

**DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES:
PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
May, 2011**

1. Procedures

1.1. 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 Romance Languages.

1.2. Compendium of Procedures

This process, while long and complicated contains many procedural safeguards for the candidate. The Romance Languages Department's policy is to hire people whom we predict will be strong candidates for promotion and tenure. The following guidelines outline the procedures involved in professional evaluations over the probationary years. They then describe the criteria for achieving a successful tenure recommendation 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 is essential reading: the *Timetable and Guidelines for Recommending Promotion and/or Tenure for Faculty Members*: <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-timelines>

1.2.1. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure recommendation and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year of regular service, candidates who do not have prior credit towards tenure will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal 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. The review should be candid and include, if necessary, specific suggestions for improvement. The Department Head will designate a personnel committee (usually composed of two tenured professors) to review the candidate's dossier, and write a report. The dossier should contain: candidate's statement, CV, teaching evaluations (including peer reviews), copies of publications, and a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors thesis committees on which the candidate has served, with an indication of whether as committee chair or as a committee member.

The tenured faculty will meet to review the personnel committee's report and the candidate's dossier. They will vote on whether or not to recommend a contract renewal for the candidate. The Head does not vote. The Department Head will write a brief report of the meeting, and state his or her own recommendation. Then, the whole file is forwarded to the Dean's office.

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 promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal 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.

1.2.2. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion and tenure in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when credit for prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire will 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 work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the promotion and tenure process. 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 work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process and consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full-time years of service at the University of Oregon. 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 process 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.

1.2.3. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the tenure and promotion year, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and prepare a list of external referees to 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; the candidate may at this time also request exclusion of potential referees. The candidate has no access to the department's list. 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. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referees' names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

1.2.4 Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver or non-waiver letter in the spring term *prior* to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access to the file fully, partially, or not at

all. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options.

1.2.5 Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several 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 with those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

1.2.6 Dossier

In addition to the letters from the external reviewers, the dossier should include:

(1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is "submitted," "forthcoming" or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications, which may include "in production" or "forthcoming" work (an unpublished work may be described on the C.V. as "in production" or "forthcoming" if it has been accepted in its final form; there must be written affirmation [may be an email] from the editor of a press for a book, the editor of a journal for an article, and the book editor for a book chapter, as to its full acceptance and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change beyond those required by the publication process); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; and (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure when new information becomes available.

1.2.7 Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty (usually 2 faculty) to review the candidate. In the spring, the committee makes a preliminary report to the tenured members of the department noting the strengths and/or weaknesses of the case. This preliminary report will include an internal 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 preliminary evaluation of the candidate regarding promotion and tenure, and make recommendations for the candidate. This report may serve as a draft for the final written report to be produced in the fall. It is not forwarded to the Dean's office.

In fall term, this committee will be charged with submitting a final written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. In particular, 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; and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding promotion and tenure.

Associate and Full Professors vote in promotion to Associate Professor and tenure case, but only Full Professors vote to recommend promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

1.2.8 Department Meeting and Vote

After all the outside letters have been received, the tenured professors read the full dossier, including publications. The department then holds 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 or not to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to Full Professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Department Head, 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 Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

1.2.9 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 case (e.g., relative importance of books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that 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 included in 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 generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for Full Professor cases.

1.3. Review after the file leaves the department

Once the file reaches CAS, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty 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, he or she 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 recommended to the Dean for a positive recommendation on promotion and, if appropriate, tenure. 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, if appropriate, tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the Dean's office for a meeting in which the Dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion to associate professor and tenure or promotion to full professor, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to his or her recommendation on promotion and tenure. 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. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

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 or 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 recommended to the Provost for promotion and, if appropriate, tenure.

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 him or her. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her 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.

2. Indefinite Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

2.1. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for departmental recommendation for promotion and tenure in Romance Languages. 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. Further details and explanations can be obtained from the Department Head, the Dean's Office, and the Provost's Office.

The Department follows the UO guidelines in reference to the expectations of a faculty member to be promoted:

- sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship in the discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative accomplishment;
- effective, stimulating teaching in the classroom and contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduates and graduate students; and
- steady responsible service and leadership to our students and our department, our university, and our professional discipline more broadly.

2.2. Literature and Culture Specialists

2.2.1. Research

Primacy of research. In making a recommendation for tenure or promotion the RL Department considers first and foremost the scholarly achievements of the candidate. This is measured primarily by the publication record. While the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the promotion and tenure recommendation, the quality of the candidate's research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.

Types and quantity of publication. Our department expects a candidate for promotion to associate professor and tenure to have made an original, important contribution to the field. Materials to be considered as part of the candidate's research profile will generally be peer-reviewed publications and may include: a book manuscript or its equivalent record of scholarly production in the form of eight or more substantial articles, critical editions, critical anthologies, book chapters and articles in edited volumes, electronic research projects and tools, essays written for a general audience, trade books, textbooks, translations, and/or pedagogically useful monographs. It is important that the majority of the record of scholarship be published by or forthcoming in major refereed journals in print or in electronic form.

Standing of publications. In general, the department expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to have a book manuscript accepted for publication at a university press (or the equivalent), or equivalent research as described above. In order for a book manuscript to be considered complete, it must be formally accepted by a professionally acknowledged press and must be "in production." "In production" indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). In order for articles or book chapters to be considered complete and therefore "forthcoming," they must be accepted for publication and require no further revisions of any kind, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). For tenure files that contain scholarly material that is not yet in print, documentation from university presses, journal editors, or book editors attesting that the manuscripts in question are "in production" or "forthcoming" is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" or "forthcoming" at the time the department meets to vote on tenure and promotion cases in late October or early November will be considered "work in progress." Although formal completion of a scholarly book or of the equivalent number of refereed articles, critical editions, critical anthologies, etc., as described above, is the usual expectation, the overall quality of the research profile remains the most important factor in the department's recommendation on promotion to associate professor and tenure

Trajectory. While having a strong publication record 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 prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity. Such evidence may take the form of published or forthcoming articles on a different project, participation at major national

and/or international conferences, success in receiving a grant or grants associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans.

