Department of Linguistics
Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

Overview

Tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Oregon depend upon excellence in scholarship and teaching, as well as satisfactory service in the department, university, and larger community. Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate that they possess national or international prominence in scholarship and must excel in teaching and service, including significant contributions to department, university, and/or professional governance. Tenure-track faculty are hired with the department's confidence that they are capable of fulfilling these expectations. The following guidelines first outline the procedures involved in professional evaluations over the probationary years. They then describe the criteria for achieving a successful tenure decision and promotion to associate professor in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The final section outlines the department's expectations for promotion from associate to full professor. The guidelines do not attempt a complete account of all rules and departmental customs, and this document should be read in the context of conversations with the Department Head and appropriate members of the faculty and administration. In addition, the following publications are essential reading: the UO *Faculty Handbook* (found under Faculty on the Academic Affairs website): http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/faculty and the *Timetable and Guidelines for Recommending Promotion and/or Tenure for Faculty Members:* http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-timelines.

This document applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Linguistics are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

Department-Specific Reviews

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide and reproduced here. The specific procedures for the Department of Linguistics do not differ from those outlined by Academic Affairs.

Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review is reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an

opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the winter term of the third year for faculty members who do not enter with prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a "contract renewal review." This review involves a personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a report 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 usually lead to a three-year contract extension, which will take the junior faculty member 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. If the contract renewal review raises questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period, the faculty member may be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal review process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the Department Head will consult with members of the department and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having conflicts of interest are not asked to be externa reviewers. There must be at least five letters from external reviewers in the submitted file.

Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term of the year prior to the tenure-decision year (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of a minimum of three tenured faculty of eligible voting rank to review the candidate. If the Head determines that participation from scholars in other units is appropriate, they she may select committee members from among tenured faculty in related departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Divisional Dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external 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, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding the tenure and promotion decision. 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. In Linguistics, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

Department Meeting and Vote

The Department will hold a meeting of tenured faculty in late October to consider the committee's promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion of the report and the case, the tenured faculty shall vote by signed, confidential ballot whether to recommend tenure and promotion. When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final result. The anonymity of individual votes will be maintained, although signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.), and an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure. The Department Head's opinion may or may not agree with the department vote.

Guidelines

This section outlines the accepted criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Linguistics. The criteria provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for the promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most

recent promotion. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

Research (40%)

Excellence in scholarly research, consistent with the guidelines articulated by the UO Office of Academic Affairs (http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/), is crucial in all professional evaluations of tenure-related faculty at the University of Oregon. Consequently, tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of Linguistics requires a high level of accomplishment through publication in the candidate's field of research. Faculty are expected to work actively on projects intended for publication and to publish regularly in books, journals, and other scholarly venues that bring their research to the attention of appropriate professional audiences.

In the area of research, tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Linguistics Department depend most importantly on the quality and significance of the candidate's research record as judged by members of the tenured faculty and by a panel of outside evaluators who are experts in the candidate's fields of research. In cases where the formal evaluation by tenured faculty in Linguistics and the outside evaluators produces a negative assessment of the quality of the research profile, a positive tenure decision is unlikely at the departmental level, regardless of the quantity of publishing activity included in the tenure dossier. Alternatively, in cases where the evaluation results in a strong affirmation of the quality and significance of the candidate's research, the department may recommend tenure and promotion, whether or not the quantity of published scholarship meets departmental expectations. While the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the tenure and promotion decision, the quality of the candidate's research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.

In terms of the quantity of excellent research productivity, Linguistics refers to a "rule of thumb" expectation that a productive researcher will be producing the rough equivalent of two refereed articles or refereed book chapters per year. Obviously, however, each individual file must be assessed in its own terms. Clearly, some publications are of higher stature than others. In some cases, a single article-length publication -- especially in a premium venue -- may be considered equivalent to two or more "rule of thumb" article-length publications. Similarly, important work might for various reasons appear in more specialized venues with circulations reaching an appropriate specialized audience. It is accordingly imperative that the department evaluate the publication record in terms of the quality and importance of the individual publications rather than simply counting and ranking publication venues.

Publication can take other forms than journal articles and book chapters. An authored book generally reflects as much work as multiple "rule of thumb" articles. Again, different books may vary widely in substance, and each book will need to be individually evaluated for its contribution to the research profile. Edited collections (i.e. the candidate is an editor of a collection of articles in a book or special journal issue) are also considered important

contributions to the field, though obviously a record of original research cannot depend entirely on such contributions.

Publication in informal series, unrefereed conference proceedings, and so forth, will ordinarily count considerably less than formal refereed publications, though they may still contribute to the evidence of an active program of research and publication. Substantive encyclopedia or handbook chapters do not primarily reflect original research, but are good evidence of general scholarship and the invitation to write such chapters is indicative of the prominence of the candidate in the field.

