**DRAFT**

Procedures and Criteria for
Tenure, Promotion and other Personnel Actions
for Faculty Assigned to the
Linguistics Department

College of Arts and Sciences
University of Southern Maine

(Based on procedures and criteria approved for the Language Sciences
Laboratory May 93)

**Background**

The governing document for purposes of promotion and tenure for the
Linguistics Department is the agreement between the Associated Faculties of
the University of Maine (AFUM) and the Board of Trustees of the
University of Maine. The discussion and criteria here should be seen as
supplementary to the criteria for University of Southern Maine and for the
University of Maine System. This statement of policies and procedures for
faculty assigned to the Linguistics Department is to be construed as
elaborating and interpreting the AFUM agreement as it applies to
Department faculty. Nothing in this policy and procedure statement is to be
construed as contradicting the AFUM agreement or USM or Maine system-
wide criteria and procedures, especially where scheduling of review
processes is concerned.

**Peer Committee**

The Peer Committee for faculty members assigned to the Linguistics
Department will consist of all the tenure-track members of the Department,
as well as such other members as may be appointed for staggered three-year
terms by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). New
members will be appointed only with the consent of the existing committee.
The Peer Committee will have no more than six members. At such time as
there may be two or more tenured members of the Department faculty,
faculty members from other departments will be appointed to the Peer
Committee only upon recommendation of the tenured Department faculty.
member of the Department faculty may not vote on or otherwise participate in making any personnel decision affecting him or herself, except as is provided for in the procedures described below. The responsibilities of the Peer Committee vis a vis Department faculty are to make recommendations for promotion, reappointment and tenure, and to conduct such periodical reviews as are required by the AFUM agreement.

Procedures

Procedure for tenure review.

The review process that leads to a tenure recommendation is to be conducted in accordance with the AFUM agreement. The review process includes the following steps and is conducted according to the procedural guidelines set out below:

All new probationary faculty are to be given a copy of this document and the AFUM contract when they join the Department, as specified by the AFUM agreement.

The candidate’s tenure application should be constructed according to the guidelines provided by the University of Maine Board of Trustees. The application is based on the candidate’s personnel file and may contain only those materials that are consistent with the terms of Article 6 of the AFUM agreement. The tenure application should also include the following elements:

A current CV.
Copies of publications and/or creative works.
A list of citations, published discussions of the candidate’s work, information on reprint requests received and any other information the candidate can provide that reflects scholarly interest in the candidate’s work.
A statement by the candidate reviewing his/her performance and achievements to date and outlining plans for future research and publication.
A key goal for the candidate in composing this review should be to
demonstrate that the candidate has established a fruitful research program which holds clear promise for continued productivity.

A review of the candidate's teaching activity including listings of courses taught and enrollments for those courses, syllabi and other course materials, summaries of student evaluations of teaching (verified by a faculty member), lists of individual studies students have done under the candidate's supervision, lists of papers and other works that have been produced by students or in collaboration with students, lists of students who have worked closely with the candidate and who have demonstrated exceptional promise in subsequent graduate or professional work, and other indicators of the candidate's ability to be useful to students. Letters commenting on the candidate's teaching performance from students and relevant peers are helpful.

A review of the candidate's service work for the Department, university and community.

Any further materials that the candidate needs may be germane to an estimation of his or her promise for further achievement in scholarship, teaching or service to the university and community.

A list of from two to four required, well-estabished scholars at institutions outside of the University of Southern Maine that the candidate considers qualified to review his or her file. Not more than one of these individuals should have served as a member of the candidate's dissertation committee. The candidate may also submit a list of names of individuals he or she feels might not be in a position to produce a fair-minded review of the candidate's work due to prior personal or professional conflict or bias. The candidate may solicit and submit with his or her file letters from other relevant commentators as well. Letters from relevant colleagues at USM and elsewhere within the U. of Maine system are helpful and germane when people with appropriate background and training are available.

Upon receipt of the candidate's file, the Committee will assemble a list of approximately four tenured, well-established scholars at institutions outside of the University of Southern Maine that it considers well qualified to review and comment on the candidate's scholarly contributions to his or her discipline. This list must include at least two of the names submitted by the candidate. The candidate's file will be forwarded to these four individuals
together with a cover letter outlining USM’s and the Department’s goals in making tenure decisions and asking for specific comment on such other matters as the Committee may deem appropriate. The materials sent to outside reviewers will include a complete copy of the Department’s policy and procedure statement on tenure and promotion. The Peer Committee should insure that timely responses are obtained from at least three outside reviewers.

