

Meaning of Excellence in Research and Teaching across the College of Arts and Sciences

University of Oregon's policy mandates that criteria used for promotion and tenure reflect the University's primary functions: Instruction; Research, scholarly, creative or artistic achievement; and service to the University and the public. Each department in CAS has a policy that defines these criteria for its particular discipline, and provides descriptions of evidence that can be used to show that a faculty member is meeting the standard set by the University. In general, excellence in scholarship is more clearly articulated than excellence in teaching. For excellence in research, themes appear consistently throughout the policies. However, there is also considerable variation in the substance of the materials considered and the detail used to describe appropriate evidence.

Across departments, the form and avenue of scholarly publication is prescribed in a manner consistent with the discipline. Scholarly work might take the form of peer reviewed articles published in refereed journals¹; creative works published in popular market books and magazines;² or software systems that are widely regarded as important.³

Generally, scholarly excellence is described as mature, well regarded, high quality body of research. Some departments expect to see a program of "independent, scholarly research,"⁴ while others place a "particular value on interdisciplinary research and collaboration across diverse fields."⁵ While expectations of faculty are guided by the norms and expectations of their disciplines, the faculty member's contributions to, and impact on a discipline are a consistent benchmark for excellence.

Many departments set expectations that a faculty member should produce a minimum number of publications (usually one book or 6-8 articles over a three year period). Some departments recognize that the standard publication timeline might be inappropriate for a candidate's sub-discipline or area of research. For example, the Ethnic Studies Department states that "extensive archival research or fieldwork that could only be conducted over several years will necessarily take longer to appear in print than other types of research."⁶ Further, most departments state that the quantity of publication is a criteria that is secondary to the quality of publication. The Department of East Asian Language and Literature exemplifies this sentiment with their statement that "[quantity] is taken as an indication of the consistency of one's production, and [quality] reflects whether or not this work meets professional standards and makes a contribution to a field."⁷

The quality of a candidate's research can be evidenced by traditional indicators such as the quality and reputation of the publisher, citation ratings, or special awards. Quality can also be evidenced by research funding, although the importance and weight of research funding in evaluating excellence is correlated to the realities of funding available to certain disciplines.⁸

¹ This is a criteria in many departments including, German and Scandinavian Studies, Linguistics, Mathematics, romance languages, and comparative literature.

² Promotion and Tenure Policies: Women & Gender Studies at 6.

³ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Computer Information Science at 4.

⁴ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Earth Sciences at 4.

⁵ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Environmental Studies at 5.

⁶ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Ethnic Studies at 5.

⁷ Promotion and Tenure Policies: East Asian Language and Literature at 4.

⁸ For instance, external funding is expected in Physics and computer information science, external funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research is crucial in earth sciences and human physiology, but

Finally, excellence in scholarship and research is shown by “the promise of future productivity including a broadening of scholarly range.”⁹ Creative Writing prescribes a fairly specific path through a hierarchy of publications that shows a faculty member’s body of work is on a “developing arc.”¹⁰ Other departments describe a coherent body of research, positive trajectory, work that is in progress, or significant research plans as indicators of a continuing commitment to excellence.

While scholarly excellence typically has concrete benchmarks and descriptions of the evidence used to evaluate objective criteria, teaching excellence is generally less well defined. Rather than try to describe what excellence in teaching is, many departments describe their methods of evaluating teaching (peer, student, and self-review) or their expectations for a faculty member’s class load.¹¹

Where excellence in teaching is more defined, it is described as effectiveness in the classroom, commitment to mentoring graduate and undergraduate students, and consistent evidence of development of teaching techniques and syllabi in order to stay current with developments in the field. The Women and Gender Studies Department expects excellence in teaching to include challenging students’ customary ways of thinking, and thus explicitly puts less emphasis on student evaluations as indicators of excellence.

In reviewing the standards used to evaluate faculty excellence in scholarship and teaching across the college of arts and sciences, a coherent picture of excellence in research appears. The wide variety of disciplines means that this picture is a mosaic made up of very different criteria. However, the expectation that the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences are producing a body of academic work that pushes their discipline forward and establishes a scholarly reputation that reflects well on the University is universal. The written policies provide a less clear picture of what excellence in teaching looks like in CAS, however, certain departments have articulated their vision of excellent teaching in a way that could be used throughout the college.¹²

external funding does not “directly figure into research excellence” in Ethnic Studies, although it may contribute indirectly, and many departments do not mention funding as an indicator of excellence at all.

⁹ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Comparative Literature at 4.

¹⁰ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Creative Writing at 4.

¹¹ Promotion and Tenure Policies: Environmental Studies at 6.

¹² Creative Writing, International Studies, Physics, Women and Gender Studies, Computer Information Science, and Earth Sciences are examples of departments that have a fuller description of excellence in teaching written into their policies.

Table of Contents

CREATIVE WRITING	2
EARTH SCIENCES	4
EAST ASIAN LANGUAGE & LIT.	6
ECONOMICS	8
ENGLISH	9
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	10
ETHNIC STUDIES	11
GEOGRAPHY.....	13
GERMAN & SCANDINAVIAN.....	15
HISTORY	16
HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY	17
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES.....	18
LINGUISTICS	20
MATHEMATICS.....	21
PHILOSOPHY	22
PHYSICS.....	23
RELIGIOUS STUDIES.....	24
ROMANCE LANGUAGES	25
THEATER ARTS	26
WOMEN, GENDER & SEXUALITY STUDIES	26
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE	28
COMPUTER INFORMATION SCIENCE	30

Creative Writing

Standard: Creative Work and Research (40%)
(creative writing, p.4)

Criteria: (a) a book or books published since hire with a nationally recognized press or presses, including fine small presses or (b) a series of coherent and/or related quality publications since hire in nationally recognized literary or commercial magazines judged to be significant by peers at the University and experts at other institutions.
(creative writing, p.4)

