

DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

I. Procedures

A. Preamble

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

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

B. Department-Specific Procedures

i. Annual Reviews

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

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members of the Department. A department vote is then held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the Department Head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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.

iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

a. External Reviewers

Late in the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head will consult with members of the department and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

b. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

c. Promotion and Tenure Committee/Report

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case and following these discussions, 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 are tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the department is 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.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case, i.e., tenured associate and full professors for tenure decisions and only full professors for promotion to full. Following these

discussions, 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 are tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the department is 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.

e. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate review providing a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.), as well as summarizing the department meeting in which the vote was taken. The report also includes a department head's statement offering an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote.

II. Guidelines

A. Preamble

The following guidelines outline the departmental criteria for recommendation for promotion and tenure in East Asian Languages and Literatures. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria provide guidelines for evaluation of the candidate in three key academic categories, the proportional weights on which are 50% research/scholarship, 40% teaching, and 10% service:

- a) Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship in the faculty member's discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative activity
- b) Effective, stimulating teaching in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable
- c) On-going, responsible service and leadership to the faculty member's students and department, the university, the community, and the faculty member's professional discipline more broadly.

B. Research

Scholarship is evaluated both by quantity and quality. 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). A positive departmental recommendation requires a book published by a scholarly press and typically 2-3 articles in major journals, or alternately a

number of substantive articles, typically 8-10, published in major journals. These articles should come from a cohesive body of scholarship and demonstrate a mastery of a particular area. Normally, chapters in books will be treated as the equivalent of a journal article if peer reviewed, but in all cases the quality of the articles and the publication is paramount. Electronic publication is equivalent to published articles if it is peer reviewed.

In cases where the formal evaluation by tenured faculty in EALL and the outside evaluators produces a negative assessment of the quality of the research profile, a positive tenure decision is unlikely at the departmental level, regardless of the quantity of publishing activity included in the tenure dossier. Alternatively, in cases where the quantity falls slightly but not significantly short of departmental expectations but the evaluation results in a strong affirmation of the quality and significance of the candidate's research, the department may still recommend tenure and promotion.

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 be "in production" in order to be counted as publications. "In production" 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 "in production" publication is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" at the time the department meets to vote on tenure and promotion cases in late October or early November will be considered "work in progress."

As for the kinds of books and articles produced by EALL faculty, the following comments offer some perspective: 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.). However in no case will this replace a book published by a scholarly press or its equivalent. The following may also constitute original scholarship: critical editions, critical anthologies, and electronic research tools.

For 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. Simple place in the order of the authors' names is not sufficiently informative of the relative contributions of co-authors, and is considered inadequate for evaluation purposes. Candidates will provide a separate statement detailing their level of participation in collaborative work.

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 single-authored or primary-authored work.

Textbooks will not count as scholarship unless they are based on original research and demonstrably incorporate the results of such research into their design and content. When textbooks consist of summaries or restatements of extant material, or compilations of examples for established rules, no matter how accomplished or useful they may be, they will count as teaching materials. Any textbook or similar material submitted as part of a promotion case must be accompanied by an explanation of why it should be considered as evidence of research as opposed to teaching productivity or service to the profession.

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. On the other hand, review articles may count as articles depending, as in all cases, on how substantive they are, i.e., if they contain or reflect original research, and if they are published in major journals.

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. Nor will papers presented at a meeting and subsequently published as proceedings ordinarily fit the criterion of substantive articles in major journals.

Given that citation rates vary enormously by field, and that the field of humanities behaves differently from natural sciences, medical sciences, and social sciences in scholarly communication, 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.

A final category for consideration in review of a candidate's research is that of ongoing scholarly activity. While publication of a substantial body of quality work is the primary goal to be pursued during the review period, it is essential for junior faculty to demonstrate evidence of an active, ongoing scholarly program such as work in progress, conference presentations, professional service, grant proposals, invited talks, and a continuous record of scholarly activity.

C. Teaching

Teaching is understood to include classroom-related work, advising (especially graduate student and thesis advising), and contributions to the curriculum, as reflected, for example, in new course development. The key criterion is excellence.

A teaching file, as part of a tenure case, includes student evaluations (both numerical and written comments), peer reviews, syllabi, and class materials. Originality may be a factor here as it pertains to developing courses and class materials, or to applications of technology. Also recorded and noted are the range of courses taught over the years leading to the tenure review, with regard to their levels, sizes, and subjects. As a matter of EALL policy we 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.

Advising and supervising graduate students and undergraduate majors is an important facet of teaching in EALL. One 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.

D. Service

As a criterion for promotion and tenure, service refers to the quality (rather than quantity) of contributions made to the department. This includes, but is not limited to, regular or ad hoc department committees or departmental service appointments. Service does not have the weight of scholarship or teaching and should be approached in a proportionate manner.

It is the expectation of EALL, and of the review process, that untenured faculty will contribute in discrete ways to the business of the department. While assistant professors should typically be shielded from excessive service duties, it is understood that in circumstances where there are few senior faculty available, assistant professors may be called upon to carry out significant service duties, and that such service will be recognized. Candidates may choose to participate on college or university committees, but commitments of this kind can be made only after consultation with the Department Head.

All candidates for promotion and tenure should include in their personal statements discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

III. Post-Tenure Review

A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later

than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

B. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of East Asian Languages and 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/UO policy.

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

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

IV. Promotion to Full Professor

It is expected that associate professors in EALL will continue to perform high-quality work in all three categories of professional activity after the tenure decision.

The following criteria provide guidelines for evaluation of the candidate in three key academic categories, the proportional weights on which are 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service:

- i. Research is evaluated both by quantity and quality. 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). A positive departmental recommendation requires a second scholarly book with a scholarly press or 6-8 articles in peer-reviewed academic journals and/or refereed volumes. Given that citation rates vary enormously by field, and that the field of humanities behaves differently from natural sciences, medical sciences, and social sciences in scholarly communication, 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.
- ii. High-quality teaching and active graduate and undergraduate mentorship continue to be a central category of evaluation for promotion to full professor.
- iii. Service plays an important role in the professional career of an associate professor. The candidate for full professor should normally have made substantial contributions to the department, college, and university. Significant service to the profession will also be evaluated favorably as an indication that the faculty member has the esteem of their professional peers. The relative weight accorded to these two kinds of service will vary from case to case. Community service related to scholarly work, such as participation in public programs relevant to Asia, may also be taken into account. Committee assignments and other service responsibilities performed for units *outside* EALL constitute an important benefit to the university and are an important contributor to the service component of the promotion dossier.
- iv. All candidates for promotion and tenure should include in their personal statements discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.