Tenure and Promotion, Department Procedures

As a major academic unit within a multipurpose university, the Department of English serves undergraduate and graduate students, the academic community, and society in general. Faculty members in the Department of English, like those throughout the university, have privileges which imply correlative responsibilities. In addition to maintaining standards of competence, particularly those relating to scholarship and teaching ability, faculty members are responsible for maintaining the proper attitude of objectivity, industry, and cooperation with their associates within the university. To preserve and strengthen the vitality of the department and the university, faculty must be dedicated to achieving excellence in teaching, research or creative activity, and professional service. Promotion and tenure are awarded to faculty making continuing contributions in all three of these areas. Candidates for tenure and promotion in Literature, Creative Writing, and Linguistics will be evaluated by faculty of appropriate rank and tenure status in Literature, Creative Writing, and Linguistics; candidates for tenure and promotion in Technical Communication and Rhetoric will be evaluated by faculty of appropriate rank and tenure status in Technical Communication and Rhetoric.

Applicants for tenure and/or promotion are urged, except in extraordinary circumstances, to accrue the number of years of service in rank which are described herein, although a faculty member may apply for tenure and/or promotion in any year at his or her request. Rules governing the effect of Faculty Development Leaves or other leaves of absence upon probationary periods are explained in the Texas Tech University Tenure Policy (OP 32.01). In the event that a faculty member’s period of employment in rank spans more than one university tenure policy, the faculty member has the option of selecting which of the policies will govern his or her application.

The general criteria and procedures to be used in evaluating applicants for tenure and/or promotion are described below. In all instances, these criteria and procedures will be understood to apply within the larger, overriding context by the guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Texas Tech University Tenure Policy (OP 32.01). Copies of these policies are available from the Department Chair.

Since fairness requires that criteria for promotion or tenure be applied as uniformly as possible, applicants should develop dossiers in accord with the College Format for Dossiers available from the Department Chair. The faculty member may submit whatever he or she considers relevant in addition to any information or material required by the university, collegiate, or departmental policies. Faculty members are thus encouraged to accumulate, throughout their period of employment, all material which may be considered relevant, including such items as letters of appreciation or commendation from students or from colleagues in the profession, reviews of or other published references to the faculty member’s scholarly or creative activity, notices of receipt of grants or awards, documentation or evidence of outreach and engagement, etc. The faculty member has primary responsibility for preparation of his or her dossier, with assistance to be provided by the Department Chair. The faculty member will have the right to inspect all materials included in his or her dossier.

OP 32.01, College of Arts & Sciences Guidelines, College Format for Dossiers, and other relevant documents pertinent to Tenure and Promotion are available at: http://www.depts.ttu.edu/artsandsciences/faculty/tenure-promotion.php

Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The person who applies for tenure or promotion in the Department of English must ordinarily hold the Ph.D. degree. In exceptional cases other terminal degrees may be considered appropriate. Faculty members holding temporary appointments are not eligible for promotion or tenure.

An assistant professor seeking tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor or an associate professor seeking tenure must demonstrate: (1) effectiveness as a teacher; (2) competence in research or creative activity as shown by a record of referred publication, specifically a book or its equivalence in scope and substance, such as an accepted book, professional journal articles, or other appropriate publications; (3) a record of professional service appropriate to the discipline, the department, the college, or the university; and (4) promise of growth in teaching and in research or artistic and creative activity. Assistant professors applying for tenure and promotion should normally have accrued five years of service at the rank of assistant professor in the Department
of English at Texas Tech University. Associate professors applying for tenure should normally have accrued three years of service at the rank of associate professor in the Department of English at Texas Tech University.

An associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor or a professor seeking tenure must demonstrate: (1) continued effectiveness as a teacher; (2) a career record of publication significantly exceeding that required of an associate professor to achieve tenure, including evidence of national recognition in the profession; (3) a continuing record of professional contributions and service. Associate professors applying for promotion to the rank of professor should normally have accrued three years of service in the Department of English at Texas Tech University at the rank of associate professor. Professors applying for tenure should normally have accrued three years of service at the rank of professor in the Department of English at Texas Tech University.

