



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

GUIDELINES

English Department

Workload
Faculty Annual Review
Third-Year Review
Promotion and Tenure

9/30/11

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Approved 8/24/09, Updated 4/1/11, **Approved by Provost 5/11, Updated 9/30/11 to reflect FHB changes**

The **Department of English** Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The English Department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:

https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual

review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses¹ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach² workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses³ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does become productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)

CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines⁴ the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers

Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)

NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

¹ A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

² "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition." - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

³ Ibid.

⁴ http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's

progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

Appendix 1

Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.

Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected

of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

Appendix 2

Departmental Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

The normal teaching load for graduate faculty members of the Department of English is five classes per year. Non-Graduate faculty members will be expected to teach a higher number of courses so that teaching will be weighted more heavily. Thus a tenured faculty member who is not also a member of the graduate faculty will be expected to teach six classes. Nevertheless, if a faculty member teaches six classes, he or she is not totally exempted from research. Similarly, faculty members are not exempted from service. For non-tenured and tenured faculty, the percentages for assigned duties are expected to fall within these ranges:

Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty

Teaching	50-70
Research	25-45
Outreach	0-30
Service	5-10

Tenured Faculty

Teaching	30-80
Research	10-40
Outreach	0-30
Service	10-40

Appendix 3

Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

[illegible]

Appendix 4

Annual Review Guidelines

Department Head: Annually in spring semester, the DH submits a statement of accomplishments and plans for an annual review conducted by the Dean.

Professorial faculty: In accordance with University guidelines, the DH each spring semester conducts a review with each professorial faculty member for the preceding calendar year. The purpose of the reviews is to give each faculty member (a) an opportunity to share in the assessment of the extent and value of the faculty member's instructional, research/creative work, service, and outreach activity for the year and (b) an opportunity to discuss with the DH the faculty member's present and future role within the departmental program. As a basis for the review, the faculty member is asked to provide, using a standardized format, information and materials relevant to the above; the DH augments this submission with the results of student and, if appropriate, peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching. Faculty members are rated in each area of their work assignments: teaching, research/creative work, service, and outreach. Performance descriptors are as follows: Exemplary (4), Exceeds Expectations (3), Meets Expectations (2), Marginal (1), and Unacceptable (0). The evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

Instructors: Each instructor receives an annual review during spring semester focused on the instructor's teaching and other contributions to the department, considering class visits, instructional materials, grading practices, teaching effectiveness surveys, reports solicited from the coordinators of the programs in which the instructors teach, and evidence of other service to the department. These reviews may be performed by the DH or may be delegated to a professorial faculty member. A copy of each review is forwarded to the DH.

Graduate Teaching Assistants: The Coordinator of Composition and the Coordinator of Technical Communication conduct similar reviews each spring semester of GTAs, focused on the teaching and other contributions of the GTAs to those programs, considering class visits, instructional materials, grading practices, and teaching effectiveness surveys. Copies of the review are forwarded to the Coordinator of Graduate Studies and the DH.

Staff: Annually in spring semester DH conducts an annual review of the performance of assigned duties by each staff member. A copy of this review is signed by the Dean and filed in the Office of Human Resources.

Appendix 5

Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines

The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of English follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the *Faculty Handbook*.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation can be issued at any time prior to tenure.

Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Adopted 11/18/09

1. General

General requirements for appointment or promotion to the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are outlined in the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*.

The timing of the applications for promotion and for tenure is set by the university. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education are encouraged to come up for promotion and tenure review in their fifth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, but *must* come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the *Faculty Handbook*). As further clarification of its standards for promotion and tenure, the Department of English adopts the guidelines below.

