

Promotion and Tenure Seminar  
March 7, 2006

Raffaella Y. Nanetti, Professor of Urban Planning and Policy

**A social science perspective: process and content issues in tenure cases**

- Clarity of profiles. Different profiles are sought and needed in the social sciences, particularly in the professional fields. Bylaws incorporated into the P&T papers need to be clear about how they are defined and where the bar is set for each.
- Clarity about value of inter-disciplinary work. Inter-disciplinary work is mainstreamed in the social sciences, but it varies according to the field and the departmental expectations. Case papers ought to be specific about this aspect of a candidate's work.
- Separation of peer review and administrative review. For the sake of fairness and as a barrier against a concentration of power, it is best to have a two track review of P&T cases. Eg paper preparers should not be administrators.
- Start the process at the end of spring. Social science publications tend to be voluminous. It is important to start the process early, giving reviewers the full summer to read and write their assessments.
- Identify sub-fields of a candidate's work. Social science fields branch out. To choose appropriate reviewers, it is important that the ad hoc committee is in a position to identify the specific sub-fields in which the candidate does research.
- Prestigious but unrelated reviewers. The ad hoc committee should seek well known academics as reviewers from top departments/universities. It is essential that they not be related to the candidate in any social, personal, or professional manner. When unavoidable, the terms need to be well explained.
- Detail criteria for review. The content of the letter that goes out to the reviewers is critical. To avoid generic and shallow responses, the letter ought to specify the set of criteria reviewers that should be used in their assessment of the candidate.
- Proofread, proofread, proofread. Polished P&T papers are a good omen.