Applicants for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate strength in teaching, research or creative activity, and professional service. Contributions which predate employment in the department are commendable and will be considered part of a faculty member’s overall professional record; under ordinary circumstances, however, primary emphasis in promotion or tenure evaluation will be placed on contributions made during employment in the Department of English at Texas Tech University.

**Teaching:** Applicants for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate teaching effectiveness, at either the departmental or the interdisciplinary level, through such supporting material as student teaching evaluations, faculty teaching evaluations, letters of reference, teaching awards, and, when applicable, written statements from students and colleagues. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will make allowance for the wide variety of methods and personal styles which may contribute to effective teaching, and may include outreach and engagement, as described in the Appendix to the College of Arts and Sciences Procedures. Characteristic of effective classroom teaching are such attributes as thorough and up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter, well-organized and clear presentation of relevant material, clear and willing responses to students’ questions, an overall ability to maintain students’ interest and appropriate classroom atmosphere, an understanding of course objectives, thoughtful planning of courses, and fair and responsible grading. Effective teaching may also be demonstrated outside the classroom through tutoring, design of courses and curricula, development of textbooks and innovative instructional materials, and other activities which indirectly support student learning, such as interacting with colleagues, counseling students, and being generally accessible for conferences with students.

**Research and Creative Activity:** Research and creative activity are functions that serve to advance the discipline or the state of art. Applicants for promotion and/or tenure must provide evidence of published research or creative activity such as written publications, funded grant applications and reports, published computer software, papers and nonprint presentations delivered at professional meetings, exhibits and artistic performances, and other appropriate and critically examined work. Textbooks and innovative instructional materials having significant value beyond this campus may be considered contributions to research and creative activity. Research and Creative activity may include outreach and engagement, as described in the Appendix to the College of Arts and Sciences Procedures. All published research and creative activity will be considered during promotion and/or tenure evaluation; however, the department strongly encourages continuing contributions in the field of specialization in which the faculty member was employed or fields in which he or she teaches.

Evaluation of a faculty member’s research and/or creative activity will be undertaken with due regard for individual differences and for the unique nature and requirements of specialized fields. Generally, however, the significance of research or creative activity will be assessed in terms of such criteria as quality, importance within the field of specialization and to the discipline generally; length; prestige or visibility of the outlet in which the work appears or the forum in which it is presented. The same criteria will be applied in assessing the significance of funded grants or reports.

The dossier of an applicant for promotion and/or tenure should provide substantiating evidence of the quality of the faculty member’s research or creative activity, as evaluated by appropriate observers within and/or outside the university. This evidence may be supplied in such forms as letters of reference and reviews of the faculty member’s publications. Specifically, applicants are encouraged to submit published and unpublished reviews of their work. Working collaboratively, the Department Chair, candidate, and departmental specialists in the candidate’s area will come up with names of outside reviewers. The Department Chair will be responsible for ensuring that each candidate has at least three such reviewers, and that at least three of the total number of letters come from reviewers at peer/peer-aspirant institutions (See Arts & Sciences Guidelines III.4 for list of
Professional Service: Applicants for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate professional contributions through service to the department, college, university, and discipline at large. These contributions may include service as advisers, committee members, program administrators, and participants in other professional activities of the university. Discipline-related service to the immediate community, to the state and region, and to society at large also represents important contributions. Participation in the activities of professional societies and organizations, especially through service in leadership roles, is a strong indication of professional commitment. Contributions through presentations and consultative services which do not interfere with a faculty member’s responsibilities to the university are regarded as further evidence of professional reputation. All such services may include outreach and engagement, as described in the Appendix to the College of Arts and Sciences Procedures. It is desirable that evaluations by qualified individuals, indicating the quality and extent of the service rendered, be submitted with the promotion and tenure dossier.

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

The English Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and Texas Tech University all have produced documents describing procedures associated with tenure and promotion review. What follows is a distillation and clarification of procedures, intended to aid both the untenured and tenured faculty person in meeting requirements for assessment.

Faculty with tenure-track appointments should begin collecting materials for reappointment reviews, third-year review, and tenure review, as soon as they start their employment at TTU. Save copies of publications, materials accepted for publication, peer reviews of teaching, letters of appreciation for service, award notifications, course syllabi, and teaching materials.