Decisions on promotion to Associate Professor, on promotion to Professor, and on tenure depend on the candidate's sustained work of high quality in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. (If outreach is assigned as a percentage of the candidate's effort, then it too should show evidence of high quality, and should be presented as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.) Faculty members are responsible for maintaining their own records and files of evidence, except when the responsibility is specifically assigned to the Department Head.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Teaching

Teaching is a primary activity of the Department of English, and constitutes the greatest percentage of faculty effort in almost all cases. For this reason, candidates for tenure, and for promotion to either associate professor or professor, must all demonstrate a high level of performance as teachers. (Sustained quality of teaching is also addressed through annual reviews and the third year review.)

Evidence of teaching effectiveness *must* include the items listed below. The candidate should maintain appropriate documentation of teaching activities. The DH is responsible for working with the candidate to arrange appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, as well as for providing the peer evaluations and teaching effectiveness surveys to the voting faculty.

- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Three peer evaluations, conducted over the preceding three years, assessing the candidate's:
 - Knowledge of subject matter
 - Course materials
 - Conduct of class session(s)
- Syllabi, handouts, and examinations from a sufficient number of courses, taught in the preceding three years, to demonstrate the range of the candidate's teaching.

(Typically candidates present a core course, a course for majors, and a graduate course.)

- Grade distributions (from the same courses, if possible)
- Teaching effectiveness surveys (from the same courses, if possible)

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by the candidate's contributions

- In work as a program coordinator or administrator, including study abroad
- In work with master's and doctoral students, whether as major professor, committee member, outside reader, or examiner
- In developing new courses and curricula
- In significant new preparations or redevelopments of courses taught
- In work as a mentor or lead teacher, as a research supervisor, or as director of undergraduate research projects
- In the scholarship of teaching, whether through textbooks, articles, or the publication of high quality teaching materials (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research and creative work below)
- In earning grants, honors, and awards related to teaching
- Through participation in teaching/learning conferences and symposia
- Through avenues other than those listed above

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate's overall effectiveness as a teacher, considering issues of quality, rigor, and integrity, along with issues of innovation, continuing development, and student engagement.

b. Outreach

Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

Outreach has not traditionally been an assigned area of effort for faculty in the Department of English. This does not mean that individual faculty members have not pursued outreach activities, nor that their activities in outreach do not contribute to the mission and goals of the Department. However, it is important that the faculty member and the DH agree that the planned activity *is* outreach, and that the faculty member maintain appropriate records (of outreach activities, scholarship, and impact on external audiences). Faculty are encouraged to confer with the DH before undertaking significant tasks in outreach. Appropriately arranged and documented efforts in outreach will contribute to a candidate's tenure or promotion case as do their equivalents in research and creative work: that is, major outreach publications or administration of major programs will be highly valued; brief panels or presentations will have modest value.

c. Research and Creative Work

Research and creative work occupy the second most important area of effort for most faculty members in English. Given the diversity of areas within English Studies, and the different pathways of research and creative work leading to achievement in those areas, the most important index to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in English with regard to research and creative work is the criterion of *emerging national reputation*.

i. Emerging National Reputation

A candidate for Associate Professor in the Department of English is expected to show *strong evidence of work in national contexts and venues*, thus demonstrating that he or she is building toward a national reputation within his or her field, and is likewise expected to demonstrate *the potential for continued growth as a scholar or creative artist in national or international contexts*.

The *primary* evidence of emerging national reputation exists in the quality and substance of the candidate's published work, as detailed below, and as evaluated by members of the English faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy. *Secondary* evidence of potential national reputation *must* include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate's work. (See Outside Reviewers below.) Additionally, secondary evidence of the candidate's emerging national reputation *may* include any of the following:

- Reputation of presses publishing the candidate's work
- Reviews of the candidate's work, with consideration of where the review appeared
- Reputation of journals publishing the candidate's work
- Invited work by the candidate, when based on the candidate's stature, accomplishments, or continuing work in the field
- Invited lectures at other universities and conferences, especially plenaries; invited readings by creative writers
- National media exposure, including radio, television, and print interviews
- Response of nationally-known scholars to the candidate's requests (e.g., for contributions to an edited volume, for conference papers or lectures)
- Candidate's reviews, especially review essays, in prestigious journals
- Editorial or advisory board positions on journals or other publications
- Evidence of the influence and citation of the candidate's work
- Evidence that the candidate's work is used in graduate and/or undergraduate classes at other universities
- Translation or reprinting of the candidate's published work
- Book tours
- National or international recognition of candidate's website (as demonstrated by the number and quality of external links, awards, number of hits, etc.)
- Prestige of conferences where the candidate presents work
- Consulting work by the candidate
- Candidate's work as an external reviewer or judge (of manuscripts, of contests, of grant proposals, of tenure and promotion cases at other institutions, etc.)
- Candidate's leadership (in the specific field or in the profession) as signaled by positions of responsibility
- Prizes, honors, and awards for published work
- Other prizes, honors, and awards
- Grants and fellowships

ii. Research, Creative Work, and Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of English will demonstrate continued accomplishment in all areas of effort, but the

candidate's research and creative work, in particular, should present *strong evidence of work in national contexts and venues*, thus demonstrating that the candidate is building toward a national reputation within his or her field, and demonstrating *the potential for continued growth as a scholar or creative artist in national or international contexts*.

Evidence from the list above may contribute to this, but it is understood that candidates for associate professor will have had fewer opportunities to distinguish themselves on the national level. The letters from outside reviewers may provide stronger indications of the candidate's current and potential impact within the field. The *primary* evidence of an emerging national profile, however, should be found in the substance and quality of the candidate's published work as evaluated by members of the English faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy.

The diversity of pathways to achievement in English Studies makes it hard to generalize, but all areas in English are in agreement on the importance of several key issues with regard to candidates' research and creative work:

- **Peer-reviewed publication:** The precise form of peer review should be appropriate to the candidate's area (e.g., external readers in literary study, accomplished judges and editors in creative writing, professional evaluators in software development and new media work). Published work not subject to peer review is valued, but never as highly as peer-reviewed work.
- **Publications of substance:** Book-length projects, scholarly articles, and major electronic or creative projects are valued more highly than small projects (individual poems, conference proceedings, brief essays, etc.).
- **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Collaboratively authored work, more common in writing studies and linguistics, is of great value in all areas, but strong evidence of independent or lead authorship is vital.
- **Coherent programs of research and creative work:** Each candidate should articulate a program of continued effort and potential impact within his or her area of specialization, and the voting faculty should be able to discern evidence of progress and pattern in the candidate's publications. (The voting faculty are aware that these patterns of publication may still be emerging in the work of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor.)
- **Interdisciplinarity:** The Department recognizes the special promise as well as the special cost of interdisciplinary work, and values research programs that engage in such work. Cross-disciplinary publication, when appropriately explained in the candidate's research or creative program, is valued at the same level as publication within the candidate's area.
- **Electronic media:** The Department values the use of newer media, and evaluates electronic publication and other digital work by the same criteria and as equivalent to print publication. To the extent possible, the voting faculty review these materials in the appropriate electronic environment. Candidates presenting unconventional materials should supply a statement of digital philosophy explaining the purpose, structure, and intended audience of their electronic publications.

But the pathways are diverse, and thus different areas in English Studies have different preferences, and their candidates exhibit different profiles. In the examples below, all items are peer-reviewed and single-authored unless stated otherwise. Similarly, co-author or co-PI contribution is designated by a percentage figure; unless otherwise specified, edited collections are assumed to include a substantial introduction and one additional substantial article within the collection.

