

Department of Classics:

Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure
including
Procedures Governing Merit Review

June 10th, 2014

Contents:

I TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE: Guidelines for Evaluation

- A. Teaching
- B. Research
- C. Service

II DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES: Governing Promotion and Tenure Consideration

- A. Annual Reviews
- B. Third Year Review
- C. Promotion and Tenure

III COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES Governing Promotion and Tenure Consideration

IV POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR MERIT REVIEW AND SALARY INCREASES

- A. Policies for Tenure Track Faculty
- B. Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty
- C. Policies and Procedures for Career and Adjunct NTTF
- D. Documentation

I TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE: Guidelines

The Classics Department values excellence in both teaching and research. Excellence in one dimension alone may strengthen a case, but by itself will not be sufficient to guarantee tenure and/or promotion.

A. Teaching:

The Classics Department values good teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level, moreover, the department expects that tenured faculty will share departmental responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.

In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and regular classroom visits by colleagues before and during the tenure or promotion consideration process. Documentation of activities is important: Keep a copy of any syllabus used. Especially in translation courses it is in the candidate's interest to maintain a 'journal' that records lines/pages read, any particular problems in grammar or content, the use of maps, slides, etc.

B. Research:

In making a recommendation for tenure or promotion at the department, college and university levels, committees give special attention to the activity and achievements of the candidate as a research scholar. Normally, this is measured by his or her publication record. Though the publications may be on various topics, committees expect to see a coherent plan of research. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate coherence. In general, the Classics Department expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor to have accepted for publication a book manuscript or its equivalent in substantial articles (6 – 8). In the case of articles, it is important that some of them be accepted by first class, peer reviewed/refereed journals (e.g. TAPA, AJPh, Hermes, etc.). Quality as well as quantity counts. Publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship. Additionally, the record and the candidate's own statement should indicate a program, schedule and objectives of future work.

For promotion from associate to full professor, the department expects the candidate to have accepted for publication a second book or the equivalent in articles.

Translations with a strong scholarly component including a critical introduction, critical apparatus and commentary count as original scholarship.

The terms of the original appointment (the 'job description') may define the nature of publication and the process of evaluation. The publication of textbooks, for example, is

appropriate for those who were employed to fill a position with specific pedagogical responsibilities.

C. Service:

The department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the department, but in the final analysis, service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or research. Though untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to serve one or another college or university-wide committee, they should undertake such duties only on a very limited basis, if at all. No untenured faculty member will be penalized for declining to serve on committees outside the department.

In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighed heavily, and the candidate should normally have made an important contribution to the department, college and university.

Service to the profession, while not a major element in a tenure or promotion decision, is evaluated favorably and may indicate as well that the faculty member has the esteem of his or her professional peers. The department recognizes reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses etc. as service to the profession.

II DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES:

For Classics Department members, the procedure is as follows:

A. Annual reviews of untenured faculty are to be conducted by the senior faculty each May. The candidate should submit an up-to-date c.v., copies of signed teaching evaluations plus a narrative describing accomplishments and goals for the upcoming year. The department head and/or senior faculty members will make classroom visitations, review the material and write a formal statement on performance.

B. Third Year Review: In the third year of regular service, the tenured faculty will review and evaluate performance in the categories noted above. The review should be candid and include, if necessary, specific suggestions for improvement. This review should be signed by the department head and by the person reviewed. A copy will be placed in the latter's personnel file.

C. Promotion and Tenure: The candidate is normally reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of service except in unusually meritorious cases or when prior service has led to an agreement (made at the time of appointment) shortening the time to review.