Criteria: evidence of a continuing commitment to creative work and research as evidenced by a body of work that is in progress and significant work being planned.
(creative writing, p.4)

Criteria: there must be a coherent plan of creative work and research and a focused plan of publication
(creative writing, p.4)

Evidence: responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate this coherence and focus
(creative writing, p.4)

Evidence: publications should be on a developing arc, moving from regionally significant periodicals to nationally known ones.
(creative writing, p.4)

Criteria: indicate a program, schedule, and objectives of future work
(creative writing, p.4)

Criteria: have a book published by, or accepted and “in production” at a nationally recognized press during the period since they were hired
(creative writing, p.4)

Evidence: work carried out while a member of the University of Oregon faculty will be given significantly more weight in the tenure and/or promotion decision than those resulting from work carried out prior to hire.
(creative writing, p.5)

Criteria: A candidate for promotion and tenure might begin by publishing in online and/or regional quarterlies, move to university quarterlies and/or online journals of note, then culminate with appearances in elite print periodicals of highest merit
(creative writing, p.5)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: A steady publication record is evidence of research progress.
(creative writing, p.5)

Criteria: full professor, the program expects the candidate to have accepted for publication another book or the equivalent in periodical publications since they were promoted to the rank of associate professor
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: Although the program considers translations, particularly those of book-length, to be important accomplishments, they cannot be used as a substitute
(creative writing, p.5)

Standard: Anthologies and textbooks also matter. However, they fall within the category of national service (as does journal or magazine editing) rather than research and publication.
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: within the genre in which a candidate was hired are far more important than publications in other genres or published works of criticism.
(creative writing, p.5)

Criteria: associate professor seeking promotion to full professor may present a case based upon publications in many genres, including criticism and non-fiction.
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: Quality and coherence are central,
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: Honors and awards like fellowships from the Guggenheim, NEA, and Whiting are important indications of accomplishment
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: National prizes are also indications of excellence in this area, as are regional prizes, although the latter carry less weight.
(creative writing, p.5)

Evidence: participation on literature and writing panels at major national conferences (MLA, AWP, Bread Loaf, Sewanee), lectures and readings at colleges and universities and major cultural centers (e.g., the Library of Congress, Smithsonian, 92nd St. Y), and non-promotional television and radio appearances. All of these count as secondary indications of national standing.
(creative writing, p.5)

Standard: values excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
(creative writing, p.6)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Criteria: purposes of tenure and promotion, it is graduate teaching that is weighted most heavily since the reputation of the Program rests with its MFA.
(creative writing, p.6)

Criteria: (1) excellence in the workshop and seminars, (2) effective participation in conferencing and thesis hours, (3) strong performance in creating and evaluating the MFA exams and in advising students preparing for those exams, and (4) integrating the candidate's classroom performance and expectations into the overall curricular scheme of the program.
(creative writing, p.6)

Evidence: should involve maintaining high standards of creative excellence (evidenced, for instance, in student publications or writing prizes) and academic knowledge.
(creative writing, p.6)

Criteria: informed not only by contemporary practices but also by the candidate's knowledge of canonical and even international literary approaches
(creative writing, p.6)

Evidence: syllabi, numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, letters from successful former students, and regular classroom visits by colleagues
(creative writing, p.6)

Earth Sciences

Standard: Research (40%)
(earth sciences, p.4)

Standard: expected to establish a high quality research program and generate new knowledge in their sub-disciplines,
(earth sciences, p.4)

Standard: Development of a program of independent, scholarly research is a requirement for being recommended for promotion and the granting of tenure.
(earth sciences, p.4)

Criteria: how significantly the research has impacted their discipline through the publication of scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals.
(earth sciences, p.4)

Evidence: evaluated by leaders in the discipline external to the University of Oregon.
(earth sciences, p.4)

Evidence: evaluate the magnitude of success in securing research funding through application for competitive, peer-reviewed grants, and the recognition that comes from invitations to present

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

research at scholarly meetings, discipline--specific workshops, and other universities
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Evidence: Other data, such as awards from professional or scholarly organizations, and citations of the candidate's work by others, may also be considered
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Criteria: Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly agenda and progress through a program of research that is developmental and advances a field of inquiry
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Evidence: Perceptions from nationally recognized experts regarding the path and scope of a faculty member's research are generally used to document the faculty member's research progression
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Evidence: Evidence from the faculty member's personal statement i
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Standard: Teaching (40%)
(*earth sciences, p.4*)

Standard: must demonstrate excellence in their teaching
(*earth sciences, p.5*)

Criteria: Effectiveness of instructional delivery methods ii. Quality of curriculum/course design iii. Quality of evaluation/assessment of student learning iv. Quality, impact, and quantity of advising and mentoring
(*earth sciences, p.5*)

Evidence: Student evaluations enable us to assess a faculty member's ability to (a) create a positive learning environment, (b) engage and challenge students, and (c) provide intellectual leadership. The Department of Earth Sciences uses a version of the on-- line course evaluation form that contains University--wide questions and narrative statements, plus four additional questions relating to the instructor's effectiveness in challenging and engaging the student, knowledge of the subject, and quality of the assigned readings.
(*earth sciences, p.5*)

Evidence: These evaluations include a classroom visit and a review of teaching materials such as class packets, syllabi, problem sets, internet resources etc.
(*earth sciences, p.5*)

Criteria: high quality advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research or other participatory learning experiences.
(*earth sciences, p.5*)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: Evidence of the quality and impact of advising and mentoring may include a tabulation of thesis or dissertation supervision, written evaluations from peer and external evaluators regarding student research, written testimony from current and former students, and evidence of student success after degree completion
(earth sciences, p.5)

East Asian Language & Lit.