In order for work to count towards tenure and promotion, it must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and "in production." This condition is essential with book manuscripts. The associate provost defines "in production" as the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be "in print" or "forthcoming" in order to count towards a faculty's publications. "Forthcoming" means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no substantial revisions. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each "forthcoming" publication is recommended. Generally, it is expected that the book should be "in production" and that each listed article or book chapter should be "forthcoming" by the time the candidate meets with the dean in order for the publications to count fully towards promotion.

Additional considerations that factor into a positive promotion decision at the departmental level are as follows:

Co-authored work: There are several different models of research and publication. In the humanities, scholarly work is normally single-authored. In laboratory sciences, research is conducted by teams, and publications reporting the research normally list several authors. Other models of co-authored publication include collaboration by two or three scholars, and collaborative work involving a faculty member and a student. All of these models occur within linguistics, and within our department. It is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion will specify the extent of their contribution to any co-authored work which is submitted as part of their dossier. Simple place in the order of the authors' names is not considered adequate for evaluation purposes. Participation in collaborative work is considered comparable to primary authorship if the candidate fully participated in all stages of the project from project inception to writing and revisions, as is frequently the case when a faculty advisor publishes with a student. Clearly, a work in which the candidate for promotion played a relatively small role will count less in the assessment of research productivity than one which is primarily their work. Nonetheless, multiple works of this sort may be considered equivalent to a primary-authored work.

Publication outlets: Research in linguistics is published in a wide range of venues, probably more than in many other disciplines. Research may be published in disciplinary fora (journals such as Language or Functions of Language), in area-studies outlets (e.g. Journal of the

American Oriental Society, Bulletin of the School of Asian and African Studies), or in interdisciplinary venues (e.g. a volume on migration patterns which might include contributions from historians and archaeologists as well as linguists). While particular value is placed on publication in top-tier journals, there are many possible reasons why some kinds of research are more appropriately published in less well-known specialist or regional outlets. It is expected that the departmental personnel committee and the Department Head will make every effort to evaluate the particular fora in which a candidate's work has appeared (often relying in part on the evaluation of the outside referees). A candidate can help to ensure proper evaluation of a file by including information about publication venues other than mainstream linguistics journals.

Electronic-only publications will be evaluated by the same standards as other publications. That is, publication in a refereed e-journal has the same status as publication in a similarly prestigious refereed print journal. Regardless of the medium, published scholarship that has been peer reviewed possesses more significance in the tenure decision than scholarship that has not been peer reviewed.

Grants: Grants do not substitute for publications; however, grant writing can indicate research activity and so will contribute to the perception of promise during evaluation.

Textbooks: Textbooks and teaching materials are usually better considered as part of the teaching rather than the research record. In exceptional cases, a textbook might be counted as research productivity if it includes new, previously unpublished knowledge or other significant innovation. Any textbook or similar material submitted as part of a promotion case must be accompanied by an explanation of why it should be considered as evidence of research as opposed to teaching productivity.

Promise: While publication of a substantial body of quality work is the primary goal to be pursued during the probationary period, it is essential for junior faculty to establish a research trajectory that provides evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity. Such evidence may take the form of published or forthcoming articles, grant-related activity associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans. Conference presentations also qualify as evidence of continued scholarly activity, although conference talks carry far less weight than publications and research grants in the assessment of scholarly productivity.

Teaching (40%)

Teaching is a critical area for professional evaluation, and a candidate must meet with the department's standards of excellence in teaching to be tenured and promoted.

The Linguistics Department sees excellence in teaching as comprising four related areas: (1) classroom teaching, (2) course and curriculum development, (3) thesis and dissertation advising, and (4) mentoring, general advising, and other individual and small group activities.

A core teaching activity is classroom teaching. Faculty can vary in how much teaching they do (i.e., how many courses per year), and in how it is distributed (undergraduate vs. graduate, service courses vs. major courses vs. seminars, etc.).

A second area, usually connected with actual classroom teaching, is curriculum development. Faculty may develop new courses, or in the course of teaching established courses may develop new materials, innovations, techniques, etc. which can be shared with other faculty.

A third crucial area of teaching is thesis supervision and service on thesis/dissertation committees, for undergraduate honors theses, M.A. theses, or Ph.D. dissertations. Though chairing or co-chairing a committee is significant, committee membership also may involve substantive mentoring of the student and is highly valued.

Other formal activities include formal readings courses. Linguistics faculty are often involved in organized but semi-official readings or work groups with groups of graduate and/or undergraduate students. Another teaching activity is the supervision and training of GTFs; this should be part of the teaching responsibility of the faculty member in charge of the course.

Teaching evaluation: Objective evaluation is more easily accomplished for some of these areas than for others. In evaluating teaching, we consider the following:

1. Course and materials development.

2. Peer evaluation of teaching. We weigh peer evaluations of teaching highly, as this is the most direct measure of quality of teaching and teaching competence.

