

Wendy ✓ 5/19/03

APR 23 2003

Joe ✓

Przulla ✓

TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY
FOR THE PROGRAM IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

This document is intended to profile a successful Assistant Professor of Comparative Literature and to provide useful information about the tenure and promotion process. Because the faculty positions in the program now and in the future are often shared with other units, some of the procedures described below necessarily depend on the cooperation of those departments. Further details and explanations can be obtained from the program director, the Dean's office, and the Provost's office. The Faculty Guide to Promotion and Tenure at the University of Oregon, distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs, should also be consulted.

Scholarship

In making a recommendation for tenure or promotion at the departmental, college and university levels, committees consider first and foremost the scholarly production of the candidate. Normally, this is measured primarily by his or her record of publication. In general, departments in the humanities expect a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor to have a book manuscript accepted for publication by a first-rate university press, or the equivalent in articles and/or book chapters (eight to ten of substantial length). In the case of articles, most of them should appear in major refereed journals in the national literatures or comparative literature; in the case of book chapters, these should appear in volumes with the same standard of quality and visibility as the book manuscript mentioned above. Above all, the candidate's publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship. The record should also indicate continuing scholarly activity, attendance and participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future productivity including a broadening of scholarly range. 16-10

For promotion from associate to full professor, the program expects the candidate to have accepted for publication a second book or the equivalent in articles.

Teaching

The Comparative Literature Program expects excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The program further expects that tenure-related faculty will share departmental responsibilities for courses taught at all levels, and that the research interests of the faculty will often lead to the development of new courses. In assessing teaching quality, the program relies on a variety of sources, including a sample of course materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, homework assignments, etc.), numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and classroom visits by colleagues before and during the tenure or promotion process. It is the responsibility of the director to see that such visits are made regularly enough to measure the candidate's teaching, and that visitors' reactions are shared with the candidate in a constructive spirit. Tenure-related faculty may request such visits at any time. Evidence of outstanding teaching will strengthen a tenure case but will not be sufficient by itself to ensure either promotion or tenure. Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching will certainly jeopardize promotion and/or tenure.

Service

The program expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the program, but with the understanding that service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship. Untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to serve on some college or university-wide committees but should not undertake time-consuming commitments on major university committees. They should feel free to call on the program director's support in declining such responsibilities.

In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighed more heavily, and faculty should normally have made an important contribution to the department and university.

Tenure and Promotion / 2

Service to the profession, while not a major element in a tenure or promotion decision, is evaluated favorably and may indicate as well that the faculty member has the esteem of his or her professional peers. The program recognizes reviews, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, etc., as service to the profession. Tenure-related faculty should keep a record of such activities from the start of their careers.

Departmental Procedures

The university's tenure consideration procedures are described in the Faculty Handbook and the Administrative Rules and Guidelines issued by the Provost's office. In the case of candidates whose tenure homes will be in Comparative Literature, the following procedures apply. For candidates who have a partial appointment in Comparative Literature but whose tenure homes will be elsewhere, the program director and/or Comparative Literature faculty will participate significantly in the other department's process by writing letters, visiting classes, and serving on ad hoc committees.

1. In the third year of regular service, the tenured faculty will review and evaluate the candidate's performance in the categories noted above. The review should be forthright and include, if necessary, specific suggestions for improvement. This review should be signed by the program director and the person reviewed, and will be placed in the latter's personnel file but will not be used for the tenure file.
2. The candidate is normally reviewed for tenure in his or her sixth year of service except in unusually meritorious cases or where an agreement for prior service has been made at the time of appointment.
3. During the spring term before a case comes up for tenure, an ad hoc committee of associate and/or full professors from inside and/or outside the program reviews the candidate and conducts at least two classroom visits to evaluate teaching. The committee then makes a preliminary report to the tenured members of the program noting the strengths and/or weaknesses of the case. During the summer, the program director begins to compile a dossier. Extramural evaluations of the candidate's scholarship are solicited from six established and reputable scholars in the candidate's field. Two or three of these referees will be chosen from a list proposed by the candidate (candidates should normally not choose dissertation advisers or research collaborators as referees); the tenured faculty of the program, in consultation with other informed faculty members on campus, will select the others. Intramural letters from those familiar with teaching, scholarship, or service will also be sought. The candidate may or may not waive the right to see the referees' letters. Even if the candidate has waived the right of access, he or she retains the right to request a summary of the substantive comments of the letters.
4. The dossier should also include all significant publications and a candidate's statement of accomplishments and objectives in scholarship, teaching, and service. The department chair will add to the dossier quantitative data from teaching evaluations, signed student comments, brief vitas of the referees, a statement of the candidate's position description, an evaluation of the journals in which the candidate's articles have appeared, and any other appropriate materials.
5. After all the outside letters have been received, the tenured professors read the full dossier, including publications. They then hold a meeting to discuss the case. At the end of the meeting a vote is taken by signed, secret ballot. The program director does not cast a vote. When all votes have been received, the program secretary or a designated neutral party informs those voting of the numerical count. If there is a major discrepancy between the discussion and the vote-count, the department chair must reopen the discussion. The ballots themselves will be placed in an envelope sealed and signed by the program director. Faculty who have read the dossier but cannot be present at the meeting may write a letter to the program director, stating their views on the candidate and recording their vote. The envelope with the ballots will be retained in the department unless, at a later stage, they are requested by the Dean's committee or the Provost's office.

Tenure and Promotion / 3

6. The program director then writes his or her own statement, which may or may not agree with the program faculty's vote. This statement, the ad hoc committee's report, the recorded vote, and the other materials including a summary of the discussion in the tenured faculty meetings are to be included in the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences, usually before November 1.

University Procedure

1. The Dean's Advisory Committee evaluates tenure cases in the fall and early winter. Their procedure may change from time to time, but at present the committee may request the Dean or Associate Dean to collect more information (e.g., additional outside evaluations) or it may itself interview department members or others about a case. Its report and vote are advisory to the Dean. Normally the Associate Dean who is in charge of faculty matters plays an active role in drafting the college's statements; the Associate Dean in recent years has met with all tenure candidates in the college to discuss their cases after the college has completed its report.

2. At this point, the case goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee, a university-wide body elected by the faculty. It normally deliberates in the late winter and spring, and its reports and votes are advisory to the Provost. The Provost's decision, made with the advice of the Faculty Personnel Committee and with the departmental and college-level reports, is normally the final one, although there are appeal procedures in those cases where the Provost denies tenure or promotion.

January 1996