2.2.2. Teaching

The Department of Romance Languages expects excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels. In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources, including a sample of course materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, homework assignments, etc.), numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and peer reviews. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review.

Written student evaluations and peer reviews will receive major consideration in the department's evaluation of the candidate's teaching. Numerical data for courses with a small number of students will not be considered reliable data. Work with graduate students (M.A. and Ph.D. exams and committees, and/or M.A. essay and dissertation direction) is expected to be part of the candidate's dossier.

Evidence of outstanding teaching will strengthen a tenure case but will not offset weaknesses in the research component of the file. Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching will definitely jeopardize promotion and tenure. The department requires that tenure-related faculty cooperate in accommodating the curricular needs of the department at all levels. It is expected that research interests will stimulate the development of new courses.

2.2.3. Service

Untenured faculty members are expected to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the department. RL policy is to assign limited service to untenured faculty. Untenured faculty must keep in mind that service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship. Creating connections across the UO campus is an important part of professional life; therefore, untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to accept some limited college or university-wide committee service with the guidance of the Department Head. However, they should not undertake time-consuming commitments on major university committees.

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

2.3. Language Teaching Specialists

Our department hires language teaching specialists (LTS) who have as a primary responsibility the supervision and development of language instruction. Their assignment varies from other RL faculty members and evaluations should reflect this difference.

2.3.1. Research

As in the case of literature and culture faculty, the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the promotion and tenure process, and the quality of the

candidate's research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.

Our department expects a candidate promotion to associate professor and tenure to have made an original, important contribution to the field. The candidate's record of publications will generally consist of peer-reviewed publications and materials that constitute original scholarship. These may include: a book or accepted book manuscript, or its equivalent in the form of eight or more substantial articles, book chapters and articles in edited volumes, electronic research projects and tools, essays written for a general audience, trade books, textbooks, and other published pedagogical materials (technological applications, national tests, videos, software, etc.) (see 2.2.1 above as to the criteria necessary for research to be considered as "in production" or "forthcoming").

2.3.2. Teaching

The LTS is evaluated using the same criteria as for literature and culture specialists. However, it is understood that the LTS, because of supervisory duties, might teach fewer courses than other faculty members. The teaching load for LTS is defined in the initial contract.

2.3.3. Administration

Language teaching specialists within the department usually carry the additional responsibilities of organizing language instruction and training and supervising the teaching staff (GTFs and instructors). Accordingly, the quality of the programs under their charge is a critical consideration in the evaluation of such faculty.

Factors to be weighed in the evaluation include (1) success in meeting the program goals (student proficiency in language and content areas), (2) effective supervision of the teaching staff that the LTS oversees, and (3) the development and improvement of the language program. While outstanding administration is indispensable for a candidate to be promoted to associate professor, it will not offset weaknesses in the research component of the file.

2.3.4. Service

Besides specific LTS administrative responsibilities, expectations remain substantially the same as those for all candidates seeking tenure and promotion in the department. In addition, because the languages taught in RL have a connection to language teaching in the community (K-12 and community colleges, for example), service related to the community will be appreciated in this evaluation.

3. Promotion to Full Professor

3.1. Preamble

The departmental procedures for promotion to full professor are largely the same as the procedures for promotion to associate professor and tenure, with the following provisions.

Associate professors may be considered for promotion to full professor beginning in the sixth year following promotion to their current rank. In general, we expect the same levels of performance in all areas, while recognizing that the emphasis within these areas may have shifted between the time tenure was granted and the consideration for promotion to full professor. It should be emphasized again that outstanding performance in teaching and/or service is no substitute for evidence of outstanding scholarship. While there is an expectation in the Department of Romance Languages

that all of our tenured faculty will be eligible for promotion to full professor, promotion is earned and not automatic.

3.2. Research

In making a recommendation for promotion to full professor, RL considers first and foremost the scholarly achievements of the candidate, measured primarily by the publication record. The department expects a candidate for promotion to full professor to have a record of publications similar to or stronger than that of a candidate for promotion to associate professor. Thus, it is expected that the candidate have a book or book manuscript that is “in production”, or its equivalent in the form of eight or more substantial published or “forthcoming” articles, critical editions, critical anthologies, book chapters and articles in edited volumes, electronic research projects and tools, essays written for a general audience, trade books, textbooks, translations, and/or pedagogically useful monographs. The department expects ongoing research activity, including broadening of scholarly range, and a high degree of visibility in the profession (national and/or international prominence in scholarship).

3.3. Teaching

The Department of Romance Languages expects a continuing record of excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels. The candidate’s file should reflect support of the curricular needs of the department at all levels and regular development of new courses. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor. The teaching file should reflect the work of an active mentor of graduate and undergraduate students (on dissertations, job file preparation, grant applications, conference and publication activity, etc.).

3.4. Service

Service is a crucial component in considering promotion to full professor. In general, the candidate will have made an important service contribution to department, university, and/or professional governance. Leadership in developing our program is expected, and strong participation in service at the university level is positively evaluated.

Service to the profession is evaluated favorably as an indication that the faculty member has the esteem of professional peers. The department recognizes book reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, review of major grant applications, service as an external tenure and promotion referee, conference organization, service in national organizations, etc., as service to the profession.