

## **Department of Comparative Literature Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines**

### **Preamble**

This document applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Comparative Literature are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

Because certain faculty positions in the Department are shared with other units, some of the procedures and guidelines described below necessarily depend on the cooperation of those departments and programs. Faculty members should familiarize themselves early on with the nature and degree of this cooperation. This information is typically articulated at the time of the faculty member's hire in the form of an MOU regarding the assignment of responsibilities and the details of review processes, and faculty should consult with the Department Head and any other relevant Program Directors or Department Heads about questions or concerns that arise in view of these joint appointments. Both this document, and any joint-appointment considerations, should be reviewed on an annual basis with relevant Directors and Department Heads. In general, the guidelines and procedures articulated here should be read within the context of conversations with the Department Head and appropriate members of the faculty and university administration.

### **Department-Specific Procedures**

Procedures for promotion to Full Professor within the Department of Comparative Literature (regarding, for example, the selection of outside evaluators, rights of access to the promotion file, the selection of a departmental committee, meeting and voting protocols, etc.) mirror those of the promotion to Associate Professor, except that only the Department's full professors participate in the promotion recommendation. As with promotion to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure, the University's procedures for promotion to Full Professor are also described on the Academic Affairs website. There is no fixed probationary period leading to promotion to Full Professor, but faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the Associate Professor rank. Earlier promotion to Full Professor is appropriate when the accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor are commensurate with promotion expectations, or in rare instances where called for in written hiring agreements.

### **Annual Reviews**

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the Department Head, usually in mid-April. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

### **Contract Renewal/Third Year Review**

In the middle of the promotion and tenure period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a personnel committee report (which, in most cases, given both the relatively small size of the Department and the interdisciplinary nature of Comparative Literature, may include faculty members not just from the Department but from other key units on campus in which the faculty member's research and teaching interests reside), a vote of the Program Faculty and any other units in which the member's contract is held, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

### **External Reviewers**

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure and/or promotion case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with appropriate Program and Participating faculty members, as well as appropriate members of any other unit with which the candidate for tenure is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

### **Internal Reviewers**

The Department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. Such reviews from interdisciplinary institutes and centers are typically prepared by the Director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members. However, since appointments in Comparative Literature

are often jointly held with other units, the conditions of a candidate's hire will usually stipulate the precise nature and role of internal reviews from other units.

### **Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report**

During the spring term of the year prior to the tenure-decision year (usually the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the probationary period), the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. This committee will include members from the Department faculty and, when appropriate and with guidance from the Dean and Divisional Dean, tenured faculty members may also be selected from relevant units outside of the Department. Often guidelines for the membership of this committee will be stipulated in the candidate's initial hiring documents. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the Department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees' assessment of the candidate's work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. It is further expected that, if at all possible, one or more members of the committee will observe the candidate's teaching personally. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the Department regarding promotion and tenure. The committee report is generally made available in the Department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the Program meeting. Both Associate and Full Professors vote in promotion and tenure cases, but only Full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

### **Department Meeting and Vote**

The Department will hold a meeting, typically in early November, to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to Full Professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the Department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

### **Department Head's Review**

After the Department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process. The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the Department vote.

### **Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor**

These guidelines outline the criteria for Department's recommendation for promotion and tenure in the Comparative Literature. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the

most recent promotion. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 25, respectively.

### **Research (40%)**

Excellence in scholarly research, consistent with the guidelines articulated by the UO Office of Academic Affairs (<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>), is crucial in all professional evaluations of tenure-related faculty at the University of Oregon. Consequently, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure in the Department of Comparative Literature requires a high level of accomplishment in the candidate's field of research. Normally, such accomplishment is 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. In 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. Wherever questions about equivalence arise, candidates should seek out explicit guidance as early as possible from the Department Head and other relevant senior faculty mentors. 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. As for venue, in the case of articles, these should appear in major refereed journals; these journals may appear either in print or in electronic format. In the case of book chapters, these should appear in volumes with the same standard or quality and visibility as the book manuscript mentioned above. Above all, the candidate's publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship. 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. The record 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.

A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and "in production" in order to count towards promotion and tenure. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. "In production" indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be "in print" or "forthcoming" in order to be counted as publications. "Forthcoming" means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further authorial revisions or editing, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each "forthcoming" publication is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" or "forthcoming" at the time the Department meets to vote on tenure and promotion cases in late October will be considered "work in progress."