Since untenured faculty are expected to submit evidence of research activity in all review procedures beyond year one, the English Department follows guidelines from the A&S Dean regarding the submission of such evidence. Only research already published or accepted for publication may be submitted to the Department. A faculty member is urged, in the first year of employment, to adapt his or her curriculum vitae to the format specified by the College of Arts & Sciences, and to keep that version of the vita updated for later use in the tenure and promotion process.

Year One: During a faculty member’s first year on tenure-track, he or she will turn in an Annual Faculty Report (due January 20), using Digital Measures. From this report, the Department Chair writes a Chairperson’s Assessment, which is forwarded to the A&S Dean’s Office. The faculty member should also provide a copy of the report to the Faculty Merit Committee, which will use it in determining the allocation of merit money among Department members.

During the spring semester the Department Chair, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Procedures Committee, will assign the tenure-track faculty member a peer observer. This peer shall examine all relevant teaching materials, meet with the faculty member prior to the classroom visitation, observe the faculty member’s class, and meet again with the faculty member to discuss his or her teaching. After the observation, the peer reviewer writes up a report, using the standard form and submits copies of the report to the faculty member and the Department Chair. The faculty member has the right to make a written response to the peer observation report. At this point (usually the second week in April), the untenured faculty must make available for review by the pertinent faculty (i.e., LCWL or TCR) a dossier that will consist of the following:

1. a curriculum vitae, using the department’s annual report form, but cumulative for all semesters of teaching at TTU; list all (including prior) pertinent publications, experience, and service to the profession
2. all sets of student evaluations of teaching from the previous semester and copies of the corresponding course syllabi

3. all peer observation reports on teaching (and any written response from the untenured faculty member)

4. copies of all relevant publications (including documentation of acceptance for forthcoming publications)

5. a brief statement summarizing their achievements during the period under review, as well as a statement of goals for future years (optional)

After the pertinent tenured faculty have had time to review the materials submitted by untenured faculty, the pertinent tenured faculty will assess each untenured faculty member’s progress toward tenure in the areas of teaching, research, and service, providing assessments to the Department Chair. Synthesizing the assessments and comments made by the pertinent tenured faculty, the Department Chair will write an assessment of each untenured faculty person’s progress, and share this assessment with that person. (Two copies need to be signed by both the faculty member and the Department Chair.) This process should be completed before the end of the spring semester.

**Year Two:** During the fall the Department Chair, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Procedures Committee, will assign the tenure-track faculty member a peer observer. This peer shall examine all relevant teaching materials, meet with the faculty member prior to the classroom visitation, observe the faculty member’s class, and meet again with the faculty member to discuss his or her teaching. After the observation, the peer reviewer writes up a report, using the standard form and submits copies of the report to the faculty member and the Department Chair. The faculty member has the right to make a written response to the peer observation report. At this point (usually the second week in November), the untenured faculty must make available for review by the pertinent faculty (i.e., LCWL or TCR) a dossier that will consist of the following:

1. a curriculum vitae, using the department’s annual report form, but cumulative for all semesters of teaching at TTU; list all (including prior) pertinent publications, experience, and service to the profession

2. all sets of student evaluations of teaching from the previous one-year period and copies of the corresponding course syllabi

3. all peer observation reports on teaching (and any written response from the untenured faculty member)

4. copies of all relevant publications (including documentation of acceptance for forthcoming publications)

5. a brief statement summarizing their achievements during the period under review, as well as a statement of goals for future years (optional)

After the pertinent tenured faculty have had time to review the materials submitted by untenured faculty, the pertinent tenured faculty will assess each untenured faculty member’s progress toward tenure in the areas of teaching, research, and service, providing assessments to the Department Chair. Synthesizing the assessments and comments made by the pertinent tenured faculty, the Department Chair will write an assessment of each untenured faculty person’s progress, and share this assessment with that person. (Two copies need to be signed by both the faculty member and the Department Chair.) This process should be completed before the end of the fall semester.

In January, just as in year one, the untenured person must submit an Annual Faculty Report to the Department Chair, and a copy of the report to the Faculty Merit Committee. (This requirement continues—even post-tenure—and so will no longer be noted in this description.)