The Committee will convene to review the candidate’s file and the letters provided by outside reviewers as early as possible. The Committee will make a diligent effort to identify all factors that might militate for or against a recommendation for tenure. These issues and concerns will be enumerated and discussed in a letter to the candidate that will be delivered to the candidate at least two weeks before the Committee presents its final recommendation to the Dean of CAS.

At least one week before the Committee’s recommendation is given to the Dean of CAS the Committee will meet with the candidate in order to give the candidate an opportunity to respond to whatever comments or criticisms were raised in the Committee’s earlier letter, or to raise any other issues germane to the matter. The candidate may also add to his or her file a written response to the Committee’s letter.

If one or more members of the Peer Committee strongly objects to the Committee’s recommendation, these members may collectively or individually incorporate a minority report in the committee’s letter to the Dean.

**Procedures for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor**

The review process that leads to a recommendation for promotion for a member of the Department faculty follows the steps listed below:

A recommendation for promotion will be decided by the candidate’s regular Peer Committee.

The candidate will submit to the Peer Committee a file whose content and structure will parallel that outlined above for tenure applicants.
Upon receipt of the candidate's file, the Committee will assemble a list of at least four tenured, well-established scholars at institutions outside of the University of Southern Maine that it considers well qualified to review and comment on the candidate's contributions to his or her discipline. This list must include at least two of the names submitted by the candidate. The candidate's file will be forwarded to the individuals selected by the Committee, together with a cover letter outlining the Department's goals in making promotion decisions and asking for specific comment on such other matters as the Committee may deem appropriate. The materials sent to outside reviewers will include a complete copy of USM's and the Department's policy and procedure statements on tenure and promotion. The Committee should insure that timely responses are obtained from at least three outside reviewers.

The Committee will review the candidate's file, together with the letters provided by outside reviewers. At this time the Committee will make a diligent effort to identify all factors that might militate for or against a recommendation for promotion. These issues and concerns will be enumerated and discussed in a letter to the candidate that will be delivered not later than two weeks before the Peer Committee’s recommendation is due to the Dean.

The candidate may, if he/she chooses, submit a letter to the Committee responding to the Committee’s letter.

After giving due consideration to the candidate’s response, if any, the Committee will determine its recommendation. A letter stating this recommendation and enumerating the reasons for it will be composed promptly and forwarded to the Dean, together with the candidate's complete file. The candidate will also receive a copy of this letter and may submit a letter responding to or commenting on the final recommendation.

Beyond this step, the criteria, procedures and scheduling of promotion review are determined by college, university, and system policy.

*Procedures for periodic reviews.*
For probationary faculty.

Probationary faculty are reviewed on an annual basis.

Annual report.

Thirty days before the end of the Spring semester each year, all probationary faculty will submit a report on their activities over the last year. This will include:

A current CV.

Copies of publications that appeared during the last year or which were accepted for publication.

A list of published citations and discussions of the candidate's work that appeared in the last year, reprint requests, etc.

A statement by the candidate reviewing the progress of his or her research program and identifying the most important tasks to be undertaken in the coming year. This statement should also clearly specify the goals by which the candidate wants his or her next year of effort to be judged.

A review of the candidate's teaching and service activity for the past year and goals for the next year.

Teaching Observations

The Peer Committee will delegate one or more of its members to observe one or more classes taught by the probationary faculty member each year. Reports of these visits will be prepared as letters to the Peer Committee and will made available to the probationary faculty member.

Review.

The Peer Committee will review the report of the probationary faculty member and the Committee's own teaching observation report, and respond with written comments to the probationary faculty member by the end of the Spring semester. The Committee's responsibility will be to gauge the faculty member's progress against the criteria that govern the Peer Committee's
tenure recommendations and to advise the faculty member as to whether or not he or she seems likely to be recommended for tenure if their work continues to progress in the manner observed thus far. Furthermore, the Committee should make a diligent effort to offer whatever constructive comment it can as to how the faculty member might strengthen his or her efforts.

Report to the candidate

Where there is evidence that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress, it is the Peer Committee’s responsibility to advise the faculty member of this assessment and to offer constructive suggestions as to how the situation might be remedied.

For tenured faculty.

The procedures for periodic reviews of tenured faculty are the same as those for probationary faculty except that tenured and Associate Professors are reviewed every second year and tenured Professors every fourth year, unless the faculty member requests more frequent reviews.

