

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

(Approved by Department April, 2015)

The composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is designed to reflect the diversity of the department's faculty and programs and to ensure that each candidate is guaranteed fair representation by colleagues sharing his or her area of academic specialization. The Committee consists of a four-member Core, which is augmented by two ad hoc appointments appropriate to the specific qualifications of individual candidates. The Core Committee consists of four full professors, two elected in alternate years, and two appointed by the Head in order to ensure insofar as possible balance of programs and gender. At the beginning of the spring semester each year, the voting members of the Department of English elect one full professor to the Core Promotion and Tenure Committee, to serve for two years; then the Department Head appoints two full professors to the Core Committee, each to serve for one year. Ordinarily, the elected member serving the second year of his or her term chairs the Committee.

In February the Head distributes a memorandum to the faculty asking those who wish to stand for promotion and/or tenure during the coming fall semester to indicate their intentions. This list of candidates who choose to be reviewed is supplemented with the names of those who are subject to mandatory review; the resulting compilation is presented to the Core Committee.

In March the Head gives the Core Promotion and Tenure Committee its charge. Committee members and candidates are provided with copies of the Department's and College's Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Criteria documents, and the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Process and Preparation of Dossiers memorandum when it is issued in April.

For each case of reappointment, tenure, or promotion, two additional members of appropriate professional expertise and rank are appointed by the Head. By April 3, each candidate provides the Head with the names of up to five potential ad hoc members, from the English Department or other departments, who are especially well qualified to evaluate the candidate's work. Prior to appointment, the Head confers with the candidate and the P&T Committee.

In the case of a candidate who has integral professional responsibilities in a Graduate Interdisciplinary Program as a component of his or her formal workload, the Head may, with the candidate's written approval, invite one (or more) tenured faculty of appropriate rank from the Executive Council of that program to serve as an ad hoc voting member.

No one who is otherwise qualified is ever barred from service on the Department of English Promotion and Tenure Committee on the basis of age, religion, race, color, national origin, gender, physical ability, or sexual orientation. Should any questions regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias arise during the process, the Committee will consult with a representative from the University's Affirmative Action Office.

All committee members and candidates are strongly encouraged by the Head to attend the Provost's workshop on promotion and tenure held each spring.

Review of Candidates on Joint Appointment

When the Department of English is the primary academic unit and tenure home for a candidate on joint appointment, all department and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences guidelines, criteria and procedures will apply. At least one ad hoc member will be from the candidate's secondary unit. A single recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean.

Selection of Outside Referees to Evaluate the Candidate's Publications and Professional Standing

By April 3, each candidate will submit to the Head a list of at least six, but not more than ten, potential referees from outside the University of Arizona. The candidate should take care to include only the names of evaluators with whom he or she has no close association -- e.g., major professor, co-author, or dissertation advisor. The Head, in consultation with members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, augments the candidate's list. The Head then discusses with the candidate the augmented list of potential referees, and gives the candidate an opportunity to state reasons for not asking one or more of the persons on the list to serve. If the Head thinks the reasons are legitimate, he or she will honor the candidate's wishes in this regard. In conformity with the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Procedures, "A list of all potential reviewers to whom the candidate has objected will be kept as a part of the official promotion and tenure file" (II, C. 3). The function of outside evaluators is to provide independent assessments of the candidate's work and professional standing. At no point in the process will the candidate communicate directly or indirectly with any potential reviewer regarding the tenure or promotion process. All queries should be directed to the Head. Letters of recommendation will be treated with the greatest possible confidentiality permitted by Arizona Board of Regents' policy and applicable law.

By April 17, the Head, in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selects from the list of potential referees at least three, but as a general rule five or six, persons who will be asked to serve as referees for each candidate. Some, but not more than half, of the referees will have been selected from the candidate's list. The Head and the Committee also

select some potential referees to hold in reserve in case any of those first selected do not choose to serve.

By May 10, the Head writes a letter to each selected referee, following the form prescribed by the Provost, requesting an evaluation of the candidate's publications and professional standing. When someone has agreed to serve as a referee, he or she is provided with copies of the candidate's curriculum vitae; summary of workload assignment; statement of accomplishments and objectives in research/creative activity, in teaching, and in service/outreach; and a representative set of publications. All correspondence with referees is dealt with by the Head.

Evaluation of the Candidate's Work in Other Units

If within the last five years the candidate has taught courses based in another unit and/or served on committees in the other unit (not designated as an interdisciplinary graduate program), the Head asks the Head or Director of that unit to write an evaluative letter for the candidate's Promotion and Tenure file.