**Year Three:** Once again, during the fall, the tenure-track faculty member will be observed by a peer who will report on teaching. However, the faculty person does not go through a fall semester review by the Department or have an assessment written by the Department Chair. Instead, such a review occurs in the spring of year three (in the candidate’s sixth long semester). The Department Chair, in consultation with the Tenure, Promotion and Procedures Committee, designates and notifies three pertinent tenured faculty members who will serve as chair and members of the candidate’s Review Committee, which shall scrutinize, evaluate, and report on the candidate’s teaching, research, and service to the pertinent tenured members of the Department.
If the untenured faculty member undergoing the review has an objection to a specific member of the Review Committee, the untenured faculty member may request that the Department Chair evaluate the potential for a conflict of interest. If the Department Chair determines that there is a conflict of interest, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Tenure, Promotion and Procedures Committee, will select a new member for the candidate’s Review Committee. If a member of the Review Committee has a conflict of interest with an individual under evaluation, the member should meet with the Department Chair and request to recuse himself or herself from the Review Committee.

After examining materials submitted by the candidate, the Review Committee’s report (and the candidate’s response, if any), the pertinent tenured faculty will meet to discuss the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The meeting is to be conducted by the Department Chair, but Review Committee Chairs will be responsible for conducting the discussion of the particular candidates under review. After the meeting, the pertinent tenured faculty will vote by confidential ballot on the candidate’s progress toward tenure. If the vote is negative, the pertinent tenured faculty will meet to discuss the candidate’s case, and a second vote will be held to determine whether to recommend to the A&S Dean termination of the probationary appointment.

The procedure outlined above will be conducted according to the specific procedures and guidelines contained in College of Arts and Science Procedures for the Third-Year Review of Faculty in Tenure-Track Positions

**Year Four:** Same procedures as in year two.

**Year Five:** Same procedures as in year two, with the addition that in the spring semester the candidate will have another peer observation of teaching in addition to that done in the fall of the fifth year. If for some reason the candidate did not have a peer observer in the fall, two observations will be done in the spring. Also during spring, the Department Chair will provide the candidate with the copy of the Department’s tenure and promotion guidelines that is to be included in the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Dossier, and remind the candidate to begin gathering together the other materials that will be due early in the candidate’s sixth year. In addition, the candidate should start consulting with the Department Chair about possible outside reviewers. At least three outside reviewers will be needed; and at least three of the total number of letters should come from reviewers at peer/peer-aspirant institutions (See Arts & Sciences Guidelines III.4 for list of institutions). All materials to be reviewed should be sent by the Department Chair to the reviewers by the end of the spring semester of year five.

**Year Six:** In the spring of the candidate’s fifth year, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Tenure, Promotion and Procedures Committee, designates and notifies three pertinent tenured faculty members who did not serve on the candidate’s Third-Year Review Committee to serve as the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. Any potential conflicts of interest are to be brought before the Department Chair by the individuals named to serve on the committee or by the candidate, and they will be resolved in the manner indicated for such cases in the description of the Third-Year Review.

Having been reminded by the Department Chair to begin preparing the necessary materials during the spring of the candidate’s fifth year, the candidate must submit her or his Tenure and Promotion Dossier to the English Department office by August 25. The dossier will consist of those materials specified in section II of the “College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion,” and will follow the format and standards designated in section II of that same document.

In addition to the dossier, the candidate will provide a separate file that contains the following:

1. teaching evaluations from all courses taught since the time of the candidate’s Third-Year Review
2. copies of all relevant publications (including documentation of acceptance for forthcoming publications)
3. as in all previous years, the candidate may choose to submit a brief statement summarizing his or her achievements during the period under review, as well as a statement of goals for future years

When the candidate has filed his or her materials, the Department Chair will provide ratings of the outlets in which candidate’s publications appear. These ratings, from 1-5, appear in the left hand margin of the curriculum vitae. To determine the ratings, the Department Chair will make every effort to consult with colleagues who are most knowledgeable about the journals and presses with which the candidate has published (see sample memo regarding rating of presses and journals) and will also consult with the candidate about the ratings. The candidate has the right to discuss revisions.
After the publication outlets have been rated, the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will have two weeks to evaluate the candidate’s submitted materials and to file a Tenure and Promotion Report that assesses the candidate’s success in meeting the Department’s standards for tenure and promotion. Parallel to the procedure at the time of the Third-Year Review, the candidate’s Review Committee chair should consult with appropriate program directors (Directors of Graduate Studies, Literature, Creative Writing, Linguistics, Composition, Technical Communication) to determine whether there are particular areas of concern to be addressed in the review of the candidate.

