment of the faculty member by approving the RTO for the contract renewal. By May 10, the senior vice provost will respond in writing to the dean the resulting decision. The RTO paperwork will then be submitted to Human Resources.

By no later than May 15 the dean (or designee) will notify the faculty member of the review decision and contract renewal. The summary report is to be placed in the faculty member's departmental or college personnel file.

For all details of the mid-term review process please refer to the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/evaluation-ttf>; the CBA, Article 20, section 7 regarding mid-term reviews; and CBA, Article 16, section 19-20 regarding notice of non-renewals for TTF.

1.5 Departmental Process and Time Line for Tenure Review

1.5.1 Winter quarter preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required:

- 1.5.1.1** The department head will contact the bargaining unit member and request the following: CV, scholarship portfolio, personal statement, teaching portfolio, service portfolio, a list of qualified external reviewers, and a statement on institutional equity and inclusion.
- 1.5.1.2** The department head will appoint a review committee comprised of at least two tenured faculty members from the department (when necessary or appropriate, a third member may come from the list of WGS participating faculty members).
- 1.5.2** Third week of April in the quarter preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required:

1.5.2.1 The following materials must be delivered to the department head:

- Final copies of the personal statement and the CV
- Waiver letter
- Scholarship portfolio
- Teaching portfolio
- Service portfolio

- Any other materials they wish to be included in the tenure file.

1.5.3 Late September of the year in which a tenure decision is required:

1.5.3.1 External reviewers submit their letters.

1.5.3.2 The department prepares the dossier;

1.5.3.3 The review committee writes and submits its report to the faculty

1.5.4 October of the year in which a tenure decision is required:

1.5.4.1 Tenured faculty members review the report and the dossier and vote

1.5.4.2 The dossier, review committee report, and the head's report are submitted to the Dean.

1.6 External Reviewers:

1.6.1 After the review committee has met and appointed a chair, the chair of that committee will consult with faculty members in the department and prepare a list of possible external reviewers who the committee chair will invite to evaluate the research record of the candidate.

1.6.2 Subsequently and independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external reviewers to the department head. The candidate is encouraged to suggest the most-qualified people in their field, including those that may not be obvious choices to non-specialists. If the candidate suggests a reviewer who independently appears on the department list, that reviewer is NOT considered to have been suggested by the candidate.

1.6.3 The candidate should avoid suggesting the names of people with whom they have had overly close relationships. Relationships such as dissertation supervisor, research collaborator within the past five years, or co-author within the past five years should be viewed as disqualifying, just as they are under federal conflict of interest guidelines. Personal relationships – close friendships, for example – are also problematic. Many other relationships are generally acceptable, though prospective reviewers who express concern about their ability to present an unbiased evaluation or are uncomfortable playing the role of an evaluator should be excused.

1.6.4 The candidate also may indicate potentially objectionable reviewers.

1.6.5 Reviewers should be at or above the rank being sought, ideally at the rank of full professor. However, an associate professor can serve as a reviewer for an assistant professor seeking promotion and tenure and even for a candidate for full professor, if that reviewer clearly represents an essential voice in the critical evaluation of the candidate's scholarly/creative practice.

1.6.6 Reviewers should be drawn from comparable institutions.

1.6.7 A minimum of at least five substantive reviews is required for a file to move forward. WGS will solicit at least eight letters from external reviewers. Five of these will be names that were not suggested by the candidate. The dossier must also include correspondence from any potential reviewers who were contacted but declined to serve. If the declination was received orally – in person or by telephone – a note to that effect should be included in the dossier.

1.6.8 If declinations to review or disclosure of overly close relationships with the candidate result in less than a clear majority of letters fitting this description, then more letters

should be sought immediately. All letters received must be included in the dossier, however.

1.7 Internal Reviewers:

The candidate may request that the committee 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/program. This review is prepared by the director(s) of the institute/center/program, in consultation with senior members and will be submitted along with the candidate's complete file in the spring quarter preceding the decision.

- 1.8 Dossier:** The dossier documents all facets of the candidate's achievements relevant to tenure and promotion. The candidate's dossier must include the following materials, as well as the five letters from external reviewers. The dossier will be managed by a staff person in the Department of Women's and Gender Studies appointed and overseen by the office manager. The dossier will include the below information as pdfs, organized in the following order:

1.8.1.1 Table of contents

- 1.8.1.2 Curriculum Vitae:** The CV must be signed and dated. It must distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, "forthcoming" or published; it must also indicate the length of all writing listed, and it must indicate which journals or books are refereed.