3. Student evaluations. This most directly measures student satisfaction rather than teaching competence per se. Student satisfaction is in itself a desirable thing and recurrent student dissatisfaction is considered carefully. "z-scores" are not considered heavily as they are statistically unreliable with small class sizes, combine GTF and faculty evaluations, and evaluate an individual's score only relative to already high departmental standards.

4. Candidate's statement of teaching activities, teaching philosophy, and goals.

Service (20%)

In order to achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, candidates must establish a record of satisfactory service to the department, the university, the profession, and the larger community. The department attempts to limit committee assignments for untenured faculty, but all tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental

deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance of official department meetings is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department.

Committee assignments and other service responsibilities outside the department can serve as an important benefit to the university and are relevant to the service component of the tenure dossier. Satisfactory participation in departmental governance, however, is paramount.

Professional service beyond the university is relevant to the tenure review and might include delivering public lectures to community groups, serving on governing committees of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for journals and university presses, performing other editorial responsibilities with a research journal, or reviewing grant proposals. Community service and outreach activities are also relevant to the service component of the tenure dossier. While professional and community service activities bring important benefits, such activities carry significantly less weight in the tenure decision than research, teaching, and departmental and university service.

We believe that service is a critical component of a faculty member's profile, and it makes a substantive contribution to the overall health and functioning of the Department, the University and the profession. Faculty governance is the most basic cornerstone of academic freedom, so service on important university committees protects the teaching and research possibilities of all faculty. We recognize that service at one level may be a benefit to another level as well; for example, establishing cross-disciplinary networks through university service enhances the viability of the department, through greater access to resources and information, increasing exchange of students, etc.

The following guidelines are meant to help evaluate the service contributions of faculty members. For tenure, only moderate service to the department is expected. For promotion to Full Professor, service to the department, university and field is expected. Service to the community will also be highly valued if conducted.

Service to the department: A service profile at the departmental level will be highly valued if it shows commitment to core functioning of the department, as well as a serious time commitment. Examples of departmental service that are highly valued include student advising (undergraduate and graduate) and student admissions. Additionally, service work related to the American English Institute (AEI), a unit located within the Department, will be valued as service to the Department, as well as service in departmental endeavors in other areas, such as our joint programs with Hanyang University.

Service to the University: A service profile at the university level will be highly valued if it performs vital functions of the University, furthers the mission of the University, or enhances the profile of the Department within the University. Examples of university service that are highly valued include service on the DAC, FPC, University Senate, Curriculum Committee, or

Library Committee. Service on other, ad hoc university committees such as executive committees, steering committees, and institute boards may also be highly valued.

Service to the field: A service profile at the national and international level within the field of Linguistics will be highly valued if it enhances the visibility and prestige of the Department and/or performs a function that is critical to the health of the profession as a whole. Examples of professional service that is highly valued include peer-reviewing manuscripts for journals, publishing houses, grant applications and conference abstracts and papers. Journal editing, conference organizing, service (beyond simple membership) on national and international professional organizations are also considered valuable service to the field.

Service to the community: A service profile at the level of the community will be highly valued if it provides a needed service or enhances the profile of linguistics in the community at large. Examples of service to the community that are highly valued include general community education (e.g. high school senior project mentoring and outreach) and preservation and revitalization work with endangered languages (including the training of native speakers to work with their own language communities). Community service may also take the form of teacher training, workshops and lectures for the public, the preparation of pedagogical materials and literacy endeavors.

Other forms of service: The development and maintenance of publically available resources such as on-line dictionaries, databases, and software are valuable for language communities, research, and teaching. For these reasons, development of such projects will count towards community outreach, service to the field or service to the profession. On occasion, such work may also contribute to the totality of a research or teaching profile.

Post-Tenure Review

Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post- tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department

head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Linguistics expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy.

Promotion to Full Professor: Procedures

The university's procedures for promotion to full professor are described on the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide. There is no fixed probationary period leading to promotion to full professor, but faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the associate professor rank. Earlier promotion to full professor is appropriate when the accomplishments since promotion to associate professor are commensurate with promotion expectations, or in rare instances where called for in written hiring agreements. The Linguistics Department's internal procedures for promotion to full professor (regarding, for example, the selection of outside evaluators, rights of access to the promotion file, the selection of a departmental committee, meeting and voting protocols, etc.) mirror those of the promotion to associate professor, except that only the department's full professors participate in the promotion decision.

Promotion to Full Professor: Guidelines

It is expected that associate professors in the Department of Linguistics will continue to excel in all three areas of professional activity after the tenure decision. The standards for research and teaching in the evaluation of promotion to full professor are essentially the same, though with an expectation that the teaching will reflect greater experience and that the research will have a broader level of recognition within the field. There is generally an expectation of substantial service commitment for promotion to full professor both in the areas of service to the department/university (e.g. committee membership) and to the field (e.g. editorships, grant and manuscript refereeing, conference organizing).