After the Review Committee has filed its report in the candidate’s dossier, the candidate will have one week to make a written response to the report if he or she so desires. The completed Tenure and Promotion Report, along with the report written during the Third-Year Review and any written responses by the candidate to these reports, will be included in the appendix to the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Dossier. The A&S Dean has requested that nothing should be added to the dossier once it has been provided to the Department for evaluation. (The sole exception to the prohibition on additions to the dossier occurs when a submitted manuscript is accepted for publication and is thus “in press.” In this case, the Department Chair may add a letter to that effect to the dossier.)

At this point (usually the third week of September), the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Dossier will be made available to the pertinent members of the Department, who will have approximately two weeks to read the materials. After examining materials submitted by the candidate, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee’s report (and the candidate’s response, if any), the pertinent tenured faculty will meet to discuss the candidate’s progress toward tenure. As in the procedures at the time of the Third-Year Review, the meeting is to be conducted by the Department Chair, but Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Chairs will be responsible for conducting the discussion of the particular candidates under review. After the meeting, the Department Chair will distribute ballots, which must be returned by a specific date (usually early in October). The pertinent tenured faculty will vote separately on tenure, and then those faculty who have achieved at least that rank will vote on promotion. A & S Guidelines require that ballots be submitted unsigned.

In voting on the candidate, members of the pertinent faculty are charged with assessing the candidate’s success in teaching, research, and service. According to the English Department’s document on standards for tenure and promotion, the candidate seeking tenure must demonstrate: “(1) effectiveness as a teacher; (2) competence in research or creative activity as shown by a record of refereed publication, specifically a book or its equivalence in significance, scope, and substance (such as an accepted book, professional journal articles, or other appropriate publications); (3) a record of professional service appropriate to the discipline, the department, the college, or the university; and (4) promise of growth in teaching and in research or artistic activity.”

The English Department’s standard for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor is the same as its standard for tenure.

Along with the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Procedures Committee, the Department Chair will count the ballots and record the vote on a ballot count form, and include the name of the chair of the Tenure and Promotions Procedures Committee who assisted in counting ballots. The Department Chair will then place in the candidate’s Tenure and Promotion Dossier a tabulation of the pertinent faculty’s vote on the candidate, and a letter explaining the Department Chair’s own vote for or against the candidate.

At this point, the Department Chair will make available to the candidate the entire dossier, including the ballot count. The candidate will sign a statement, to be included in the dossier, certifying that he or she has reviewed the contents of the dossier and has been provided with a copy thereof. This statement does not constitute approval of the dossier. Any time prior to submission of the dossier to the A&S Dean, the candidate may request in writing that the dossier be withdrawn from further consideration.

From this point on, the tenure and promotion process moves out of the Department of English. The A&S committee may ask the candidate for more information or to appear before the committee. After the A&S committee and the A&S Dean make their determinations, the dossier moves to higher administrative levels.
T&P Explanatory Addenda

Creative Writing

For tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate should be measured by a substantial combination of the following items:

1. The quality of the candidate's work in a primary genre.
2. The quality of the candidate's work in a secondary genre, if the candidate should desire this work to be considered.
3. The publication record of the candidate's work in a primary genre (this may consist of books, publications in relevant journals and relevant online journals/websites, editorial accomplishment, recordings, readings, inclusions in anthologies, exhibits, published collaborations, and conference presentations) greater than or equal to a published book in the primary genre.
4. The publication record of the candidate's work in a secondary and/or tertiary genre (consisting of the same items in #3 above), if the candidate should desire this work to be considered.
5. Excellence/creativity in teaching.
6. Service to the department, college, university, and profession.
7. Prizes, fellowships, and awards.

For promotion to full professor, a candidate should have a substantial combination of the above items (1-7) and the equivalent of two or more published books.

Comparative Literature

Because of the inherently interdisciplinary nature of comparative literature, we suggest that review of candidates in that field be extremely flexible about venues of publication so long as the published research equals in significance, scope, and quality a well-refereed book.