1. During the spring term before a case comes up for submission, the department head will appoint an ad hoc committee of associate and/or full professors (from inside and/or outside the department) to review the candidate and make at least two classroom visits to

evaluate teaching. The committee then makes a preliminary report to the tenured members of the department noting the strengths and/or weaknesses of the case. During the late spring and summer, the department head begins to compile a dossier. We normally seek outside evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from four to six well-regarded scholars in the candidate's field. Some of these referees will be chosen from names proposed by the candidate, and the department will select others. Candidates should not choose dissertation advisers or research collaborators as referees, for this may raise questions about the objectivity of their evaluations. On-campus letters from those familiar with teaching, scholarship or service will also be sought. The candidate may or may not waive the right to see the referees' letters. Even if the candidate has waived the right of access, he or she does have the right to request a summary of the substantive comments of the letters. If the candidate selects an 'open' file, the whole file can be opened.

2. The dossier should also include all significant publications and a candidate's statement of accomplishments and objectives in scholarship, teaching, and service. The department chair will add to the dossier quantitative data from teaching evaluations, signed student comments, brief vitae of the referees, a statement of the candidate's position description, an evaluation of the journals in which the candidate's articles have appeared, and any other appropriate materials.

3. After all the outside letters have been received the appointed committee will prepare its report and recommendations (early October). All votes in the committee will be counted and reported to the department. The report of the committee shall then be circulated to the voting members of the department. In the case of promotion to associate professor with tenure, the voting members are regular faculty with the rank of associate for full professor; in the case of promotion from associate professor to full professor, the voting members are full professors. Should the committee have an 'outside' member, that person may be present for and participate in the discussion but not vote. At the end of the discussion a vote is taken by signed and secret ballot. When all votes have been received, the department secretary or designated neutral party shall inform those voting of the numerical count but preserve the anonymity of the individual ballots. If there is a major discrepancy between the discussion and the vote count the department chair must reopen the discussion. The ballots themselves will be placed in an envelope sealed and signed by the department head. Department members who have read the dossier but cannot be present at the meeting may write a letter to the department chair, stating their views on the candidate and recording their vote. The department head does not cast a vote. The envelope with the ballots will be retained in the department unless, at a later stage, they are requested by the Dean's Advisory Committee or the Provost's office.

4. The department chair then writes his or her own statement, which may or may not agree with the department's vote. This statement, the ad hoc committee's report, the recorded vote and the other materials including a brief, factual summary of the discussion in the departmental meetings are to be included in the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences usually no later than 1 November.

III COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES

The University's tenure consideration procedures are described in the university's Faculty Handbook, the Administrative Rules, the Survival Handbook on Tenure and Promotion, as well as the guidelines issued by the office of the Provost and of the Dean. These documents are usually updated each year. What follows below is a summary of the current procedures; it should not be considered definitive. It is the responsibility of the candidate to know the current regulations.

1. The Dean's Advisory Committee, elected by the CAS faculty, evaluates tenure cases in the fall and early winter. The committee may request the Dean or Associate Dean to collect more information (e.g. additional outside evaluations) or it may itself interview department members or others about a case. Its report and vote are advisory to the Dean. The Dean or the Associate Dean meets with all candidates in the College to discuss their cases after the College has completed its report. The objective of this meeting is to give the candidate a full account, within the limits of confidentiality, of the contents of the dossier and an opportunity to add new material or comments, if that is desired.

2. At this point, the case goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee, a university-wide body elected by the faculty. It normally deliberates in the late winter and spring. The report of this committee is advisory to the Provost. The Provost's decision, made with the advice of the Faculty Personnel Committee and with the department and college level reports, is the final one. There are appeal procedures in those cases where the Provost denies tenure or promotion. A final word: the tenure process, as the description indicates, is long, complicated and sometimes stressful. However, it contains many procedural safeguards for the well-being of the candidate. The Classics Department's policy is to hire people who we predict will be strong candidates for tenure and promotion.

IV POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR MERIT REVIEW AND SALARY INCREASES

This section details the merit evaluation policies and procedures for all tenure-related (TTF) and non-tenure-related faculty (NTTF), including career, adjunct, and post-doc, in Classics. All faculty must be evaluated for merit and it is not permitted to opt out. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit ranking.