- **Literary Studies:** For literary scholars, the *usual* evidence of continued achievement and of emerging national reputation is the publication of a book from a respected academic press. This criterion can also be met by a minimum of 6 substantial scholarly articles in journals or in essay collections, *or* by an appropriate mix of articles, edited collections, editions, digital media projects, and other substantial scholarly work.
 - *For example, a literary scholar might present a scholarly edition from an academic press; 2 journal articles; 2 invited essays in collections*
- **Writing Studies:** For scholars in writing studies (including technical and professional communication, composition studies, and rhetoric), the publishing avenues are more diverse, and the single-authored monograph not so central; in addition, scholarship of pedagogy and practice is directly related to achievement of national reputation in this area, and thus is evaluated as research. Evidence of continued achievement and emerging national reputation *may* be demonstrated by a scholarly book or a minimum of 6 substantial single-authored articles in journals or in essay collections; more frequently, this criterion is met by an appropriate mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research: textbooks or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; software development digital media projects; conference proceedings; significant external research grants.
 - *For example, a scholar in writing studies might present a co-authored textbook from an educational press (50%); 3 single-authored journal articles; 2 papers in conference proceedings*
- **Linguistics:** For scholars in linguistics, evidence of continued achievement and of emerging national reputation is generally provided by a minimum of 6 substantial scholarly articles in journals or in essay collections. As in writing studies, this criterion is frequently met by an appropriate mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research: scholarly monographs; textbooks or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; software development or digital media projects; significant external research grants.
 - *For example, a scholar in linguistics might present an edited collection; 2 single-authored journal articles; 2 co-authored journal articles*
- **Creative Writing:** For creative writers, evidence of continued achievement and of emerging national reputation is usually provided by a minimum of one book length project, supplemented by a strong record of continuing publication in well regarded journals and/or magazines. Though candidates generally present work chiefly in one genre (e.g., prose fiction or poetry), both scholarly work and creative work in other genres are also accepted as part of their creative profile.
 - *For example, a creative writer might present a novel; a series of monologues; three short stories; one non-fiction essay*

In addition to providing copies of all relevant publications for review, the candidate will prepare an updated program of research and/or creative work which outlines the candidate's plans beyond promotion. The voting faculty will consider all of the candidate's publications, including those published prior to initial appointment at Auburn University.

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate's work as a scholar or creative artist, considering issues of quality, substance, and integrity, as well as issues of reputation, venue, and potential for continuing impact in the field.

iii. Outside Reviews

Outside reviewers should be selected in accordance with CLA⁵ and Provost⁶ guidelines.

d. Service

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member's workload, but the Department expects a candidate for promotion or for tenure to perform service tasks at a high level of quality.

In general, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to have performed limited service on the department level and very little, if any, service at the college or university level. Modest professional service beyond the university is also reasonable, but candidates at this level should consult with the Department Head before taking on demanding service roles. Successful performance of service roles, for any level of the University or the profession, is demonstrated over a sustained period by any of the following:

- Service as program coordinator, administrator, or responsible officeholder
- Service as chair or member of standing committees, search committees, or ad hoc committees
- Service as evaluator, reviewer, or judge (manuscripts, contests, etc.)
- Service on editorial boards
- Sponsorship or organization of professional conferences
- Sponsorship or organization of visiting speakers or events
- Grants, honors, or awards for meritorious service
- Scholarship of service, whether through books, articles, or the publication of other high quality materials related to service (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research and creative work below.)
- Other contributions to service

Appropriate documentation of service activities should be maintained by the candidate. In evaluating candidates, the voting faculty will consider the following aspects of their service: initiative and effectiveness, as well as attitude toward and engagement with the service activity.

3. Promotion to Professor

a. Teaching

⁵ Available at <http://cla-web.auburn.edu/cla/index.cfm/faculty/promotion-and-tenure/>

⁶ Available at <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

Teaching is a primary activity of the Department of English, and constitutes the greatest percentage of faculty effort in almost all cases. For this reason, candidates for tenure, and for promotion to either associate professor or professor, must all demonstrate a high level of performance as teachers. (Sustained quality of teaching is also addressed through annual reviews, and, if necessary, through post-tenure review.)