Technical Communication and Rhetoric

Tenure and promotion is a choice that many academics make for both personal and professional reasons. The evaluation of materials submitted for these academic ranks should be done in full light of the nature of scholarship in technical communication and rhetoric, reflecting various genres, media, theories, pedagogies, and professional values that shape our work.

Research

We do not subscribe to the single-authored book as the sole standard for scholarship, but consider contributions to scholarship that can take many forms: articles, textbooks, media publication, software publication, and other forms of knowledge that reflect the professional endeavor of knowledge making in our field. Similarly, our research methods, grant writing, collaborative strategies, and subsequent publication formats may be very different from those in other disciplines and will require an appropriate evaluation.

Teaching

Our teaching takes on various forms—service-learning, distance formats, synchronous and asynchronous digital interactive learning—as well as what goes on in a conventional classroom. We wish our teaching to be evaluated according to appropriate standards, where, in many instances, we do not have face-to-face interaction, and our teaching does not exist solely within 4 walls, but may be individualized, exploratory, collaborative, and highly interactive. Our teaching assessment may not be clearly measured by performance-based measures or university standard teacher and course evaluations, but may need to be supplemented by testimonials, evidence of achievement, and professional engagement of students to which our work strives.

Service

In a growing profession like ours, professional service can have impacts far beyond what might be seen from more established disciplines. Our service to professional organizations, encouragement of publication projects, involvement in university affairs, and program administration needs to be recognized by valid measures of the requirements and challenges we face in our discipline.
Later British Literature

Criteria for Evaluating Publications

1. Work makes an original contribution to the applicant’s discipline
   a. Work as an editor (whether of a scholarly journal or book series) is valued for bringing original work to scholars in the discipline.
   b. Review essays (which by their nature draw connections between works of published scholarship or which overview the field) are also valued as making an original contribution.

2. Publication pattern reveals a coherent body of work
   a. This is not to say that candidates cannot publish work outside of their immediate field. Our department has always shown a generous flexibility in considering works outside of period boundaries but arguably within a candidate’s area of specialization. So, a candidate with a thematic interest could publish across period boundaries: a medieval scholar could reasonably publish on Tolkien or William Morris; a drama specialist on Renaissance and twentieth-century comedy.
   b. Candidate’s narrative rhetorically situates how the various elements of their publication record forms a coherent body of work.

3. The candidate’s pattern of publication should be convincing to a review committee. One for example could not publish 8 review essays and successfully meet the requirements for tenure.

4. Publication appears in peer-reviewed venues
   a. This wording accepts materials published in formats other than print as long as those formats are peer-reviewed. If we say “journal” or “essay collection,” or even “book,” we imply a certain sort of publication: typically a print one that comes out on a regular schedule (with issues and years). But many electronic scholarly publications come out when things are ready: this will be an especially important point for candidates in disciplines other than traditional literary criticism and theory.
   b. Eventually in one’s career, the quality of one’s work publications bring positive attention from the scholarly community, leading to invitations to participate in projects, special issues, collections, etc. As long as the project or venue is peer-reviewed (even if by the publisher’s vetting process), such works should receive value as indicating one’s status in the profession.

5. All publications, regardless of publication date, count towards tenure and/or promotion.

6. Publication record over time shows a continued pattern of research and publication. Administrative or service appointments may slow the progress of a work to publication, but it should not replace continued publication as criteria for promotion.

7. The quality of one’s work has received recognition from the community of scholarship. Primarily for candidates seeking promotion to full, some indication of the candidate’s value to the discipline should be considered: impact of one’s work and reputation as a scholar as evidenced by citations, speaking engagements, officerships in field-specific organizations, etc.