A) Policies for Tenure Track Faculty:

1. Merit increases should not take into account other increases related to promotion, retention, excellence awards, etc.

2. For the merit component of salary increases, faculty will be evaluated according to the criteria below in each of the three areas of activity, and typically weighted in the following manner: 40% of the available resources will be allocated for research

productivity, 30% for the performance of teaching responsibilities, and 30% for service to the department, the university, and the profession.

a) In specific cases the weighting may be different to take into account the particular conditions and duties specified in an individual employee's contract, job description, or other agreement.

b) Although the same percentages will apply to all FTE, there will be consideration of the different service expectations for faculty at different points in their career: the appropriate level of service for a tenured professor will be different than that for an assistant professor. Also, as the University frequently specifies criteria for each round of increases, these too must be taken into account as the head makes his or her decision.

3. In order to receive a merit increase TTF are expected to meet or exceed departmental expectations in research, teaching, and service. The standard of satisfactory performance is based on the normal expectations for these categories appropriate to each faculty promotion level as outlined in the current guidelines for promotion and tenure of the Classics department.
4. **Merit in research.** The department has no set quantitative measure for annual performance (see section IB above on research expectations for promotion and tenure). In general the department values quality over quantity, and it acknowledges that there are many factors affecting scholarly rhythms from year to year. Assessment of merit is based on a profile that shows, among its elements: ongoing research activity (e.g., papers delivered, conferences attended); evidence of a sustained program of and for publication (e.g., monographs and scholarly articles, etc., as evaluated according to the department's Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure); and recognition of the faculty member's quality as indicated by the receipt of grants, honors or awards, reviews, and evidence of national and international standing in one's field. While publications count only in the year they appear, and the same work cannot count in more than one salary increase evaluation (except as specified in guidelines for a specific increase), evidence of substantial progress in research that has not yet reached publication in the evaluation period (e.g., monograph chapters, articles submitted) may count toward evidence of satisfactory performance in research. Faculty members who do not demonstrate active involvement in on-going research projects as outlined in these ways would fall below departmental expectations.
5. **Merit in teaching:** In addition to the statements and CVs submitted by faculty for the purpose of determining salary raises, the material upon which assessment is based includes numerical data compiled from student course evaluations; signed comments from student course evaluations; classroom visits by peers; and perusal of syllabi. Other possible indications of merit include teaching awards, willingness to develop or to teach new courses, major revisions of course contents and materials, attempts at new teaching methods or use of new technologies, and use of

time-tested and effective, but labor-intensive, methods. Undergraduate thesis and graduate advising (including MA thesis and dissertation advising for other departments, as well as thesis and dissertation committee membership) will also be considered under teaching. Faculty members whose student evaluations are consistently and significantly lower than the departmental averages in specific language and classics-in-translation courses (not lower in relation to the average of all the courses taught in any one particular quarter), and who do not seek to improve their teaching success through participation in the Teaching Effectiveness Program, would fall below departmental expectations of satisfactory performance.

6. Merit in Service. Willingness to share in normal departmental duties such as committee assignments, undergraduate and graduate student advising, etc., will constitute satisfactory service to the Department. Positions such as Graduate Advisor or directorship of programs will be an indication of above average service. Also of special merit will be participation in university, state, regional, and national committees. Credit will be given for service work performed for other University of Oregon departments and/or programs, such as serving on search committees, program evaluation committees, the faculty union, etc. Work on special projects, such as planning and running conferences or setting up new programs will be given special recognition. TTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below department expectations for service. The consistent failure to extend service beyond the department to college and university committees would also fall below the departmental expectations of satisfactory performance in the area of service.

