

Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese

Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

1. Initiation

In the Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese, the process of consideration for promotion to Full Professor can be initiated either by the Department Chair, or by any of the tenured Full Professors. In either case, there must be a consensus among the Full Professors that promotion proceedings be set in motion. The candidate also has the right to initiate the process, but again, there should be a consensus among the tenured Full Professors that the process be set in motion. The candidate should be aware that the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, and Provost will be looking for strong departmental support for the candidate.

This process begins in early April of the academic year before the promotion process academic year. At this time the Department Chair notifies the candidate of procedures. Also at this time, the Chair of the *ad hoc* committee (see 1.3 below) will send a letter to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences to inform him or her that promotion proceedings have been set in motion.

The Department Chair will make an effort to answer the candidate's questions about the promotion process.

1.2 As part of the initial phase, candidate will submit **a list of 8 to 10 experts external to U. Va.** who would be capable of commenting on the candidate's work. This list, which should include addresses, will be submitted by April 15 of the academic year before the promotion process academic year. Candidate should briefly specify his or her relation to each expert listed. Along with this list, the candidate will submit a *curriculum vitae*.

1.3 *ad hoc* Committee

In the Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese, two Full Professors from the department and one Full Professor from outside of the department constitute the *ad hoc* committee. The Chair of the Department recommends potential members of the *ad hoc* committee which must be approved by the Associate Dean.

2. Supporting materials to be submitted to the Department Chair by **candidate** (both hard copy and in electronic form) by June 1st:

Curriculum vitae, including a section on teaching and service that specifies: courses taught and number of students in each course, advising activities with number of advisees, undergraduate supervised thesis research; participation in administration at the departmental, university, national, and international levels; awards and fellowships.

Bibliography, as part of the CV, dividing publications into the following categories:

- a) books,
- b) articles,
- c) digital projects,
- d) popular articles and other publications,
- e) project reports.

Work accomplished since promotion to Associate Professor should be separated from the work that preceded it, upon which the earlier promotion was based.

Three copies of all publications and other relevant materials, including articles still in press and other appropriate manuscripts.

Personal statement discussing teaching and research to date, as well as teaching and research plans for the future, preferably not more than two or three pages.

Readers' reports on manuscripts submitted for publication and reviews of published work. If a candidate has a publisher's contract, a copy of it should be submitted.

3. Outside experts

Eight to ten letters from experts outside the department will be required. These letters are solicited from a list composed of names suggested by the candidate as well as names suggested by members of the *ad hoc* committee. After deciding on the list of referees, after April 15, the list needs to be submitted to the pertinent Associate Dean for approval. Chair of the *ad hoc* committee will write in neutral language to potential external reviewers (by May 1 of the academic year in which the promotion decision will be made), requesting their help and submitting the candidate's CV. At least four of the outside experts approached will be from the candidate's list. If referee accepts the task, Chair of the *ad hoc* committee will send copies of candidate's publications and manuscripts (other relevant materials) to him or her. Outside experts will receive the candidate's material upon request; they are asked to complete their evaluations by **September 15, if possible, and by October 1** at the very latest.

4. Committee Evaluation Process

The candidate's performance in research, teaching, and service will be evaluated in an *ad hoc* committee report. This report will be presented to all of the tenured Full Professors in the department, who will then vote. The Department Chair writes a letter reporting the vote of the Department and gives his/her own assessment. The *ad hoc* committee report is included among the materials submitted to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and to the University Provost.

4.1 Evaluation of Research

The standard for promotion to full professor is **excellence of scholarly work**. Members of the *ad hoc* committee will succinctly summarize and analyze the work and then judge it for its quantity, quality and significance. The criteria used to judge the significance of the work are: (a) Does the work contribute to our understanding of the material analyzed?; (b) Does the work advance our knowledge of the material? (i.e., have new aspects of the material been discovered?); and/or (c) Does the work change significantly the way one views the material analyzed?

4.2 Committee Evaluation of Teaching

The candidate's performance in teaching is evaluated in a teaching section of the *ad hoc* committee report. This section is prepared by a member of the *ad hoc* committee appointed by the *ad hoc* committee Chair. The Chair of the *ad hoc* committee also appoints a sub-committee of graduate students (at least three) to poll other graduate

students and write a summary report on the candidate's teaching and interaction with graduate students.