Number of Publications Required

The candidate can fulfill the publication requirements for tenure in a variety of ways:

1. A book (print or electronic)
2. 6-8 articles
   a. Whether a candidate should publish 6, 7, or 8 depends on the quality of the publication venues for his or her work overall
   b. Articles can be print or electronic as long as the venue is peer-reviewed
3. Some combination of articles and other scholarly work. The department merit guidelines already designate the values the department places on various types of scholarly publications:
   - translation: 4/5s of a book
   - textbook (as distinguished from a reader), 3/5s of a book
   - collection of essays: 3/5s of a book
   - monograph: 3/5s of a book
Linguistics

We, the faculty in linguistics, are open to new media and to collaborative work and to defining broadly what constitutes a publication. The Linguistic Society of America, in fact, has a strong official policy about electronic media’s place in tenure & promotion reviews. We affirm that there are equivalencies to books in publishing. We value book reviews. It is our feeling that the current departmental policy provides adequate flexibility to accommodate all of the above without further revision, but we are happy to listen to what other groups in the department may have to suggest by way of revision.
T&P Procedures for the Annual Progress-Toward-Tenure Review (2\textsuperscript{nd}, 4\textsuperscript{th}, and 5\textsuperscript{th} years)

A. Each Fall semester the department chair, in conjunction with the Tenure and Promotion Procedures Committee, shall establish and make available to the voting faculty a time table for the tenure-progress review.

B. The department chair shall make available to tenure-track faculty copies of the curriculum vitae format and shall issue a call for the submission of all relevant materials, including a completed curriculum vitae, all sets of the department’s student teaching evaluations collected during the previous one-year period, copies of all publications, and work accepted for publication.

C. The TP&P Committee shall supervise a program of faculty visitation and teaching evaluation. The following guidelines will be observed:

1. The evaluation in the first year will be conducted in the Spring semester, in the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 4\textsuperscript{th}, and 5\textsuperscript{th} years in the Fall semester, with one tenured faculty member evaluating each tenure-track faculty member.
2. If possible, visits in subsequent years should be made by evaluators who have not previously evaluated the same faculty member, in order to permit a variety of evaluators.
3. Though faculty members who are to be evaluated may not request a specific individual or class for an evaluation, changes of assignment will be considered under certain circumstances, such as 1) when both the evaluator and the faculty member to be evaluated request a change, or 2) when an existing relationship is considered by either faculty member to be a significant hindrance to the proper functioning of the evaluation process or the process a threat to the relationship.
4. A request for change of assignment should be directed to the department chair, who may bring the matter to the attention of the TP&P Committee, or the person making the request may appear before the Committee.
5. The evaluator shall request from the faculty member to be evaluated all relevant teaching materials, such as course policy statement, syllabus, and a sampling of graded student papers.
6. The evaluator shall schedule a pre-observation conference with the faculty member to be evaluated. At this conference the evaluator and faculty member shall discuss the criteria (and the departmental evaluation form) which shall govern the evaluation, as well as other pertinent matters, such as course objectives, teaching methods, etc., and shall agree upon a date for an in-class observation.
7. The evaluator shall visit the faculty member’s class and observe the faculty member’s teaching.
8. The evaluator shall schedule a post-observation conference with the faculty member, at which time they will discuss their impressions, comment on apparent strengths and weaknesses evident in the faculty.
9. Following the post-observation conference, the evaluator shall write his or her evaluation (using the departmental form) and submit copies to the faculty member evaluated and to the department chair.
10. A faculty member wishing to appeal his or her teaching evaluation prior to its consideration by the tenured faculty should immediately initiate an appeal with the department chair, who will counsel with the faculty member and advise him or her of the right to submit a written response to the teaching evaluation.

D. The department chair shall make available for review by the pertinent tenured faculty (i.e., LCWL or TCR) all materials submitted for tenure-progress review, including a curriculum vitae, student teaching evaluations, faculty teaching evaluations, copies of all publications, and work accepted for publication.

E. The pertinent tenured faculty shall meet to advise the department chair regarding each tenure-track faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

F. Synthesizing comments made by the pertinent tenured faculty, the department chair shall write an assessment of each tenure-track faculty member’s progress toward tenure and shall meet with each candidate to discuss the assessment. The department chair and the candidate shall each sign two copies of the assessment, and each shall retain a copy.
Approximate Calendar for Tenure and Promotion Application

Spring of Year Five

Feb/March  Spring peer observation of teaching for fifth-year candidates.

March 15  Department Chair sends letters to external reviewers for evaluation of candidate’s publications.

April 1  Department Chair gives candidate the copy of the Department’s tenure and promotion guidelines that is to be included in the Tenure and Promotion Dossier.