Evidence of teaching effectiveness *must* include the items listed below. The candidate should maintain appropriate documentation of teaching activities. The DH is responsible for working with the candidate to arrange appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, as well as for providing the peer evaluations and teaching effectiveness surveys to the voting faculty.

- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Three peer evaluations, conducted over the preceding three years, assessing the candidate's:
 - Knowledge of subject matter
 - Course materials
 - Conduct of class session(s)
- Syllabi, handouts, and examinations from a sufficient number of courses, taught in the preceding three years, to demonstrate the range of the candidate's teaching. (Typically candidates present a core course, a course for majors, and a graduate course.)
- Grade distributions (from the same courses, if possible)
- Teaching effectiveness surveys (from the same courses, if possible)

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by the candidate's contributions

- In work as a program coordinator or administrator, including study abroad
- In work with master's and doctoral students, whether as major professor, committee member, outside reader, or examiner
- In developing new courses and curricula
- In significant new preparations or redevelopments of courses taught
- In work as a mentor or lead teacher, as a research supervisor, or as director of undergraduate research projects
- In the scholarship of teaching, whether through textbooks, articles, or the publication of high quality teaching materials (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research and creative work below)
- In earning grants, honors, and awards related to teaching
- Through participation in teaching/learning conferences and symposia
- Through avenues other than those listed above

In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate's overall effectiveness as a teacher, considering issues of quality, rigor, and integrity, along with issues of innovation, continuing development, and student engagement.

b. Outreach

Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

Outreach has not traditionally been an assigned area of effort for faculty in the Department of English. This does not mean that individual faculty members have not pursued outreach activities, nor that their activities in outreach do not contribute to the mission and goals of the Department. However, it is important that the faculty member and the DH agree that the planned activity *is* outreach, and that the faculty member maintain appropriate records (of outreach activities, scholarship, and impact on external audiences). Faculty are encouraged to confer with the DH before undertaking significant tasks in outreach. Appropriately arranged and documented efforts in outreach will contribute to a candidate's tenure or promotion case as do their equivalents in research and creative work: that is, major outreach publications or administration of major programs will be highly valued; brief panels or presentations will have modest value.

c. Research and Creative Work

Research and creative work occupy the second most important area of effort for most faculty members in English. Given the diversity of areas within English Studies, and the different pathways of research and creative work leading to achievement in those areas, the most important index to promotion to Professor in English with regard to research and creative work is the criterion of *national reputation*.

i. National Reputation

A candidate for Professor in the Department of English is expected to demonstrate *a respected national reputation within his or her field, along with evidence of continuing growth as a scholar or creative artist in national or international contexts*.

The *primary* evidence of national reputation exists in the quality and substance of the candidate's published work, as detailed below, and as evaluated by members of the English faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy. *Secondary* evidence of the candidate's national reputation *must* include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate's work. (See Outside Reviewers below.) Additionally, secondary evidence of the candidate's national reputation *may* include any of the following:

- Reputation of presses publishing the candidate's work
- Reviews of the candidate's work, with consideration of where the review appeared
- Reputation of journals publishing the candidate's work
- Invited work by the candidate, when based on the candidate's stature, accomplishments, or continuing work in the field
- Invited lectures at other universities and conferences, especially plenaries; invited readings by creative writers
- National media exposure, including radio, television, and print interviews
- Response of nationally-known scholars to the candidate's requests (e.g., for contributions to an edited volume, for conference papers or lectures)
- Candidate's reviews, especially review essays, in prestigious journals
- Editorial or advisory board positions on journals or other publications
- Evidence of the influence and citation of the candidate's work
- Evidence that the candidate's work is used in graduate and/or undergraduate classes at other universities
- Translation or reprinting of the candidate's published work
- Book tours

