

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES: REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

1. Procedures

1.1 Preamble

This policy 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 Romance Languages are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

1.2 Department-Specific Procedures

Annual Reviews

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 promotion and tenure recommendation 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 promotion and tenure period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal review. The contract renewal 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. The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members of the department. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, 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. 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 referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

Internal Reviewers

The department may also 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. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and 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 to review the case. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty

in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other 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 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. 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 promotion to associate professor and tenure cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold a meeting in late September or early 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 promotion and tenure (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.

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.). The statement also offers a recommendation 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 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 for both tenure cases and full-professor promotion cases.

2. Guidelines

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.

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

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 their 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.

As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, personal statements by candidates for review should also include “discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion” (Section 12, Article 20).

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 for 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.

As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, personal statements by candidates for review should also include “discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion” (Section 12, Article 20).

3. Post-Tenure Review

3.2 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.

3.3 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 Romance Languages 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.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

4. Promotion to Full Professor

4.1. 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. Earlier promotion to full professor is appropriate when the accomplishments since promotion to associate professor are commensurate with promotion expectations. 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.

4.2. 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).

4.3. 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.).

4.4. 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.

As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, personal statements by candidates for review should also include “discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion” (Section 12, Article 20).