Standard: Research
(east asian lang. & lit., p.3)

Standard: Scholarship is evaluated both by quantity and quality.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.3)

Evidence: The former is taken as an indication of the consistency of one's production, and the latter reflects whether or not this work meets professional standards and makes a contribution to a field (or fields).
(east asian lang. & lit., p.3)

Criteria: A positive departmental recommendation requires a book published by a scholarly press and typically 2-3 articles in major journals, or alternately a
(east asian lang. & lit., p.3)

Criteria: number of substantive articles, typically 8-10, published in major journals.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Criteria: cohesive body of scholarship and demonstrate a mastery of a particular area.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Evidence: chapters in books will be treated as the equivalent of a journal article if peer reviewed,
(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Evidence: Literary and scholarly peer-reviewed translations from Chinese, Japanese or Korean will be counted as scholarship when they include a strong scholarly component (critical introduction, critical apparatus, commentary, etc.).
(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Evidence: The following may also constitute original scholarship: critical editions, critical anthologies, and electronic research tools.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Evidence: co-authored publications, it is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion will specify the extent of their contribution to any co-authored work that is submitted as part of their dossier

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(east asian lang. & lit., p.4)

Evidence: Participation in collaborative work is considered comparable to primary authorship if the candidate fully participated in all stages of the project from project inception to writing and revisions
(east asian lang. & lit., p.5)

Evidence: Book reviews may indicate recognition in one's field and contribute to a file in this respect, but they do not count as scholarship per se
(east asian lang. & lit., p.5)

Evidence: Papers presented at professional meetings and grant activity are encouraged and certainly do add to a scholarly profile, both for the research they may contain and what they reflect of activity in and contribution to a field, but they do not equate with published work.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.5)

Evidence: The citation record of the candidate might not be considered a reliable measure of the candidate's scholarly impact depending on the nature of the research. In no case shall a citation record disadvantage candidacy for P&T.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.5)

Standard: Teaching
(east asian lang. & lit., p.5)

Standard: The key criterion is excellence.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Criteria: includes student evaluations (both numerical and written comments), peer reviews, syllabi, and class materials.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Evidence: Originality may be a factor here as it pertains to developing courses and class materials, or to applications of technology
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Evidence: range of courses taught over the years leading to the tenure review
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Standard: expect our faculty to teach at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and to be highly effective in large lecture courses as well as in seminars.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Criteria: Advising and supervising graduate students and undergraduate majors is an important facet of teaching in EALL

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Evidence: measure of excellence and impact of teaching is the quantity and quality of participation on graduate committees, the supervision of undergraduate honors theses, and/or the offering of independent research courses.
(east asian lang. & lit., p.6)

Economics

Standard: Research
(economics, p.4)

Standard: mature, high quality, research program is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure in the economics department.
(economics, p.4)

Criteria: The primary indicator of research productivity is a proven record of published research, and the primary outlet for scholarly output in our discipline is refereed journal articles.
(economics, p.4)

Criteria: A secondary indicator of research productivity is the development of a substantial body of research that is under review and in progress.
(economics, p.4)

Evidence: research (published and unpublished) is deemed high quality by both internal and external reviewers
(economics, p.4)

Evidence: Other secondary indicators include invited lectures, conference presentations, research fellowships, and grant awards
(economics, p.4)

Standard: Teaching
(economics, p.4)

Standard: A demonstrated record of high quality teaching is an absolute requirement to gain tenure in the economics department
(economics, p.4)

Criteria: assesses quality of teaching through peer evaluation of classroom teaching, numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, supervision of student research (both at the graduate and undergraduate levels), solicited letters from students, a review of syllabi and exams for all courses taught, and analysis of course results such as enrollments and grade distributions.

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(economics, p.4)

Criteria: each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding
(economics, p.4)

English

Standard: Research
(english, p.3)

Criteria: quality and significance of the candidate's research record as judged by members of the tenured faculty and by a panel of outside evaluators, who are experts in the candidate's fields of research.
(english, p.4)

Criteria: completion of a scholarly book or of an equivalent number of refereed articles is the usual expectation
(english, p.4)

Criteria: essential for junior faculty to establish a research trajectory that provides evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity
(english, p.4)

Evidence: evidence may take the form of published or in-production articles on a different project, success in receiving a grant or grants associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans
(english, p.4)

Evidence: Conference participation also qualifies as evidence of continued scholarly activity
(english, p.4)

Criteria: Scholarly productions in forms other than print (for example, projects in film, video, or multimedia platforms) are evaluated according to prevailing standards in relevant research areas
(english, p.5)

Evidence: although a very important distinction is made between academic publications that have been rigorously peer refereed by scholars in the field and those that have not received such evaluation.
(english, p.5)

Standard: Teaching
(english, p.5)

Standard: The usual expectation for promotion and tenure is an established record of excellence in the classroom

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(english, p.5)

Evidence: The Department also takes into consideration evidence of teaching development, such as participation in the Teaching Engagement Program or other activities intended to improve teaching performance.

(english, p.5)

Criteria: examines the entire teaching profile, including the candidate's record of course-development activity, supervision of graduate and undergraduate independent work, and mentoring of GTFs.

(english, p.5)

Environmental Studies

Standard: Research

(environmental studies, p.5)

Criteria: Environmental Studies places particular value on interdisciplinary research and collaboration across diverse fields, so work of this nature that may not fit with the standard expectations in traditional disciplines will receive special consideration in Environmental Studies

(environmental studies, p.5)

Evidence: interdisciplinary research and collaboration receive special recognition, and the standards of what constitutes excellence in research will be guided by what is expected in the field that is most closely associated with the candidate's work.

(environmental studies, p.5)

Evidence: The quality (as measured by the peer review process, the publication venue, and the significance as judged by internal and external reviewers) of scientific publications is of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity.

(environmental studies, p.5)

Evidence: External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research in the candidate's sub--discipline is crucial; however, the Department does recognize that the average funding available in different sub-- disciplines of chemistry varies.

(environmental studies, p.5)

Evidence: citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered.