Criteria

Criteria for tenure

Scholarship/Research/Publication.

The ultimate test of scholarship is its effect. Publications, presentations and creative works that are cited by other scholars, and which affect in some way the collective understanding of their topic are significant contributions to the discipline. This is the standard against which scholarship must be judged for tenure; is the candidate a productive, contributing member of a national or international community of scholars that takes an interest in the candidate’s area of expertise? If so, the candidate’s scholarship is worthy of tenure. It is in this context that reviewers must consider carefully the quality and quantity of the candidate’s work and the prominence of the journals and presses that have published it. Needless to say, funded external grants from
Federal or private organizations with rigorous review systems constitute strong evidence of scholarly achievement. Though success in scholarship is an indispensable core obligation of faculty, any fair evaluation of a candidate's scholarly promise, as indexed by prior achievements, must recognize that scholarly projects are not pursued in a vacuum. Thus in assessing a candidate's scholarly promise fairness demands that due consideration be given to the teaching and service obligations that the candidate has accepted over the relevant period. The candidate's scholarly performance is appropriately compared to that of other scholars who have borne similar teaching and administrative responsibilities in similar institutions.

Teaching.

Teaching is much harder to evaluate than scholarship. The results of good teaching are embedded in the student's mind and are inextricably mingled with knowledge and experience to which the instructor contributes nothing. As with good scholarship, the most important effects may not emerge until years later. Given these realities, the evaluation of teaching should take into account the widest possible range of indices as well as the full range of kinds of teaching that are practiced in the institution. Thus, relevant information can be gleaned not only from formal end-of-term teaching evaluations, but also from syllabi and other course materials, from letters from students, from the observations of peers who visit the instructor's classroom, from the frequency with which students enroll for courses and individual studies with an instructor, from conference papers, publications and other works done by an instructor's students, from collaborative works done with students, from the successes of students who go on to graduate or professional work in areas related to an instructor's teaching, and from other indicators. Here too, the test of effort is in its effects. The task of the Peer Committee is to determine whether the candidate has established a solid record as an effective and creative teacher who succeeds not only in conveying existing knowledge to students, but also some insights into the modes of inquiry by which it is created.

Service.

The Department and University are organized in part around the principle of faculty governance. Thus faculty members have an important responsibility to participate constructively in the management of the Department's affairs
and in the running of the university as a whole. A recommendation for
tenure should be made only for candidates who are able and willing to
contribute in these areas as well. The university serves the community at
large primarily through its efforts in research and teaching. Nevertheless,
there are other opportunities for scholars to bring their expertise to bear on
community concerns. This may take the form of publications directed to lay
audiences, public lectures to non-specialist audiences; research addressed to
current practical or policy issues, or any of a variety of other forms.
Documented contributions of this kind can strengthen the case for tenure so
long as efforts of this kind do not displace or seriously compromise the
candidate's efforts in research and teaching.

Criteria for promotion:

The relation between tenure and promotion.

As a general rule, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the
award of tenure are based on the same criteria. Except in extraordinary
circumstances, probationary faculty will be promoted to Associate Professor
only in conjunction with a recommendation for tenure.

Criteria for promotion to Professor.

Advancement to the rank of Professor should be recommended by the Peer
Committee only in cases where an individual has established a solid career
record of continuing scholarly achievement that is recognized by their
national and international peers and accepted as a significant contribution to
the individual's discipline. This record may be based on books published by
reputable scholarly presses, substantial articles published in significant peer-
reviewed journals, and such other manifestations of scholarly achievement
as may be relevant in the candidate's research area(s). There should also be
clear evidence of excellence in teaching that shows significant continuing
progress and development. A candidate for promotion to Professor should
also have compiled a record of substantial high-quality service to the
university community and to southern Maine.
Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

As noted above, the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and the criteria for tenure are the same.

Criteria for appointment and retention in tenure-track Assistant Professor positions.

The Department seeks to appoint and retain faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor only where there is good reason to believe that the individual involved will ultimately meet the criteria for tenure in the Department. There are no further or higher criteria.

Criteria for Periodic Reviews

The purpose of periodic reviews is to determine whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of professional achievement. Therefore the criteria that apply will vary with rank and tenure status. For an untenured member, satisfactory performance consists in steady progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For a tenured Associate Professor, satisfactory performance consists in progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion to Professor.