The standard for promotion is **excellence of teaching and advising**.

The report will examine the quality of the teaching and consider:

Record of courses taught, enrollment numbers, grade distribution and average grade whenever possible in each course; statistical and narrative summaries of student course evaluations over at least the past three years.

It will be the Department's responsibility to keep Associate Professor's student teaching evaluations until he or she is promoted.

Numbers and kinds of advisees, graduate and undergraduate.

Letters from or interviews with selected students, etc.

4.3 *Ad hoc* Committee Evaluation of Service

The candidate's performance in service is evaluated in the report by the committee. Those elements of service may include: (a) departmental service such as advising of majors or minors, service on committees such as Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee, search committees, etc.; (b) extra-departmental service on committees such as Faculty Senate, etc.; (c) Service on national committees, editorial boards, reviewing of manuscripts for national and international journals, etc.

5. Departmental Vote

The *ad hoc* departmental committee will meet with the tenured Full Professors in early November and will vote on the case. The Department Chair will tell candidate of outcome of the vote soon after the meeting.

6. Statement of Confidentiality about the candidate's materials and departmental deliberations, both oral and written:

In the Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese, only members of the *ad hoc* committee and tenured Full Professors may be privy to the candidate's materials and committee deliberations.

7. Promotion Materials for the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Provost

Whether the tenured Full Professors have made a positive or negative recommendation, the Department Chair prepares a set of promotion materials as specified by the Dean's Promotion and Tenure Committee. **See Appendix A: Arts and Sciences, "Procedures for Renewal and Promotion"** for the list of required materials. The Chair of the *ad hoc* committee is responsible for preparing the *ad hoc* committee's report, which should include a summary statement of the candidate's perceived value to the Department and the University and either a specific recommendation or a statement of the reasons for the absence of such a recommendation. Individual sections may be written by different members of the committee, but the final product should have as much substantive and stylistic coherence as possible. In

the case of split votes, the dissenting faculty members should submit a minority report, giving the specific points of disagreement. The *ad hoc* committee report should be as forthright, impartial, and objective as possible. It should attempt a reasoned balancing of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses with a view to justifying the ultimate recommendation. It should analyze the merits of the candidate's published work and career trajectory, including the promise of future research. This analysis should include thorough discussion of the specific strengths and weaknesses of each major work of scholarship. The report should be clear as to the qualities in the candidate's performance that are the basis for that recommendation; contrary evidence—including any dissident recommendations from the outside referees—should be carefully explored, and the reasons for not giving it decisive weight in the final decision should be spelled out. Committees should meet face-to-face, and as often and as long as necessary to sort out a consensus or a decision that no consensus is possible. There should be no presumption of consensus until one is actually voted. Reports will be forwarded to the Dean as written, but will be accompanied by a letter from the Department Chair summarizing departmental discussion of the report and addressing any serious discrepancy between the report and that discussion.

8. Arts & Sciences Promotions and Tenure Committee

Early in the spring semester, the Dean's Promotion and Tenure Committee will tell the Chair of any concerns it has about a candidate who has been recommended for promotion by the department. The Chair, after preparing carefully, will appear before the P & T Committee, briefly present the case, and answer any questions the Committee poses. The Committee expects the Chair to consider not just the candidate, but also the perspective and welfare of the department as a whole. The Chair may bring a member of the department who knows the candidate well.

After the Promotion and Tenure Committee votes on each candidate, the Dean decides whether or not to concur in the recommendations of the committee. The Dean informs the Chair of the decision, and the Chair immediately passes on this information to the candidate.

9. Consideration at the Provost's level:

See Appendix A: Arts and Sciences "Procedures for Renewal and Promotion"

10. Candidate who has been denied promotion to Full Professor will be reconsidered only when there is new and significant information about the candidate's case.

11. Candidate's appeal mechanism

A candidate wishing to appeal a negative decision should consult The Dean's "Procedures for Renewal and Promotion" and the *Faculty Handbook of the University of Virginia* (section on "Promotion and Tenure Policy"). The *Handbook* is available on the Provost's WEB page, (<http://minerva.acc.virginia.edu/~provost/uvap&t.htm>).

Revised March 31, 2011

Revised August 29, 2013

Revised May 5, 2014