- 1.8.1.3 Personal statement:** The candidate is required to submit a personal statement summarizing their research, teaching, and service activities in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The personal statement should be accessible to multiple 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 3-6 page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues. The statement should include the following:

- 1.8.1.3.1** A description of the candidate's scholarship, research, or creative accomplishments, agenda, and future plans;
- 1.8.1.3.2** If applicable, an explanation of 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;
- 1.8.1.3.3** A section describing their teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity;
- 1.8.1.3.4** A discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community;
- 1.8.1.3.5** Evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The Office of Equity and Inclusion offers guidance for describing contributions to institutional equity and inclusion in this statement on their website.

- 1.8.1.4 Scholarship portfolio:** 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.
- 1.8.1.5 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.) Courses for which written student comments apply should be clearly identified.
- 1.8.1.6 Teaching portfolio:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.
- 1.8.1.7 Service portfolio:** Evidence of the candidate's service contributions to their academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession and the community. Such evidence could include white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio may also include a short narrative elaborating on the candidate's unique service experiences or obligations. syllabi and other course materials.
- 1.8.1.8 External reviewers:** letters from external reviewers (and, as appropriate, internal reviewers); a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers;
- 1.8.1.9 Waiver statement:** By Oregon law, promotion and/or tenure evaluation files are considered to be part of the candidate's personnel file and must be made available to the candidate upon request unless the candidate specifically waives access. A signed and dated document establishing the candidate's chosen waiver status for the dossier. This statement must be completed prior to departmental contact with external reviewers.
- 1.8.1.10 Additional materials:** Individuals' dossiers vary by the nature of their achievements. Other possible materials in the dossier may include evidence of awards received, a table summarizing citation counts or journal impact indicators, information about juried work, documentation of significant service contributions, copies of non-refereed publications, audio or video files, etc.

1.9 Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report:

1.9.1 Promotion and Tenure Committee: During the winter quarter preceding the year in which a tenure decision will be made, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of three tenured faculty members, at least two from the Department, for the purpose of the review. When appropriate, a third member may come from the list of WGS affiliated faculty members. For promotion to full professor, the committee must be comprised of full professors only.

1.9.1.1 This committee will be charged with:

- Selecting external reviewers,
- Ensuring the completeness of the candidate's dossier,
- Submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion;
- Recommending a decision to the department based on their evaluation.

1.9.1.2 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;
- 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 vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

1.10 Department Meeting and Vote:

The committee report will be made available to voting members at the beginning of fall quarter. External letters will be made available to voting members as they are received.

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). Only tenured faculty members are allowed to vote on tenure cases. Further, unless there are extenuating circumstances and approval for an exception has been granted by the provost or designee, only those tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought are allowed to vote – i.e., only tenured associate and full professors vote on the granting of tenure and/or promotion from assistant to associate professor, and only tenured full professors vote on promotions to full professor. Faculty members who are on leave will be allowed to vote providing they review all materials and attend the mid-to late October meeting to consider the promotion and tenure recommendation for

the candidate. Only tenured faculty members will be allowed to review the promotion and/or tenure file.

When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the office manager 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 office manager in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost.

The department head does not vote at this stage.

1.11 Department Head's Review:

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement, which may include a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship and collaboration; evidence of civic engagement; impact of creative work; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The department head's decision regarding the case for promotion and tenure 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 November 1.

1.12 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.

1.13 College and University Procedures:

1.13.1 Dean's Advisory Committee: Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty members 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.

1.13.2 Dean-level approval: 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.

1.13.3 Faculty Personnel Committee: 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.

1.13.4 Provost: 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 them. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing their 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.

1.14 Joint appointments: The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that faculty holding appointments in more than one department or school are entitled to an MOU "specifying expectations for promotion and tenure review and identifying how the tenure and promotion process will be handled among the units." This MOU must be "approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member and the Provost or the Dean(s) associated with the units. All new faculty members with joint appointments should have an MOU generated at time of offer and/or when joint appointment is identified after hire. A sample MOU appears as an appendix to this document.