(environmental studies, p.5)

Evidence: we expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of

(environmental studies, p.5)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Evidence: all cases, evidence of a positive trajectory of research accomplishments is expected.
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Standard: Teaching
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Standard: Excellence in teaching in Environmental Studies includes an ability and willingness to teach at a variety of levels from large lower division undergraduate courses to upper division undergraduate courses, to graduate core classes.
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Criteria: a person teach in all of those areas in a given year, but that based on the needs of the program and the skills of the individual faculty member, teaching in all of those areas are possible.
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Evidence: judged by a convergence of data including: peer teaching evaluations conducted by faculty, quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations, and records and course documents compiled by the faculty member including things such as syllabi, exams, course website, assignments, activities and personal statements
(*environmental studies, p.6*)

Ethnic Studies

Standard: Research
(*ethnic studies, p.4*)

Criteria: publication of a single--authored peer--reviewed scholarly book with a university or trade press appropriate
(*ethnic studies, p.4*)

Criteria: publication of a substantial number of single-- or first--authored articles or book chapters(not book reviews, comments, or dictionary or encyclopedia entries) in peer--reviewed academic outlets.
(*ethnic studies, p.4*)

Criteria: a candidate must demonstrate evidence of additional scholarly activity or promise of continuing productivity and evidence of a growing national or international scholarly presence.
(*ethnic studies, p.4*)

Evidence: evidence of originality, importance, and impact or promise of impact in the field. Indicators of these factors can include reports from external evaluators, citations of a candidate's published

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

work, and venue of publication.
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: External grant funding does not directly figure into research excellence; however, it may contribute indirectly through the publication of articles.
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: Conference attendance and other professional activities that are signs of professional regard (e.g., editorial activities) may constitute evidence
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: Nature of scholarship can also mediate quantitative expectations
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: extensive archival research or fieldwork that could only be conducted over several years will necessarily take longer to appear in print than other types of research.
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Criteria: Faculty members in ethnic studies are encouraged to engage in collaborative research, although this does create a practical problem for evaluation of research.
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: urged to keep documentation of one's degree of participation in collaborative projects.
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: status in the field (potential impact) and peer review (intellectual rigor)
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Evidence: they must demonstrate proof that manuscripts and book chapters have passed through a rigorous, academic peer review process before publication
(ethnic studies, p.5)

Standard: Teaching
(ethnic studies, p.6)

Criteria: Multiple indicators of teaching quality will balance one another to provide an assessment of teaching quality
(ethnic studies, p.6)

Evidence: teaching statement, observations of teaching by multiple tenured faculty members across the span of the faculty member's probationary period, class evaluations by students, syllabi and other course
(ethnic studies, p.6)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: looks for excellence at promoting critical thinking about the role of race and ethnicity in society and at encouraging students to articulate their own, independent analyses.
(ethnic studies, p.6)

Geography

Standard: Research (40%)
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: Physical geographers typically publish in specialty journals, the majority of which are outside of the discipline, and rarely are junior faculty members the authors of books or monographs
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: Peer-reviewed articles in important journals or edited volumes are widely viewed by physical geographers as the appropriate method for distributing new information.
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: Scholarly output for human geographers can range from the production of a book or monograph to peer-reviewed journal articles to some combination of the two.
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: Human geographers writing journal articles often publish much of their work in disciplinary journals, but extra-disciplinary publication is acceptable and encouraged, where appropriate.
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: Because of the emerging nature of this part of the discipline, development of teaching materials and advancement of curricular matters in GIScience are also of academic importance.
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: presentation of theoretical and methodological advancements in geographic techniques, and publication of maps or compilations of maps in paper or as on- line atlases.
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: peer-reviewed articles in journals both within geography and in related disciplines
(geography, p.4)

Criteria: are generally recognized as the primary medium for reporting the results of research
(geography, p.5)

Criteria: single- or lead-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume. Single or lead-authored books or monographs that present the author's original research are also a form of scholarly output in geography
(geography, p.5)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: The quality of the journal and/or publisher as well as the overall quantity of publications will be taken into consideration.
(geography, p.5)

Evidence: Instead, we emphasize the appropriateness of publication outlets, and the quality of individual journals as perceived by external reviewers.
(geography, p.5)

Evidence: publications of significance and quality; • participation in conferences, conventions, seminars and professional meetings; and • research in progress and substantially planned work.
(geography, p.5)

Evidence: holding office and serving on committees of relevant professional organizations; serving on the editorial boards of relevant journals; acting as a reviewer of peer-reviewed articles and grant proposals within one's area of expertise; and • recognized evidence of scholarship, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the re-publication of work.
(geography, p.6)

Criteria: The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor with indefinite tenure is the establishment of a significant research program, distinct from unrelated research projects.
(geography, p.6)

Evidence: evidence of growth, impact on the field (for example, work that opens new lines of investigation), and future promise.
(geography, p.6)

Evidence: This theme would be recognized as significant by peers and external referees and would tend to be identified with the faculty member being evaluated if continued over time.
(geography, p.6)

Evidence: Evidence for the satisfaction of this criterion could include a continued stream of publications, a second monograph, or other longer scholarly work, that builds on the work begun prior to promotion to Associate Professor, or that represents the development of a secondary research focus.
(geography, p.6)

Standard: Teaching (40%)
(geography, p.6)

Criteria: classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation; • supervision of student research; and • academic advising, consultation, and informal teaching
(geography, p.6)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: encouraged to make contributions to the definition of educational objectives and the development of teaching and evaluative materials that reflect current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory
(geography, p.7)

German & Scandinavian

Standard: Research
(german & scandinavian , p.3)

Standard: Normally, this is measured by their publication record. Faculty are expected to publish regularly.
(german & scandinavian , p.3)

Criteria: the primary goal should be to have a completed, peer-reviewed, authored book manuscript accepted for publication at a university or similar academic press.
(german & scandinavian , p.3)

