

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

Overview

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.

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>

This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

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

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review 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. 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 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." 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 voting members of the Department. The 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.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

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. 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.

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, they may select committee members from among tenured faculty in

related departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Divisional 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 mid-October 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.

Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

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 following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

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 requires a high level of accomplishment

through dissemination of scholarly work in the candidate's fields of research. Faculty are expected to work actively on projects 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 number 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 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 "in press" is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly "in production" 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 in-production articles on a different project, success in receiving a grant or grants associated with new research, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate's research plans. 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 productions in forms other than print (for example, projects in film, video, or multimedia platforms) are evaluated according to prevailing standards in relevant research areas. 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. The usual expectation for promotion and tenure is an established record of excellence in the classroom. The Department also takes into consideration evidence of teaching development, such as participation in the Teaching Engagement Program or other activities intended to improve teaching performance.

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 their 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.

Equity and Inclusion:

Candidates should describe contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. For examples of institutional equity and inclusion statements, see the Division of Equity and inclusion website: <http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/node/264>

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 English 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.

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. 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. 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 four areas of professional activity (research, teaching, service, and contributions to institutional equity and inclusion) 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.