Section 2. Guidelines and expectations for promotion and tenure in Women's and Gender Studies

2.1 Overview: 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.

The University of Oregon requires excellence in research for promotion and tenure, consistent with the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. The Department of Women's and Gender Studies recognizes that terms like "rigor" or "excellence" can often mask poorly defined evaluative measures tied to systems of power that have historically excluded white women, women and men of color, and other underrepresented members of the professoriate from the tenured or full professor ranks. As a field, WGS recognizes divergent and diverse contributions and works to account for what the National Women's Studies Association describes as "plural forms of research, teaching, and service that occur in multiple locations, and not just the traditional forms" (NWSA, 2016, 9). Our guidelines strive to create well-defined and transparent evaluative measures.

The field of women's and gender studies 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. Faculty members trained as interdisciplinary scholars in WGS are often evaluated by scholars trained in traditional disciplines, which can result in different expectations around tenure and promotion. One purpose of these guidelines is to anticipate these issues and insure fair and equitable standards for candidates as well as to provide general expectations of the candidate for each stage of review, promotion, and tenure and other considerations pertaining to promotion and tenure.

2.2 Third-Year Review:

2.2.1 Scholarship and Creative Work:

WGS scholarship, research, and creative work may embrace multiple genres, languages, and collaborations within and beyond the academy. WGS recognizes and values multiple forms of scholarship, from traditional written products to artistic and creative work, like film, performance, digital media, collaborative editorial work, archival research. Increasingly, scholarship in the field is produced in online journals, blogs, op-eds, policy reports, social media, and community action projects. While the below describes three possible paths toward tenure, the department recognizes that scholars may combine elements of each of these paths as well.

2.2.1.1 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, as well as any additional articles/chapters in preparation or under review. 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. Assistant professors are encouraged to consult with senior faculty and with the department head early in their careers about the venues most appropriate for their scholarship.

2.2.1.2 Creative Work and Performance:

If faculty members plan to stand for tenure based on creative work, this evidence will include published reviews of productions or performances, videos, published art work, screenplays, documentaries, etc. within the previous two and a half years, with additional material in preparation or under review. The following work is considered a proper fit for this category: writing and production of videos and films; creation and exhibition of photographic, film/video, and multi-media works; publication in creative writing; publication in popular markets, books and magazines and/or internet; editing, design, cinematography, and production of media products in all forms; public presentations based on the candidate's current and published work; and invited presentations to festivals, conventions or other venues where such dissemination provides an opportunity for substantive review. Judging of contests and festivals, related to the creative work of the candidate, is also considered in this category.

2.2.1.3 Book Manuscripts:

If candidates plan to stand for tenure with a published book, evidence in the third year could include **one** of the following:

- 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.
- 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.

2.2.2 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.

Because Women's and Gender Studies as a field takes an overtly critical approach to knowledge and power, women's and gender studies scholars often confront significant resistance in their classrooms. In assessing their teaching, in particular, the department must be mindful that teaching evaluations may reflect students' discomfort with challenges to their customary ways of thinking about their social world, especially in the context of required courses. In addition, significant scholarship has indicated that women and people of color tend to score lower on standardized evaluations. The Department of Women's and Gender Studies thus will place strong emphasis on alternative modes of evaluating teaching, like annual observations of teaching by tenured members of the department, written comments by and correspondence from students, and syllabi and other course materials.

2.2.3 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 faculty meetings.

Many faculty members in WGS hold joint appointments. When assessing contributions to service, the Department must take into account the additional forms of service faculty members perform in serving as citizens in two separate units.

Women's and Gender Studies scholars frequently engage in institution building both within and outside the Department. Faculty members' contributions to forms of institution-building that are vital for the field, the university, and local institutions will be valued in evaluating candidates for third year review and for promotion to associate and tenure.

2.3 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

2.3.1 Research:

2.3.1.1 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.

2.3.1.2 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 (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field) or exclusively through the publication of a series of articles.

- 2.3.1.2.1 Single-authored book and single-authored or co-authored articles:** If the candidate produces a single-authored scholarly or creative 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.

In addition to the book, WGS expects the candidate to have published a couple of single or co-authored articles (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field).

- 2.3.1.2.2 Articles and book chapters:** 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.

- 2.3.1.2.3 Additional evidence of activity and productivity:** We will also look for evidence of additional scholarly and/or creative activity and promise of future productivity, and evidence of a growing national scholarly or artistic reputation, such as presentations at national conferences, invitations to present 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, inclusion of faculty research, scholarship, and creative work on syllabi, and receipt of external research or art awards.

2.3.1.3 Other Research Considerations:

- 2.3.1.3.1 Miscellaneous publications:** 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).