- National or international recognition of candidate's website (as demonstrated by the number and quality of external links, awards, number of hits, etc.)
- Prestige of conferences where the candidate presents work
- Consulting work by the candidate
- Candidate's work as an external reviewer or judge (of manuscripts, of contests, of grant proposals, of tenure and promotion cases at other institutions, etc.)
- Candidate's leadership (in the specific field or in the profession) as signaled by positions of responsibility
- Prizes, honors, and awards for published work
- Other prizes, honors, and awards
- Grants and fellowships

ii. Research, Creative Work, and Promotion to Professor

The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor in the Department of English will demonstrate continued accomplishment in all areas of effort, but the candidate's research and creative work, in particular, should meet the requirement of national reputation specified by the *Faculty Handbook*. That is, a candidate for Professor in the Department of English is expected to demonstrate *a respected national reputation within his or her field, along with evidence of continuing growth as a scholar or creative artist in national or international contexts*.

Secondary evidence of national reputation *must* include at least three confidential outside reviews assessing the candidate's work. Other secondary evidence of national reputation (from the list above) is also important in the evaluation of the candidate for promotion to Professor. But the *primary* evidence of the candidate's national reputation should be found in the substance and quality of the candidate's published work as evaluated by members of the English faculty eligible to vote on the candidacy. The diversity of pathways to achievement in English Studies makes it hard to generalize, but all areas in English are in agreement on the importance of several key issues with regard to candidates' research and creative work:

- **Peer-reviewed publication:** The precise form of peer review should be appropriate to the candidate's area (e.g., external readers in literary study, accomplished judges and editors in creative writing, professional evaluators in software development and new media work). Published work not subject to peer review is valued, but never as highly as peer-reviewed work.
- **Publications of substance:** Book-length projects, scholarly articles, and major electronic or creative projects are valued more highly than small projects (individual poems, conference proceedings, brief essays, etc.).
- **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Collaboratively authored work, more common in writing studies and linguistics, is of great value in all areas, but strong evidence of independent or lead authorship is vital.
- **Coherent programs of research and creative work:** Each candidate should articulate a program of continued effort and impact within his or her area of specialization, and the voting faculty should be able to discern evidence of progress and pattern in the candidate's publications.
- **Interdisciplinarity:** The Department recognizes the special promise as well as the special cost of interdisciplinary work, and values research programs that

engage in such work. Cross-disciplinary publication, when appropriately explained in the candidate's research or creative program, is valued at the same level as publication within the candidate's area.

- **Electronic media:** The Department values the use of newer media, and evaluates electronic publication and other digital work by the same criteria and as equivalent to print publication. To the extent possible, the voting faculty review these materials in the appropriate electronic environment. Candidates presenting unconventional materials should supply a statement of digital philosophy explaining the purpose, structure, and intended audience of their electronic publications.

But the pathways are diverse, and thus different areas in English Studies have different preferences, and their candidates exhibit different profiles. In the examples below, all items are peer-reviewed and single-authored unless stated otherwise. Similarly, co-author or co-PI contribution is designated by a percentage figure; unless otherwise specified, edited collections are assumed to include a substantial introduction and one additional substantial article within the collection.

- **Literary Studies:** For literary scholars, the *usual* evidence of national reputation and continuing growth as a scholar is the publication of a second book from a respected academic press. Occasionally this criterion can also be met by publication, after tenure, of a minimum of 6 substantial articles. An appropriate mix of scholarly monographs, articles, edited collections, editions, digital media projects, and other substantial scholarly work may take the place of the 6 articles.
 - *For example, a literary scholar might present a scholarly edition from an academic press; 2 substantial journal articles; an edited collection; a substantial, nationally recognized website*
- **Writing Studies:** For scholars in writing studies (including technical and professional communication, composition studies, and rhetoric), the publishing avenues are more diverse, and the single-authored monograph not so central; in addition, scholarship of pedagogy and practice is directly related to achievement of national reputation in this area, and thus should be evaluated as research. Evidence of national reputation and continued growth as a scholar *may* be demonstrated by publication, after tenure, of a scholarly book or a minimum of 6 substantial articles in journals or in essay collections; more frequently, this criterion is met by an appropriate mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research: textbooks or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; software development or digital media projects; conference proceedings; significant external research grants.
 - *For example, a scholar in writing studies might present a \$100,000 federal research grant (as Principal Investigator); 2 journal articles; 2 co-authored journal articles (50%)*
- **Linguistics:** For scholars in linguistics, evidence of national reputation and continued growth as a scholar *may* be demonstrated by publication, after tenure, of a scholarly book or a minimum of 6 substantial scholarly articles in journals or in essay collections. As in writing studies, this criterion is frequently met by an appropriate mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research: textbooks