Evidence: 6--10 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters may well result in a successful tenure case, but the publication of a monograph along with some peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters articles (two or more) makes a stronger case for promotion.
(german & scandinavian , p.3)

Evidence: articles required depends on their length, substantive quality, impact and visibility, and also the volume and quality of other less directly related published work
(german & scandinavian , p.4)

Evidence: translations, critical editions, critical anthologies, and electronic research tools when they include a strong scholarly component
(german & scandinavian , p.4)

Criteria: For a strong case for tenure, the candidate should have a book, completed and accepted for publication, as well as some articles published in major refereed, peer-reviewed scholarly journals. Publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship, as evaluated by recognized experts in the field according to current standards.
(german & scandinavian , p.4)

Criteria: Additionally, the record and the candidate's own statement should indicate ongoing scholarly activity, attendance and participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future productivity.
(german & scandinavian , p.4)

Standard: Teaching
(german & scandinavian , p.5)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Standard: excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level
(german & scandinavian , p.5)

Standard: share departmental responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.
(german & scandinavian , p.5)

Criteria: Department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, a sample of course materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, homework assignments, etc.), and classroom visits by colleagues. 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.
(german & scandinavian , p.5)

Criteria: Special note will be taken of mentoring and supervision of graduate students and of advising and supervision of undergraduate students.
(german & scandinavian , p.5)

History

Standard: Scholarship
(history, p.4)

Criteria: Normally, excellence in research is measured by the candidate's publication record.
(history, p.4)

Criteria: expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to have either a published book or a completed manuscript that has been accepted for publication by a reputable press
(history, p.4)

Criteria: For example, individual scholarly profiles may lead to a pattern of publishing substantial articles rather than books. In other cases, in subfields of the discipline where the publication of scholarly articles is the prevalent and accepted practice, a number of substantial articles may fulfill this requirement.
(history, p.4)

Evidence: is unlikely that fewer than six to eight would be viewed as a scholarly equivalent to a book in print or accepted for publication.
(history, p.4)

Evidence: highly regarded and peer-reviewed outlets.
(history, p.4)

Evidence: must make significant contributions to scholarship in the judgment of outside referees in the

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

candidate's field
(*history, p.5*)

Standard: Teaching
(*history, p.6*)

Standard: excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Moreover, the department expects in most cases that tenured (and in many cases untenured) faculty will share department responsibilities for large introductory courses as well as more specialized, upper--division classes
(*history, p.6*)

Criteria: including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and classroom visits by colleagues before and during the process of consideration for tenure and/or promotion.
(*history, p.6*)

Evidence: candidates should keep copies of syllabi and other course materials used. Teaching materials developed in electronic form should also be included in the teaching file and, whenever possible, should be evaluated in the medium for which they were produced.
(*history, p.6*)

Human Physiology

Standard: Research (60%)
(*human physiology, p.4*)

Criteria: The primary venue for publication of scholarship in our field is as scientific articles in established, peer-reviewed journals
(*human physiology, p.4*)

Evidence: we rely upon external evaluations to help judge a faculty member's productivity and the quality of his or her contributions relative to the norm in the sub-discipline.
(*human physiology, p.4*)

Evidence: External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research in the candidate's sub-discipline is crucial;
(*human physiology, p.4*)

Evidence: External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered.
(*human physiology, p.4*)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Criteria: expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue
(human physiology, p.4)

Standard: Teaching (30%)
(human physiology, p.4)

Criteria: Supervision and mentoring of graduate students working on graduate student thesis projects. • Supervision and mentoring of undergraduate students who participate in undergraduate research projects. • Supervision and mentoring of postdoctoral scholars or physicians during their temporary appointments as research associates.
(human physiology, p.5)

International Studies

Standard: Research (40%)
(international studies, p.5)

Standard: engaged in ongoing research and publication of significance in their fields of inquiry,
(international studies, p.5)

Criteria: with relevance across disciplinary boundaries and for appropriate international audiences.
(international studies, p.5)

Evidence: Quality depends in part on reputation and selectivity of journals, citation impact, extent of readership, scholarly awards, republication, and assessment of peer reviewers, internal and external, among other factors
(international studies, p.5)

Evidence: Publication in venues (journals and presses) appropriate for one's primary discipline is important, as is publication in venues relevant for interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary engagement
(international studies, p.5)

Criteria: A consistent trajectory of ongoing scholarly engagement,
(international studies, p.5)

Evidence: ongoing field research, paper presentations at conferences (with attention to selectivity of acceptances), invited addresses (at other universities, symposia, conferences, etc.), research in progress and substantially planned work, regular and constructive use of sabbaticals and leaves of absence.
(international studies, p.5)

Criteria: A coherent process of cumulative intellectual development

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(international studies, p.5)

Evidence: project or theme builds upon previous efforts, to establish an ensemble of scholarship that contributes to understanding of important international phenomena and/or the development of theoretical tools for such understanding.

(international studies, p.5)

Criteria: Emergence of a body of work that contributes to a national and international reputation for the faculty member.

(international studies, p.5)

Evidence: publishing in languages and locales relevant for one's areas of interest, as well as international collaboration.

(international studies, p.5)

Standard: Teaching (40%)

(international studies, p.6)

Criteria: International Studies courses should help students "de- center" from their familiar contexts, experiences and worldviews, in part by learning about realities and perspectives from other parts of the world and other cultural frames.

(international studies, p.6)

Evidence: faculty should regularly revise and update their curriculum and materials, and develop new course offerings as appropriate.