7. Principles of Weighting and Rating Metric. For tenure-track faculty, each faculty member will be given a numerical score for each category of research, teaching, and service. These scores will be based, not on comparison with other faculty, but rather relative to general expectations as stated above. Each of the three categories will be scored according to the following metric:

- 0 = Does not meet expectations
- 2 = Meets expectations
- 3 = exceeds expectations

The total available pool of money for merit raises will then be divided, as specified above (section A, 2), into a 40% pool for research; a 30% pool for teaching; and a 30% pool for service. The 40% pool of available funds for research will then be divided by the total score for all the TTF in the area of research to determine what a score of "1" unit would be worth. Individual faculty members' research merit scores (0, 2, or 3) will then be multiplied by this unit's worth of merit allotment for research to arrive at the amount of the research portion of each merit raise. Similarly, the total sum score for all the TTF in the area of teaching will be divided into the 30% pool of available funds to determine the worth of 1 unit and each faculty member will receive the number of units' worth for his or her teaching. The same metrics apply to service.

B) Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty: Classics is a small department with five FTE, two of whom are married to each other. The size of the department and the connection between two of its members have led to the adoption of specific procedures. Allocations of discretionary funds for merit are distributed in the following way.

1. The department head solicits an up-to-date statement/CV from all members.
2. The department head and the faculty member review the statement/CV together in order to assess the faculty member's achievements and contributions over the designated period for review.
3. The department head will consult one of the senior and non-FTE members of the department so that all merit reviews will be undertaken jointly by the department head and a non-FTE member of the department. The senior non-FTE member of the department must be a current voting member of Classics. If such a senior member is not available, the department head will consult the head of an external department or program in the Humanities Consortium or in the division of the Humanities at large. In this case, the head of Classics will make every effort to consult with an external program or department head who has some knowledge of the unique demands of Classics as a small department.
4. The increases are reviewed by the responsible Associate Dean of CAS.
5. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.
6. Faculty may appeal to the Dean for an additional review or adjustment.

C) Policies and Procedures for Career and Adjunct NTTF

1. Because of the small size of the Classics department, the NTTF evaluations will be conducted by the Classics department head. The decision to entrust merit decisions to the department head will be confirmed annually by the faculty, or before each round of merit increases.
2. The department head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the NTTF Merit Evaluation form found on CASweb. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the department head will perform such a review to evaluate the NTTF's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties.
3. The department head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

4. For adjunct NTTF, unless other duties are specified in the contract, merit increases will be based solely on the performance of teaching responsibilities.
5. For Career NTTF, the evaluations and recommended merit increase will be weighted in the following manner: 60% of the available resources will be allocated for performance of teaching responsibilities, including the supervision of GTFs; 25% for service to the department, such as student advising; and 15% for other activities that benefit and/or bring visibility to the department. Such activities may, but need not, include participation in the local chapter of the AIA; assistance in organizing conferences or undergraduate Classics clubs; presentation of papers; publication of articles, etc.
6. Career and adjunct NTTF whose student evaluations are consistently and significantly lower than the departmental averages in specific language and classics-in-translation courses (not lower in relation to the average of all the courses taught in any one particular quarter), and who do not seek to improve their teaching success through participation in the Teaching Effectiveness Program, would fall below departmental expectations of satisfactory performance.
7. When requested, the department head will provide the department's merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.
8. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.

D) Documentation

The department head will document in a report the general procedures and deliberations undertaken by the head in consultation with the senior outside FTE voting member of Classics or with the head of another department or program in the Humanities Consortium or in the CAS Division of the Humanities. This report should include: merit evaluation procedures, the basis for the merit raises (i.e., percentages or whole dollar amounts), any special considerations or exceptions made to standard procedures, and in general terms, how the evaluations were turned into specific recommendations for merit raises. The department head will confidentially preserve, in the main departmental office of Classics, all records pertaining to the merit pay increase process and evaluation, including the categorization of each faculty member as exceeding, meeting, or falling below expectations in terms of research, teaching, and service.

Lowell Bowditch, Department Head
June 10th, 2014