Although formal completion of a scholarly book or of an equivalent number of articles and/or book chapters is the usual expectation, the overall quality of the research profile remains the most important factor in the Department's recommendation on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In cases where the formal evaluation by tenured faculty in Comparative Literature and

the outside evaluators produces a negative assessment of the quality of the research profile, a positive tenure recommendation is unlikely at the Department level, regardless of the quantity of publishing activity included in the tenure dossier. Alternatively, in cases where the evaluation results in a strong affirmation of the quality and significance of the candidate's research, the Department may recommend tenure and promotion, whether or not the quantity of published scholarship meets Department expectations. 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.

While publication of a scholarly book or its equivalent is the primary goal to be pursued during the probationary period, it is essential for faculty to establish a research trajectory that provides evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity. 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.

Scholarly output in forms other than print is evaluated according to prevailing standards in relevant research areas. No distinction is made between electronic and traditional print publication of scholarly books, articles, or other research projects, 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. Peer review is understood to entail anonymous assessment by at least one disinterested scholarly referee. In cases where the evaluation process is unclear (e.g. chapters contributed to scholarly anthologies, conference proceedings, essays in journals not listed as peer reviewed in the MLA Directory of Periodicals or Ulrich's Periodical Directory), candidates for tenure and promotion may be required to provide documentation attesting to the level of peer evaluation. Regardless of the medium, published scholarship that has been peer reviewed possesses more significance in the tenure recommendation than scholarship that has not been peer reviewed.

### **Teaching (40%)**

In the Humanities the classroom is, in many ways, our laboratory: our research is not only relayed through our commitment to pedagogy, but positively enlivened and furthered by it. Accordingly, the Department of Comparative Literature expects dedicated and excellent teaching and advising at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Department further expects that tenure-related faculty will share departmental responsibilities for courses taught at all levels of the curriculum.

In assessing teaching quality, the Department's personnel committee 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. The committee also reviews all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) student written evaluations (signed), peer evaluations performed by faculty colleagues, and student numerical evaluations. These measures of teaching performance are carefully balanced in the committee's assessment of the candidate's overall teaching profile, including information regarding pedagogical objectives and philosophy from the candidate's curriculum vitae and

statement. 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.

Evidence of outstanding teaching will strengthen a tenure case, but will not be sufficient by itself to ensure either promotion or tenure. Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching will certainly jeopardize promotion and/or tenure.

### **Service (20%)**

In order to achieve promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, candidates must establish a record of satisfactory service to the Department, the University, the profession, and the larger community. At the same time, owing to the interdisciplinary nature of our field, the service demands on our Department faculty from a variety of different sectors and academic units may be considerable; for this reason junior faculty in particular are advised to seek support and mentorship as they weigh their commitments across campus. The Department attempts to limit committee assignments for untenured faculty, but all tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at Department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance of official Department faculty meetings is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the Program.

Service to the profession, while not a major element in a promotion or tenure recommendation, is evaluated favorably and may indicate as well that the faculty member has the esteem of their professional peers. The Department recognizes reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, etc., as service to the profession. Tenure-related faculty should keep a record of such activities from the start of their careers.

## **Post-Tenure Review**

### **Third-Year Post-Tenure Review**

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the Department Head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the Department Head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The Department Head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The Department Head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the Department Head. For Associate Professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the Department Head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may

provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Department Head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

### **Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review**

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Comparative Literature expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/VO policy.

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

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

### **Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor**

It is expected that Associate Professors in Comparative Literature will continue to excel in all three areas of professional activity after the tenure decision. Professional careers develop along various paths, especially after the promotion to Associate Professor. Nevertheless, candidates for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate that they possess national or international prominence in scholarship. Such prominence will ordinarily be established through publication of a second scholarly book (though book publication is not a guarantee of promotion), or its equivalent. In order for a book manuscript to be counted towards promotion, it should be "in production." "In production" indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). Faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the Associate Professor rank. However, since there is no set probationary period for promotion to Full Professor, it is generally expected that any publications to be weighed in the decision process will have appeared in print (or via an equivalent form of distribution, as in the case of online journals) by fall of the promotion-decision year.

Alongside scholarly excellence, a record of excellent teaching as described above will prove essential for the successful candidate. Service, on the other hand, is weighed more heavily for promotion to Full Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, and faculty

should normally have made an important contribution to the Department, University, and/or professional governance.

Some individuals may achieve a comparable level of national or international distinction through alternative means of scholarly activity and communication. In exceptional instances, a case for promotion can be based on an extraordinary record of teaching and especially significant service contributions to the Department and University, although not without a demonstrated commitment to continued scholarship in the form of publications.

In evaluating a faculty member for promotion to the rank of Professor, the department assigns research, teaching and service the following respective weights: 40%, 40% and 20%.