Participation in the activities of interdisciplinary programs or collaborations with community, international, or business partners, may comprise an ongoing and integral part of a faculty member's professional activities. To the extent that this is so, these efforts should be recognized, alongside other relevant activities, in the evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

If the candidate's formal workload includes a significant portion within graduate and/or undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, then it shall be evaluated according to the procedures outlined below, consistent with current Graduate College procedures. Moreover, if the candidate, in consultation with the department head, considers his or her informal or "overload" participation in teaching, research, or service within the framework of an interdisciplinary program or within a university or external collaboration to constitute a significant portion of his or her workload, the head of the home department shall seek a written evaluation of the candidate's performance from the director of the interdisciplinary program or the chief executive of a collaborative enterprise (or his/her designee) according to the procedures outlined below. These procedures are to be followed in addition to, not in place of, all the other procedures prescribed above.

The candidate will be asked to include, as part of her or his promotion and tenure dossier, a detailed statement of all teaching, research, and service activities that she or he has undertaken as a participant in the relevant interdisciplinary program.

The head of the candidate's home department shall request from the director or chairperson of the relevant interdisciplinary program an evaluation of the degree and quality of the candidate's contributions to the interdisciplinary program.

This evaluation will be written by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program in consultation with an ad hoc committee comprising three tenured faculty of appropriate rank. The evaluation document will be sent to the head of the candidate's home department for inclusion in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Ordinarily, membership on such an ad hoc committee will be drawn from the interdisciplinary program's executive council and will include the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program. However, in the case of a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor in an interdisciplinary program the director or chairperson of which is not a full professor, that director or chairperson will join the ad hoc committee as a non-voting member (that is to say, he or she will participate in the discussion of the candidate's case but will not vote), and an additional full professor shall be added to the committee.

In cases in which the ad hoc committee mechanism appears unnecessary or redundant (e.g., when the candidate's involvement in the interdisciplinary program's activities is minimal, or when there is a large overlap between the membership of the home department's promotion and tenure committee and the interdisciplinary program's ad hoc committee), one or more tenured members of the interdisciplinary program's executive council may be invited by the head of the home department to serve as pro tempore and ad hoc voting members of the home department's promotion and tenure committee.

In the case of a member of a graduate interdisciplinary program, additional input may be solicited from the university's director of graduate interdepartmental programs whenever this is deemed appropriate by the candidate, by the head of the home department, or by the director or chairperson of the interdisciplinary program.

Once documentation of a candidate's interdisciplinary program activities has been incorporated into the candidate's dossier it will be considered - at all stages of review and by all reviewers - as integral to the evaluation of the candidate.

Preparation of the Candidate's Dossier

In April, when the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Process and Preparation of Dossiers memorandum becomes available, the Head consults with each candidate to review the content and format of the dossier and the timeline for the process. The dossier includes the vita, the statement of accomplishments and objectives in research, teaching, and service/outreach, and the evaluation of teaching and advising. Such dossiers must be prepared using the outline form (headings and subheadings) from the most recent version of the Provost's Guidelines for Preparing Promotion and Tenure Cases issued each spring by the Provost. Such dossiers must include a Teaching Portfolio and should, in some cases, if mandated by the position description of the candidate or agreed on between the candidate

and his/her department head, include a Service and Outreach Portfolio, both compiled according to the Provost's Guidelines. For further information, consult the current version of the Provost's Guidelines. These Guidelines indicate, where appropriate to the description of the candidate's position, the following documentations of scholarly and service or outreach impact:

- letters from academic, community, or business collaborators
- letters from University collaborators noting the impact and rigor of the candidate's work
- verifiable news or media reports on service contributions
- grants secured, whether for research, teaching, or service contributions
- contracts for external contributions or translational research
- adoptions of programs and materials by other institutions

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication. Each manuscript accepted for publication but not yet actually published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher, journal editor, or other responsible person indicating its acceptance.

A candidate's teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted, by way of a Teaching Portfolio compiled according to Provost Guidelines. It is the responsibility of the department head and the candidate to provide an evaluation of teaching and advising, as directed in the current Provost's Guidelines.

Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without the university, is the responsibility of the candidate. He or she should submit all pertinent documentation when citing such honors, awards, or service, e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc. These can, and in some cases should, be submitted within a Service and Outreach Portfolio.

In any case in which a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should submit all pertinent documentation, e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations; etc..

The candidate should discuss with the department head submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action.

Significant new materials may be added to the candidate packet during the review process in accordance with the procedures described in the current Provost's Guidelines.

The department head shall ensure that the candidate's file remain intact and the identical file as was reviewed at the department level be forwarded intact to the dean's level.

By May 10, the candidate provides the Head with draft copies of these documents for review and suggestions for revision.

By May 30, the candidate submits the revised documents, which will be sent to all external reviewers. At the same time, the candidate submits a copy of all publications. Work accepted for publication and presented in manuscript form must include a letter from the publisher or journal editor indicating its acceptance. All published or forthcoming works listed on the curriculum vitae must include title, publisher, place, date, and number of pages. The candidate may provide copies of reviews and citations of his or her work.

