

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH:
PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
May, 2011**

Overview

Promotion to associate professor and tenure in the Department of English at the University of Oregon depend upon excellence in scholarship and teaching, as well as satisfactory service in the department, university, and larger community. Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate that they possess national or international prominence in scholarship and must excel in teaching and service, including significant contributions to department, university, and/or professional governance. Tenure-track faculty are hired with the department's confidence that they are capable of fulfilling these expectations. The following guidelines first outline the procedures involved in professional evaluations over the probationary years. They then describe the criteria for achieving a successful tenure decision and promotion to associate professor in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The final section outlines the department's expectations for promotion from associate to full professor. The guidelines do not attempt a complete account of all rules and departmental customs, and this document should be read in the context of conversations with the Department Head and appropriate members of the faculty and administration. In addition, the following is essential reading: *Timetable and Guidelines for Recommending Promotion and/or Tenure for Faculty Members*:

<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-timelines>

Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Procedures

The university's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>. Below are specific procedures for the Department of English.

Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor is reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the promotion and tenure period, typically in the spring term of the third year for faculty members who do not enter with prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a "contract renewal review." This review involves a personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a report 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 usually lead to a three-year contract extension, which will take the junior faculty member through the promotion and tenure 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. If the contract renewal review raises questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the probationary period, the faculty member may be given a renewable contract that does not

extend to the promotion and tenure year. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal review 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.

Promotion and Tenure Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion and tenure during the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in unusually meritorious cases or when credit for prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the promotion and tenure process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full-time service, consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full-time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Faculty members must discuss the timing of a leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure process with the Department Head, who may also consult with the Dean and the Provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the promotion and tenure case is to be considered (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), 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. 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. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having conflicts of interest are not asked to be external reviewers. There must be at least five letters from external reviewers in the submitted file. The university requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list, rather than from the candidate’s. If the department’s list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate’s list of recommended external referees, these referee’s names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October of the tenure-decision year.

Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver or non-waiver letter in the spring term *prior* to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access to the file fully, partially, or not at all. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options.

Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to promotion and tenure consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's accomplishments and future plans in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The personal statement should offer a detailed account of the candidate's scholarly profile, including clear delineation of which projects are completed, forthcoming, or in-progress. When the profile includes dissertation work, it is crucial to provide specific information about the nature and extent of revisions and additions that have occurred since the Ph.D. The statement should include a section describing the candidate's teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course-development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement must be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, non-specialist university colleagues, and university administrators.

Dossier

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate's dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is "submitted," "forthcoming" or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications, including "in production" or "forthcoming" work (an unpublished work may be described on the C.V. as "in production" or "forthcoming" if it has been accepted in its final form; there must be written affirmation [an email is acceptable] from the editor of a press for a book, the editor of a journal for an article, and the book editor for a book chapter, as to its full acceptance and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial changes beyond those required by the publication process); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; and (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for promotion and tenure when new information becomes available.

Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term of the year prior to the tenure-decision year (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If the Head determines that participation from scholars in other units is appropriate, he or she may select committee members from among tenured faculty in related departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Associate Dean. 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 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. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding promotion and tenure decision. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting.

Department Meeting and Vote

The department will hold a meeting of tenured faculty in late October or early November to consider the committee's promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Following discussion of the report and the case, the tenured faculty vote by signed, confidential ballot whether or not to recommend promotion and tenure. When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final result. The anonymity of individual votes will be maintained, although 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 and an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure. The Department Head's opinion may or may not agree with the department vote.

Submission of the Promotion and Tenure File

The Department Head's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is

generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for Full Professor cases.

College and University Procedures

Once the file reaches CAS, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty members from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from consideration of the file. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC then votes on whether the candidate should be recommended to the Dean for promotion and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

After the file leaves the DAC, the Dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the Dean supports or does not support promotion and, if appropriate, tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the Dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the Dean indicates whether or not he or she supports promotion to associate professor and tenure or promotion to full professor, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to his or her recommendation. The candidate may request a written summary of the Dean's review after the meeting with the Dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in January, February, or March.

After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from consideration of the file). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be recommended to the Provost for promotion and, if appropriate, tenure.

Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost's office. The Provost makes the final promotion and tenure decision, and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the Provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The Provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the Provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Criteria

This section outlines the accepted criteria for a recommendation for promotion and tenure in the Department of English. The criteria provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for the promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the

candidate's promotion file are those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

Research

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 English require a high level of accomplishment through publication in the candidate's fields of research. 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 the area of research, promotion to associate professor and tenure in English depend 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. In cases where the formal evaluation by tenured faculty in English and the outside evaluators produces a negative assessment of the *quality* of the research profile, a positive tenure recommendation is unlikely at the departmental 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, including work that may be defined as published, in production/forthcoming and in-progress, the department may recommend tenure and promotion, whether or not the *quantity* of published scholarship meets departmental expectations. While the *quality and quantity* of research productivity are both important considerations, the *quality* of the candidate's research, as judged by the department's tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor in the department's promotion and tenure recommendation.

In terms of the *quantity* of research productivity, completion of a scholarly book or of an equivalent body of work in the form of refereed articles is the usual expectation for receiving a positive recommendation for promotion to associate professor and tenure in English. In order for a book manuscript to be considered "complete," it must be formally accepted by a professionally acknowledged press and must 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). In order for articles or book chapters to be considered complete and therefore "forthcoming," they must be accepted for publication and require no further revisions of any kind, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). For tenure files that contain scholarly material that is not yet in print, documentation from university presses, journal editors, or book editors attesting that the manuscripts in question are "in production" or "forthcoming" is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" or "forthcoming" at the time the department meets to vote on promotion and tenure cases in late October or early November will be considered "work in progress." Although formal completion of a scholarly book or of an equivalent number of refereed articles 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.

While publication of a scholarly book or an equivalent number of refereed articles is the primary goal to be pursued during the probationary period, it is essential for junior 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 participation also qualifies as evidence of continued scholarly activity, although such participation carries less weight than publications, work-in-progress, and research grants in the assessment of scholarly productivity.

Scholarly publications in forms other than print (for example, projects in film or video) are 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 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 promotion and tenure 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 department's promotion and tenure recommendation than scholarship that has not been peer reviewed.

Teaching

Teaching is the heart of our profession and the area to which we devote most of our energy during the academic year. Moreover, as with research, teaching is a critical area for professional evaluation. No English Department faculty member will be recommended for promotion and tenure who has not established a record of excellence in the classroom.

To determine if the candidate for promotion and tenure has met the department's expectations for teaching excellence, the department's promotion and tenure 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 GTFs. The committee also reviews all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) student written evaluations (signed), student numerical evaluations, and peer evaluations performed by faculty colleagues. These measures of teaching performance are carefully balanced in the committee's assessment of the candidate's overall teaching profile.

In preparing its report, the department's promotion and tenure committee also carefully reviews relevant sections of the C.V. and Candidate Statement, which include information on teaching philosophy and pedagogical objectives and methods. 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 his or her pedagogic practice.

Service

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. 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 at official department meetings is mandatory, except when other university business interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department. Committee assignments and other service responsibilities performed for units *outside* the department constitute an important benefit to the university and contribute equally to the service component of the dossier.

Professional service beyond the university is relevant to the promotion and tenure review and might include delivering public lectures to community groups, serving on governing committees of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for journals and university presses, performing other editorial responsibilities with a research journal, or reviewing grant proposals. Community service and outreach activities are also relevant to the service component of the dossier. While professional and community service activities bring important benefits, such activities carry significantly less weight in the promotion and tenure recommendation than research, teaching, and departmental and university service.

Promotion to Full Professor: Procedures

The university's procedures for promotion to full professor are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>. 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. Early promotion to full professor is warranted in exceptional cases, or in rare instances where called for in written hiring agreements. The English Department's internal procedures for promotion to full professor (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, with the exception that only the department's full professors participate in the promotion recommendation .

Promotion to Full Professor: Criteria

It is expected that associate professors in the Department of English 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. A record of excellent teaching and service, including significant contributions to department, university, and/or professional governance, is also essential, but the

primary qualification for promotion to full professor is scholarly distinction. Such distinction will ordinarily be established through publication of a second scholarly book (though book publication is not a guarantee of promotion), or its equivalent. 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.