- 2.3.1.3.2 Collaborative work:** Collaborative work is frequently more challenging than individual scholarship. WGS faculty members are encouraged to engage in collaborative research. Candidates' statements should elaborate on the role the candidate played in creating, compiling, and disseminating collaborative research.
- 2.3.1.3.3 Additional publishing venues:** In addition to traditional publishing outlets (academic presses and journals), WGS scholarship may be produced in such forums as online journals, blogs, op-eds, policy reports, peer-reviewed publications, performances, community action projects, grant applications, consulting, lectures, conference presentations, curriculum transformation projects, field-defining statements, social media, and alliance work. As media continue to change, there may be other case-specific contingencies that merit consideration.

2.3.2 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 this 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 faculty members 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 their 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.

2.3.3 Service:

While service to the department, college, university, profession, and community is essential for faculty members, WGS encourages its assistant professors to 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 faculty 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.

2.4 Post-Tenure Reviews:

2.4.1 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.

2.4.2 Teaching:

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

2.4.3 Service

Compared to assistant professors, the Department expects tenured faculty members to perform both more service, as well as service above the department level.

2.5 Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor:

2.5.1 Research:

2.5.1.1 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.

2.5.1.2 Quantity of Research:

Post-tenure publication of a single-authored scholarly book with a university press or other press possessing a solid reputation in the field and a couple of articles (the number dependent on the quality and importance of the journal or edited volume and the impact of the candidate's work on the field)

or

publication of articles and book chapters in peer-reviewed academic outlets plus a co-authored book

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, or evidence of significant creative work

and

Evidence of additional scholarly or creative activity and promise of continuing productivity,

and

Evidence of a national or international scholarly or creative 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.

2.5.2 Teaching:

- 2.5.2.1** 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.
- 2.5.2.2** 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.

2.5.3 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 faculty 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.

APPENDIX:

Sample Memorandum of Understanding for Joint Appointments:

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE JOINT APPOINTMENT OF
FIRSTNAME LASTNAME IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF DEPARTMENT 1 (50%) AND
DEPARTMENT 2 (50%) (Effective month day year)**

- 1 Home Department: Department 1 is designated the administrative home department. All office space will be provided by Department 1. Department 1 will also supply administrative support including contracts and grants administration. Where applicable, Professor LASTNAME will participate in selection of graduate students in both departments.
- 2 Teaching: Each department is responsible for funding and providing GTFs and/or graders for the courses Prof. LASTNAME teaches in that department according to the policies of that department. The departments will coordinate the hiring of the GTFs. Classes will be scheduled by the respective departments (i.e., DEPARTMENT 1 will schedule DEPARTMENT 1 classes and DEPARTMENT 2 will schedule DEPARTMENT 2 classes). DEPARTMENT 1 will remain the administering department for [name of cross-listed course], and will collect course evaluations. The normal teaching load in both departments is 30–45 lecture hours per academic year, as defined in the attached documents. Prof. LASTNAME will be expected to teach 15–20 lecture hours in each department. A regular teaching schedule of Dept1 100 and Dept1 200 (3.5 units) plus advising 15 Dept1 undergraduate students and three graduate students meet this criterion. Any future teaching assignments will be discussed between Prof. LASTNAME and the cognizant department heads.
- 3 Leaves such as sabbaticals and course releases, etc, will be approved by both departments prior to the start date of the leave.
- 4 Review of future academic personnel actions: University policy requires that with a joint appointment such as the one proposed for Prof. LASTNAME, any future reviews for advancement should be coordinated between all involved departments. Dept1 will take the lead on processing review cases. If a merit or promotion case requires an ad hoc committee, there should be balanced representation from both departments. Department 1 will get Department 2's concurrence on every review case and will then forward the case to the applicable Deans. Except in unusual circumstances, merit increases will be considered at the normal time intervals. Every effort will be made to ensure that the departments agree on whether a merit increase is justified and on the size of the increase. However, in the event that they cannot agree then each department will submit a recommendation to the cognizant Dean and they will resolve the issue.
- 5 Service: Prof. LASTNAME's departmental committee assignments will be coordinated annually between the two departments. Service in both departments will be expected to be roughly half that expected for a full FTE. Prof. LASTNAME should be prepared to participate in both departments' faculty meetings and serve on confidential ad hoc committees as appropriate. The department head(s) will take all outside service obligations into account when making assignments.

We agree to the joint appointment of Professor LASTNAME as proposed above.