(international studies, p.6)

Criteria: faculty should be actively advising graduate students and beginning to chair International Studies MA committees

(international studies, p.6)

Criteria: CI

(international studies, p.7)

Criteria: Course evaluations by students

(international studies, p.7)

Evidence: Enrollment trends for classes taught by the candidate

(international studies, p.7)

Evidence: Evidence of innovativeness in teaching

(international studies, p.7)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Linguistics

Standard: Research (40%)
(linguistics, p.4)

Standard: requires a high level of accomplishment through publication in the candidate's field of research.
(linguistics, p.4)

Standard: Faculty are expected to work actively on projects intended for publication and to publish regularly in books, journals, and other scholarly venues that bring their research to the attention of appropriate professional audiences.
(linguistics, p.4)

Criteria: most importantly on the quality and significance of the candidate's research record as judged by members of the tenured faculty and by a panel of outside evaluators who are experts in the candidate's fields of research
(linguistics, p.4)

Criteria: "rule of thumb" expectation that a productive researcher will be producing the rough equivalent of two refereed articles or refereed book chapters per year.
(linguistics, p.4)

Evidence: single article--length publication ---- especially in a premium venue ---- may be considered equivalent to two or more "rule of thumb" article--length publications
(linguistics, p.4)

Criteria: An authored book generally reflects as much work as multiple "rule of thumb" articles
(linguistics, p.4)

Evidence: Participation in collaborative work is considered comparable to primary authorship if the candidate fully participated in all stages of the project from project inception to writing and revisions, as is frequently the case when a faculty advisor publishes with a student. Clearly, a work in which the candidate for promotion played a relatively small role will count less in the assessment of research productivity than one which is primarily their work. Nonetheless, multiple works of this sort may be considered equivalent to a primary--authored work.
(linguistics, p.5)

Evidence: Research may be published in disciplinary fora (journals such as Language or Functions of Language), in area--studies outlets (e.g. Journal of the
(linguistics, p.5)

Evidence: American Oriental Society, Bulletin of the School of Asian and African Studies), or in interdisciplinary venues (e.g. a volume on migration patterns which might include contributions from historians and archaeologists as well as linguists).

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(linguistics, p.6)

Evidence: grant writing can indicate research activity and so will contribute to the perception of promise during evaluation
(linguistics, p.6)

Standard: essential for junior faculty to establish a research trajectory that provides evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity.
(linguistics, p.6)

Evidence: Evidence may take the form of published or forthcoming articles, grant--related activity associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans.
(linguistics, p.6)

Standard: Teaching (40%)
(linguistics, p.6)

Criteria: is curriculum development
(linguistics, p.7)

Criteria: new materials, innovations, techniques, etc. which can be shared with other faculty.
(linguistics, p.7)

Criteria: A third crucial area of teaching is thesis supervision and service on thesis/dissertation committees, for undergraduate honors theses, M.A. theses, or Ph.D. dissertations.
(linguistics, p.7)

Mathematics

Standard: Research (55%)
(mathematics, p.4)

Standard: successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for a recommendation
(mathematics, p.4)

Criteria: series of quality publications that are judged to be significant by peers at the University of Oregon and experts from other major institutions;
(mathematics, p.4)

Criteria: body of work in progress and a reasonable program for future work
(mathematics, p.4)

Evidence: Advising Ph.D. students successfully to their degree; • Invitations to present colloquia and other

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

talks at other major institutions; • Invitations to serve on journal editorial boards; • Research grants from external sources; • Participation in and/or organization of major professional conferences and workshops; • Other scholarly activity.

(mathematics, p.5)

Criteria: an established international reputation in mathematical research
(mathematics, p.5)

Criteria: Successful Ph.D. students.
(mathematics, p.5)

Criteria: Invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions
(mathematics, p.5)

Criteria: Invitations to participate in major professional conferences and workshops
(mathematics, p.5)

Evidence: The standard units of research in mathematics are articles published in refereed journals (or sometimes other refereed venues), although there are exceptions such as refereed scholarly monographs containing substantial original research
(mathematics, p.5)

Evidence: Considerations such as venue of publication, influence on the field, opinions of reviewers, citations and length may be among those used to measure quality.
(mathematics, p.5)

Standard: Teaching (35%)
(mathematics, p.5)

Criteria: Providing an educational experience for the students beyond the routine; • Having appropriately high expectations and teaching at a level to encourage meeting them; • Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students.
(mathematics, p.5)

Philosophy

Standard: Research (40%)
(philosophy, p.4)

Criteria: book forthcoming
(philosophy, p.4)

Criteria: (typically 6--8).

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(philosophy, p.4)

Criteria: important that some of them be accepted in first--class, peer--reviewed journals in the candidate's field of research. A
(philosophy, p.4)

Evidence: Although edited anthologies, translations, and special issues of journals give evidence of research interests and activities, they do not count as much as original research and
(philosophy, p.4)

Evidence: writing. Chapters or substantial introductions contributed to anthologies are evaluated on the basis of the quality of the work itself, the quality and importance of the volume, and whether or not the article was invited.
(philosophy, p.5)

Evidence: Translations with a strong scholarly component including critical introduction, critical apparatus, and commentary are counted, but they are not considered to be equivalent to original scholarship.
(philosophy, p.5)

Evidence: While conference participation and paper presentations are encouraged as being important both for individual development and for department visibility, their value for promotion and tenure lies in the publications to which they lead
(philosophy, p.5)

Standard: Teaching (40%)
(philosophy, p.5)

Physics

Standard: Research (50%)
(physics, p.3)

Criteria: The quality (as measured by the peer review process) and number of scientific publications are of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity.
(physics, p.3)

Criteria: External funding and graduate student support are normally an expected part of the tenure and promotion portfolio of the candidate.
(physics, p.4)

Evidence: evidence of the candidate's impact on the field -- as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, invited talks, and participation in conferences and workshops

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(physics, p.4)

Criteria: For tenure cases, we expect the candidate to have demonstrated measurable impact on their field of professional expertise, with evidence that the development will continue.
(physics, p.4)

Evidence: some experience in successfully mentoring undergraduate students, Ph.D. students, or postdoctoral scholars is normally expected
(physics, p.4)

Standard: Teaching (25%)
(physics, p.4)

