Department of Classics
Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

I. Procedures

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

B. Department-Specific procedures

i. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review 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 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.

ii. 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. 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. 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.

iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

a. 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. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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 candidate. 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. 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.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold 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 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.

e. 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 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 added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble

These guidelines outline the criteria for departmental recommendation for
promotion and tenure in Classics. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

B. Research (40%)

Excellence in research in the Classics Department is consistent with the description in the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/, and comprises a coherent publication record. This record may be manifested by either a book manuscript unconditionally accepted for publication (see below) or its equivalent in substantial articles (6-8 articles). In the case of articles (which may include book chapters, contributions to festschrifths, etc.), it is important that some of them be accepted by first-class, peer-reviewed/refereed journals. Quality as well as quantity counts. Other publications (e.g. book reviews, encyclopedia articles, festschrift contribution, essay collections) are viewed as indicating recognition of professional standing and impact on the field. Other indications of professional engagement and regard include success at obtaining external grants and acceptance of papers at professional conferences. 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. A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production” in order to count towards promotion and tenure. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. “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). Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to be counted as publications. "Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further authorial revisions or editing, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is required. 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.

C. Teaching (40%)
The Classics Department values excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Teaching duties include classroom work as well as individual student supervision and thesis committee service.

Excellence in teaching is evaluated by 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. The university has a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty’s teaching effectiveness. 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. 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.

Documentation of activities is important: keep a copy of any syllabus. Faculty are encouraged to retain a copy of any syllabus used, and should have placed one copy of such on file in the Department.

D. Service (20%)

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

i. 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.

ii. 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 their professional peers. The department recognizes reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, etc., as service to the profession.

III. Post-Tenure Review
A. 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.

B. 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 Classics 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.