

## DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

May, 2011

### Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

#### I. Procedures

##### a. Preamble

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 East Asian Languages and Literatures (EALL).

##### b. Compendium of Procedures

###### i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable promotion and 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 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 departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, 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 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. 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 promotion and tenure 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.

###### ii. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion and tenure in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually

meritorious case 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 all other 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, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process and 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 should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision 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.

### iii. External Reviewers

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, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member 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. Generally, 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. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. 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.

### iv. 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.

v. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options.

vi. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her 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 should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research.

vii. Dossier

In addition to the letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, including one from a candidate's research institute/center director, the dossier should include:

(1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae; (2) copies of all significant publications, which may include "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 [may be an email] 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 change 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./M.S., 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) external reviewer biographies and a description of any 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.

#### viii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other 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 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. 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 department meeting. Both associate and full professors vote in promotion to associate professor and tenure cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

#### ix. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October 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 promotion and tenure (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.

ix. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The statement includes 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.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. 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.

x. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file reaches CAS, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty 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 discussion and voting. 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. 2. 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/or 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 is supporting 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 the position taken on promotion and tenure. 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 the months of January, February, or March.

3. 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 discussion and voting). 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, receive tenure.

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the provost's office. The provost ultimately makes the 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 1<sup>st</sup> (or before May 1<sup>st</sup> if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15<sup>th</sup>.

## II. Guidelines

### a. Preamble

These 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. Unless an amended agreement has been negotiated at the time of hire, 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.

### 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 2-3 articles in major journals or 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 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 departmental expectations. While the quality and quantity of research productivity are both important considerations in the tenure and promotion decision, the quality of the candidate's research, as judged by the tenured faculty and the outside evaluators, is the most significant factor.

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 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 translations from Chinese, Japanese or Korean may be counted as scholarship when they include a strong scholarly component (critical introduction, critical apparatus, commentary, etc) and when they fit within the candidate's research or teaching fields. The following may also constitute original scholarship: critical editions, critical anthologies, and electronic research tools such as a CD-ROM.

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 which is submitted as part of their dossier. Simple place in the order of the authors' names is not considered adequate for evaluation purposes. 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 his or her work. Nonetheless, multiple works of this sort may be considered equivalent to a 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 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.

A final category for consideration in review of a candidate's research is that of scholarly promise: While publication of a substantial body of quality work 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, grant activity associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans.

### 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, undergraduate advising, graduate admissions, curricular planning, and serving on occasional search committees. But 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 and possibly beyond, but this is a qualified requirement. They may choose to participate on college or university committees, but commitments of this kind should be made only after consultation with the department head.

## **Promotion to Full Professor:**

### **1. 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. EALL'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, except that only the department's full professors participate in the promotion decision.

### **2. Promotion to Full Professor: Criteria**

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 may be warranted in exceptional cases, or where called for in written hiring agreements. It is expected that associate professors in EALL will continue to perform high quality work in all three areas of professional activity after the tenure decision. However, the primary qualification for promotion to full professor is scholarly distinction. Such distinction will ordinarily be established through publication of a second scholarly book with a major academic press (though book publication is not a guarantee of promotion), or its equivalent. Service also plays an important role. The candidate 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 her or his 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 tenure dossier.