Standard: The department expects all faculty to spend a significant fraction of their time on teaching-related activities, and to strive for excellence in this area
(physics, p.4)

Criteria: All faculty are normally expected to be able to teach effectively at all levels and across our curriculum, though individual aspects such as research specialty are taken into account, particularly in courses taught at the graduate level.
(physics, p.4)

Evidence: a) individual instruction of undergraduate or Ph.D. students in terms of thesis supervision, specialized research, or reading courses, b) the development of new, innovative courses that help broaden the undergraduate and graduate physics curriculum, and c) authoring and publication of new textbooks and other course media, for example, electronic tools, simulations, and demonstrations, that support and augment course work.
(physics, p.4)

Religious studies

Standard: Teaching (30% asst / 30% assoc)
(religious studies, p.4)

Criteria: faculty at all ranks teach a broad range of courses, from undergraduate surveys, upper-division courses, to specialized seminars.
(religious studies, p.4)

Standard: Research: (50% asst / 45% assoc)
(religious studies, p.4)

Criteria: Though the publications may be on various topics, committees expect to see a coherent plan of research

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

(religious studies, p.4)

Criteria: The Department of Religious Studies expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor to have at the
(religious studies, p.4)

Criteria: minimum a book manuscript with a university press (or equivalent), based on original research,
(religious studies, p.5)

Criteria: Along with this completed book manuscript in its final form, the department expects at least a few additional publications, such as an article in a blind peer-reviewed research journal, a chapter in a peer-reviewed edited volume, an edited volume, a peer reviewed digital humanities project, an annotated translation, etc
(religious studies, p.5)

Evidence: Less preferably, in lieu of a book manuscript
(religious studies, p.5)

Evidence: manuscript, the candidate may have the equivalent in substantial articles (6 – 8),
(religious studies, p.5)

Evidence: counts. 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
(religious studies, p.5)

Romance Languages

Standard: Research
(romance languages, p.4)

Criteria: 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.
(romance languages, p.4)

Standard: made an original, important contribution to the field
(romance languages, p.4)

Criteria: made an original, important contribution to the field.
(romance languages, p.4)

Standard: Materials to be considered as part of the candidate's research profile will generally be peer--

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

-reviewed publications and may include: a book manuscript or its equivalent record of scholarly production in the form of eight or more substantial articles,
(romance languages, p.4)

Evidence: 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.
(romance languages, p.4)

Evidence: a university press
(romance languages, p.4)

Standard: Teaching
(romance languages, p.5)

Evidence: Written student evaluations and peer reviews will receive major consideration in the department's evaluation of the candidate's teaching
(romance languages, p.5)

Theater Arts

Standard: RESEARCH (40%)
(theater arts, p.4)

Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies

Standard: Scholarship and Creative Work
(women & gender studies, p.5)

Criteria: WGS recognizes and values multiple forms of scholarship, from traditional written products to artistic and creative work, like film, performance, digital media, collaborative editorial work, archival research. Increasingly, scholarship in the field is produced in online journals, blogs, op-eds, policy reports, social media, and community action projects.
(women & gender studies, p.5)

Evidence: this evidence will include publication of peer-reviewed book chapters and/or journal articles, as well as any additional articles/chapters in preparation or under review. Further evidence of progress toward tenure and promotion can include a published or in-progress edited collection and/or acceptance for publication of part of the dissertation and/or a separate study in a journal or edited collection.
(women & gender studies, p.5)

Criteria: Creative Work and Performance
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Criteria: published reviews of productions or performances, videos, published art work, screenplays, documentaries, etc. within the previous two and a half years, with additional material in preparation or under review.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Evidence: writing and production of videos and films; creation and exhibition of photographic, film/video, and multi-media works; publication in creative writing; publication in popular markets, books and magazines and/or internet; editing, design, cinematography, and production of media products in all forms; public presentations based on the candidate's current and published work; and invited presentations to festivals, conventions or other venues where such dissemination provides an opportunity for substantive review. Judging of contests and festivals, related to the creative work of the candidate, is also considered in this category.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Criteria: Book Manuscripts
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Criteria: evidence in the third year could include one of the following:
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Criteria: Substantial progress toward completion of a book manuscript based on the dissertation and a book proposal. T
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Criteria: Substantial progress toward completion of a new book manuscript separate from the dissertation, including a book proposal.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Standard: Teaching:
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Criteria: They should also have advised majors and minors in the department. If the candidate serves on graduate level committees, this will count toward tenure.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Evidence: women's and gender studies scholars often confront significant resistance in their classrooms.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Evidence: WGS thus will place strong emphasis on alternative modes of evaluating teaching, like annual observations of teaching by tenured members of the department, written comments by and correspondence from students, and syllabi and other course materials.
(women & gender studies, p.6)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Comparative literature

Standard: Research (40%)

(comparative lit, p.4)

Standard: requires a high level of accomplishment in the candidate's field of research.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Criteria: measured primarily by their record of publication. Faculty are expected to work actively on projects intended for publication and to publish regularly in books, journals, and other scholarly venues that bring their research to the attention of appropriate professional audiences.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Criteria: general, programs and departments in the Humanities expect a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to have a book manuscript in production with a professionally acknowledged press, or the equivalent in quality, scope and impact in articles and/or book chapters.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Evidence: In addition, wherever questions about quality, scope or impact arise, the guidelines for research evaluation established by the Modern Language Association should also be consulted.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Criteria: should appear in major refereed journals; these journals may appear either in print or in electronic format.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Criteria: should appear in volumes with the same standard or quality and visibility as the book manuscript mentioned above

(comparative lit, p.4)

Criteria: significant contribution to scholarship

(comparative lit, p.4)

Evidence: Impact upon scholarship will also be the crucial determining factor when including critical editions, translations, electronic research projects and tools and other research contributions in the candidate's research file. These contributions are to be considered original scholarship when they contribute significantly to a candidate's field.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Standard: should also indicate continuing scholarly activity, attendance and participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future productivity including a broadening of scholarly range.