Later, the Head prepares each candidate's dossier for transmittal to the College Committee. The Head is available throughout the process to answer questions.

Committee Procedures for Evaluating Teaching, Publications, and Service

The full Promotion and Tenure Committee for each candidate meets early in the fall semester to apportion the work. Members are selected to visit the candidate's classes and write reports on their visits. Ordinarily, there will be no more than two visits. All members are expected to familiarize themselves with the candidate's course evaluations and instructional materials. One member is selected to read all of the candidate's course evaluations and instructional materials and write a report including a quantitative summary and an assessment of the candidate's instructional preparation and planning. In the case of Assistant Professors this evaluation will be for the entire probationary period and in the case of Associate Professors this evaluation will be for the last five years. All members of the Committee are expected to familiarize themselves with the candidate's publications and the reviews of the publications. One or two members of the Committee who are specialists in the candidate's field are selected to read all the publications and reviews and write a report on them. A Committee member will be selected to write a brief statement on each external reviewer's national or international standing and affirm the reviewer's independence of the candidate.

Through this process, the departmental committee will summarize the relative importance of the candidate's scholarly and creative production. If the candidate is said to have national or international standing or his/her research is found to have community, business, or international impact beyond academia, this claim must be substantiated. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate's individual contributions, the departmental committee will also assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate's overall research program and will assess the relevance to that general program of all individual research products, including evidence of translational research.

At the decision meeting, in September, all aspects of the candidate's work, including service, are discussed, with due consideration being given to all of the reports that have been written on teaching and publications. After the discussion, a vote is taken by secret ballot. At least four votes (two-thirds) are needed for a positive recommendation. The Committee then discusses the substance of the letter that it will submit to the Head as part of the dossier. One member of the Committee subsequently writes a draft detailing the decision of the Committee and submits it for review and revision. The letter reports the vote in numerical terms only. In the case of a split vote, both opinions are explained in the Committee's letter. The Chair of the Committee sends the final draft of the letter to the Head no later than September 25.

The dossiers of each candidate, with the external letters excluded, are made available for confidential individual review by faculty in rank. Once the Promotion and Tenure Committee has completed its decision meeting, it calls a meeting with all faculty in rank in order to consult and report on its decision, including a summary of the content of the external letters. In keeping with SBS Promotion and Tenure/Continuing Status Guidelines, this meeting allows a discussion of the committee's decision so as to permit faculty in rank to discuss the case for promotion or tenure. At the end of this meeting, a vote is conducted by paper ballot. Absentee ballots will be accepted from eligible faculty unable to attend the meeting. The outcome of this vote is reported to the faculty in rank by the Department Head.

The Department Head's Review of the Candidate's Performance

The Head reviews the candidate's teaching, scholarship and/or creative writing, and service independently of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and writes a separate letter which includes his or her recommendation. Both the Committee's and the Head's letters are forwarded with the candidate's dossier.

Confidentiality and Reporting

The identity of referees and the proceedings in all meetings of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee are confidential. Members do not discuss the proceedings or evaluation with the candidate. Normally the Committee meets without the Head.

At the time the dossier is forwarded to the Vice-Dean's Office for the next level of review, the Head will provide the candidate with a written summary of the department recommendations. The candidate is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation. (UHAP 3.15)

Two- and Four-Year Reviews

The Department's Core Promotion and Tenure Committee along with two appropriate ad hoc members functions in two- and four-year reviews as it does in reviews concerning tenure and promotion. The Head provides the Committee with a list of faculty members to be reviewed, and instructs the candidates about the process and about the dossier they are to present. The Committee evaluates teaching, scholarship and/or creative writing, and service by the same procedures used in tenure reviews; however, outside letters of evaluation are not sought. If the decision of the Committee and the Head is to renew the appointment of a faculty member under review, the Head so informs the faculty member and points out any area of performance that may need to be improved before the tenure review. If the decision is to recommend non-renewal, the steps presented in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) 3.12.07 are followed.

Appeals

Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the departmental committee level, a written appeal may be directed to the department head. Should a candidate feel that procedures have not been followed at the level of the department head or of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences promotion and tenure committee, a written appeal may be directed to the dean. For further information concerning the appeal process as stipulated in the University Handbook of Appointed Personnel, see UHAP 3.12.07 and 3.12.08.

In the case of a negative decision by the Provost, not to renew or deny promotion or tenure to a tenure-eligible faculty member, or promotion to a tenured faculty member, the faculty member may appeal to the President under UHAP 3.12.08. Such appeals must be filed in writing with the Office of the President within 30 days after notice of the Provost's decision.