May 1  Department Chair meets with the candidate to discuss possible members of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

May 8  Department Chair notifies those appointed to serve as chair and members of Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

May 15  Any conflict of interest involving Review Committee members resolved through the Department Chair.

Fall of Year Six

Aug 25  Candidate files Tenure and Promotion Dossier in the English office; Department Chair adds rankings of publication outlets on the candidate’s vita.

Sept 10  Review Committee files Tenure and Promotion Report in the candidate’s dossier.

Sept 17  Candidate files in dossier a written response (if any) to Review Committee report; Tenure and Promotion Dossier made available to the tenured faculty.

Sept 30  Tenured faculty meet to discuss candidate’s application for tenure and promotion; Department Chair distributes ballots to the tenured faculty.

Oct 6  Tenured faculty return completed ballots on tenure and promotion of the candidate.

Oct 10  Department Chair places tabulation of vote and Chair’s own letter on the candidate in the dossier; candidate signs statement that he or she has reviewed the contents of the dossier; candidate is given a copy of the dossier.

Oct 14  Tenure and Promotion Dossier plus seven copies submitted to A&S Dean.
Approximate Calendar for Third-Year Review

Nov 8    Department Chair meets with the candidate to discuss possible members of the Third-Year Review Committee.

Nov 15   Department Chair notifies those appointed to serve as chair and members of Third-Year Review Committee.

Nov 22   Any conflict of interest involving Review Committee members resolved through the Department Chair.

Nov 29   Review Committee chair informs candidate of the review process and deadline for filing completed Third-Year Review Dossier.

Jan 20   Candidate files Third-Year Review Dossier in English office.

Feb 15   Review Committee completes report and files it with the candidate’s Third-Year Review Dossier in the English office.

Feb 28   Candidate files in dossier a written response (if any) to Review Committee report; Third-Year Review Dossier made available to the tenured faculty.

Mar 7    Tenured faculty meet to discuss candidate’s progress toward tenure; Department Chair distributes ballots to the tenured faculty.

Mar 14   Tenured faculty return completed ballots on candidate’s progress toward tenure.
Form for Rating of Candidate in Years Two, Four, and Five

Teaching
☐ satisfactory
☐ unsatisfactory

Research
☐ satisfactory
☐ unsatisfactory

Service
☐ satisfactory
☐ unsatisfactory

Comments
Teaching Observation Form

Date of visit:

Person Evaluated:

Subject [English 1301, 3323, etc.]:

Signature of evaluator:

Along with any other comments you wish to make, please comment upon the following points to the extent that you were able to observe them:

1) Knowledge of subject
2) Organization in lecture or discussion
3) Clarify in presentation of material
4) Clarity of response to student’s questions
5) Overall ability to maintain interest
6) Classroom Decorum
7) Course organization and grading (you are asked to request a course description and student papers from the instructor).

In addition to your narrative commentary, please provide an overall rating of the instructor by marking the appropriate box below.

1) Above average _________ 2) Satisfactory _________ 3) Unsatisfactory_________
Memorandum Requesting Journal Ratings

To: Bruce Clarke  
From: Bruce Clarke  
RE: Ratings of Presses and Journals  
Date: August 15

According to OP regulations on tenure and promotion, the Chair must rate presses and journals listed in promotion packets that go to the A&S Dean’s Office. The scale for rating is:

5 = Outstanding recognition in field, highly prestigious, refereed.  
4 = Highly respected in field, refereed.  
3 = Good reputation, selective in publication, refereed.  
2 = Average, fairly easy to publish in, typically refereed.  
1 = Below average publication, not discriminating on articles published  
0 = Not to be counted as a publication  
S = Special publication not ranked above.

I ask for your help in making decisions about ratings for journals and presses with which you are familiar. Could you please provide such ratings and return this sheet to me by Sept 1?

Procedures state the chair will consult with colleagues knowledgeable in the area.

Name of individual doing the rating: ________________________________

— University of Xxxxxx Press  
— Xxxxx Xxxxxx University Press  
— Xxxxx Xxxxxx Publishers  
— Journal of Xxxxx x Xxxxxx  
— Studies in Xxxxx x Xxxxxx Xxxxxx  
— Xxxxx x Xxxxxx Review  
— Quarterly Journal of Xxxxxxx  
— The Texas Review of Xxxxx Xxxxx