or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; software development or digital media projects; significant external research grants.

- *For example, a scholar in linguistics might present a scholarly monograph from a respected academic press; 1 co-authored journal article (30%)*
- **Creative Writing:** For creative writers, evidence of national reputation and continued growth as a writer is usually demonstrated by publication, after tenure, of a second book length project, supplemented by a strong record of continuing publication in well regarded journals and/or magazines. Though candidates generally present work chiefly in one genre (e.g., prose fiction or poetry), both scholarly work and creative work in other genres are also accepted as part of their creative profile.
 - *For example, a creative writer might present a second substantial collection of poems; editorship of a special journal issue; 6 poems*

In addition to providing copies of all relevant publications for review, the candidate will prepare an updated program of research and/or creative work which outlines the candidate's plans beyond promotion. Insofar as building a national reputation in the humanities is a gradual process, the voting faculty will consider all of the candidate's publications, but will be especially interested in materials published after tenure. In examining the available evidence, the voting faculty evaluate the candidate's work as a scholar or creative artist, considering issues of quality, substance, and integrity, as well as issues of reputation, venue, and potential for continuing impact in the field.

iii. Outside Reviews

Outside reviewers should be selected in accordance with CLA⁷ and Provost⁸ guidelines.

d. Service

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member's workload, but the Department expects a candidate for promotion or for tenure to perform service tasks at a high level of quality.

Candidates for professor, unlike candidates for associate professor, are expected to have performed well at more significant and more diverse service roles in the Department and at other levels. Service to professional organizations, especially as it builds toward the candidate's establishment of national reputation, is also appropriate. Successful performance of service roles, for any level of the University or the profession, is demonstrated over a sustained period by any of the following:

- Service as program coordinator, administrator, or responsible officeholder
- Service as chair or member of standing committees, search committees, or ad hoc committees
- Service as evaluator, reviewer, or judge (manuscripts, contests, etc.)
- Service on editorial boards
- Sponsorship or organization of professional conferences
- Sponsorship or organization of visiting speakers or events
- Grants, honors, or awards for meritorious service

⁷ Available at <http://cla-web.auburn.edu/cla/index.cfm/faculty/promotion-and-tenure/>

⁸ Available at <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

- Scholarship of service, whether through books, articles, or the publication of other high quality materials related to service (which will be assessed on the criteria outlined for research and creative work below.)
- Other contributions to service

Appropriate documentation of service activities should be maintained by the candidate. In evaluating candidates, the voting faculty will consider the following aspects of their service: leadership, initiative, and effectiveness, as well as attitude toward and engagement with the service activity.

4. Tenure

The criteria for attainment of tenured status are described in the *Faculty Handbook*. Candidates for tenure in the Department of English are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor; the recommendations are linked, in that favorable recommendation for tenure, with its more extensive requirements, presumes favorable recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

5. Procedure

Faculty members who consider their credentials appropriate for departmental review have the privilege of self-nomination. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education are encouraged to come up for promotion and tenure review in their fifth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, but *must* come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the *Faculty Handbook*). The promotion and tenure procedure is discussed in the Annual Review process as guided by the *Faculty Handbook*.

6. Revision of Standards

The present document will be reviewed every five years after its adoption, upon revision of the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*, or as judged necessary. Revision of this document requires a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of English.