(comparative lit, p.4)

Standard for Research Excellence

Criteria for Research Excellence

Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence

Criteria for Teaching Excellence

Evidence of Teaching Excellence

- Evidence:** A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production” in order to count towards promotion and tenure.
(comparative lit, p.4)
- Evidence:** 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).
(comparative lit, p.4)
- Evidence:** “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).
(comparative lit, p.4)
- Standard:** overall quality of the research profile remains the most important factor in the Department’s recommendation on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
(comparative lit, p.4)
- Evidence:** While the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the tenure and promotion recommendation, the quality of the candidate’s research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.
(comparative lit, p.5)
- Evidence:** Such evidence may take the form of published or forthcoming articles on a different project, success in receiving a grant or grants associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate’s research plans. Conference presentations also qualify as evidence of continued scholarly activity, although conference talks carry far less weight than publications and research grants in the assessment of scholarly productivity.
(comparative lit, p.5)
- Evidence:** Peer review is understood to entail anonymous assessment by at least one disinterested scholarly referee.
(comparative lit, p.5)
- Standard:** Teaching (40%)
(comparative lit, p.5)
- Standard:** Department of Comparative Literature expects dedicated and excellent teaching and advising at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
(comparative lit, p.5)
- Standard:** share departmental responsibilities for courses taught at all levels of the curriculum.
(comparative lit, p.5)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Criteria: examines the entire teaching profile, including the candidate's record of course-development activity, supervision of graduate and undergraduate independent work, and mentoring of GEs.
(comparative lit, p.5)

Criteria: student written evaluations (signed), peer evaluations performed by faculty colleagues, and student numerical evaluations.
(comparative lit, p.5)

Evidence: including information regarding pedagogical objectives and philosophy from the candidate's curriculum vitae and
(comparative lit, p.5)

Evidence: Finally, the committee takes note of any special letters of appreciation that may have been included in the dossier at the candidate's request, as well as course materials, such as syllabi, handouts, and exams, that the candidate has provided to illustrate their pedagogic practice.
(comparative lit, p.6)

Computer Information Science

Standard: Research (50%)
(computer information science, p.4)

Standard: successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute,
(computer information science, p.4)

Criteria: established a strong publication record in leading scholarly journals and conference/workshop proceedings
(computer information science, p.4)

Evidence: Acceptance rates for conferences or workshops serve as an indicator of publication significance.
(computer information science, p.4)

Evidence: software systems, will be recognized, if they are widely cited as having made an important contribution.
(computer information science, p.4)

Criteria: demonstrated an ability to obtain grant funding support (as PI) for research
(computer information science, p.4)

Criteria: initiated a significant body of ongoing work and defined a reasonable program for future research
(computer information science, p.4)

Evidence: The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

the candidate's research field.
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: based upon statements made by external referees, who are leading experts in the candidate's area of research.
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: Both the quantity and quality of citations may also be used to evaluate research impact.
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: Additional evidence
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: invitations to present colloquia and other talks at other major institutions
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: invitations to serve on journal editorial boards or conference program committee
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: participation in the organization of major professional conferences and workshops.
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Standard: Teaching (40%)
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Standard: Demonstration of effective teaching is a necessary condition for tenure in the Department of Computer and Information Science
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Criteria: candidate for promotion will have taught several terms of required courses in the undergraduate major program as part of their teaching record.
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: Providing an educational experience for the students that goes beyond the routine;
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: Providing students with intellectual challenges that reflect high expectations and teaching so as to encourage students to meet them
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Evidence: Having a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students. There are several ways that the Department assesses quality and effectiveness of teaching
(*computer information science, p.4*)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Criteria: Peer evaluations
(computer information science, p.5)

Evidence: The visitor will review all appropriate syllabi, exams, and other written materials
(computer information science, p.5)

Criteria: Student evaluations.
(computer information science, p.5)

Evidence: numerical and written student evaluations for each course taught
(computer information science, p.5)

Evidence: Consistent patterns in numerical or written evaluations will be considered to provide a reliable picture of the quality of teaching, as perceived by students.
(computer information science, p.5)

Criteria: Documentation of other contributions
(computer information science, p.5)

Evidence: These include participation in new curriculum development, the use of innovative teaching strategies, and conducting one-on-one teaching opportunities, such as directing reading courses and senior theses
(computer information science, p.5)

Criteria: Research supervision and mentorship
(computer information science, p.5)

Standard: Research Activity
(computer information science, p.7)

Criteria: It is expected that the candidate is well- established and recognized to be a leader in their field of specialization
(computer information science, p.7)

Criteria: significant instances of original accomplishments that are widely disseminated, cited and used, as well as a consistent record of grants for research is expected.
(computer information science, p.7)

Evidence: invited addresses at important professional meetings; • invitations to visit and present colloquia at other major institutions or research centers; • membership on or chairing journal editorial boards or conference program committees; • membership on influential national or international research committees; • awards recognizing academic, research work.
(computer information science, p.7)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Evidence: The strength of a candidate's record is reflected by the impact the reported research has had on the candidate's research field.
(computer information science, p.7)

Standard: Teaching
(computer information science, p.7)

Criteria: Curricular contributions. It is expected that the candidate has been an innovator in their own courses and has made contributions to the departmental curriculum as a whole.
(computer information science, p.8)

Criteria: Graduate student advising. The candidate is expected to have had substantial direct interaction with and to have supervised successful graduate students, including doctoral students.
(computer information science, p.8)

Criteria: Awards or grants for teaching or curriculum development, design and teaching of University freshman seminars or participation in FIGs; authoring a successful textbook can be recognized as indicating a dedication to effective teaching.
(computer information science, p.8)

Standard for Research Excellence
Criteria for Research Excellence
Evidence of Research Excellence

Standard for Teaching Excellence
Criteria for Teaching Excellence
Evidence of Teaching Excellence