

Appendix 7

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Adopted 11/18/2009; revised 11/30/2016; revised 2/5/2020

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 must come up for promotion and tenure review in 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*; if administration is assigned as a percentage of the candidate's effort, it will be considered as reinforcing the candidate's service or other appropriate area of effort.) Faculty members are responsible for maintaining their own records and files of evidence, except when the responsibility is specifically assigned to the Department Chair.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Teaching

Teaching is an essential activity of the Department of English, and often constitutes the greatest percentage of faculty effort. 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 DC 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 DC 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 DC 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 are crucial activities of the Department of English, occupying the most important area of effort for tenure-track 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; requests to blurb or endorse work based on the candidate's stature in the field
- 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.). A significant journal is one with a national and international reputation in its given general field (literature, technical and professional communication, creative writing, etc.), one with a similar reputation in a specific field (such as period, genre, or critical approach), or one recognized as a flagship journal for specialized research. An appropriate essay collection is one published by a respected academic press whose editors and contributors include scholars recognized as authorities in their fields.
- **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Strong evidence of independent or lead authorship is vital in all areas of English studies.
- **Collaborative work:** Collaboratively authored work, most common in writing studies, is of value in all areas of English studies simultaneously as a builder and indicator of national and international reputation. While candidates are required to indicate more precise percentages of responsibility in their dossiers, when adding up article-length scholarly contributions, the faculty in English normally count a two-authored work as equivalent to a whole publication, and an article-length scholarly contribution with three or more authors as equivalent to half a publication. Larger collaborative ventures such as edited collections and other booklength projects are counted in terms of the percentages accorded to each author.
- **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 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.
- **Significant Program Administration:** The Department recognizes the close relationship between scholarly expertise and some forms of program administration (e.g., program creation; curricular design; faculty development; program assessment and evaluation; program-related textual production). These activities constitute a valuable form of scholarly activity, especially when subject to peer review.

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, *and* other evidence of emerging national reputation, including the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly articles in appropriate journals or essay collections. Pursuing promotion and tenure in literary studies without a major, single-authored book project in press or under board-approved contract is not advised, though in some areas of literary study a significant number of particularly substantial and well-placed articles may be judged appropriate. For the purposes of review, peer-reviewed articles (but not monographs) may be supplemented or replaced by edited collections, editions, software development, digital media projects, major external research/creative grants, and other substantial scholarly work. Collaborative work should be minimal in comparison with single-authored work.
- **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 from a respected academic press or by a minimum of 8 substantial articles, most of which should be single-authored, in major national and flagship journals, major essay collections, or other venues that enhance impact and build national reputation. The expectation of emerging national reputation may also be met by an appropriately substantial and cohesive mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research, including some co-authored articles (as appropriate for their context); textbooks or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; substantial contributions in the area of writing program administration; software development; digital media projects; conference proceedings; major

external research grants. Although the case for promotion and tenure should be based primarily on single-authored work, collaborative work is more prominent in writing studies research.

- **Creative Writing:** For creative writers, who are generally hired with at least one book in hand, evidence of continued achievement and of emerging national reputation may be demonstrated by publication—during the probationary period—of a substantial book length project (e.g., a novel, memoir, collection of stories, or collection of poems) at a highly reputable press. The case for promotion and tenure may be further strengthened by a record of continued publishing activity such as stories, poems, or essays published in well-regarded journals and/or an additional book contract or book manuscript completed or near completion. Pursuing promotion and tenure in creative writing without a major, single-authored book in press or under board-approved contract is not advised, though in some cases a significant number of substantial and well-placed stories, poems or essays may be judged appropriate. Though candidates generally present work chiefly in one genre (e.g., prose fiction or poetry), scholarly and creative work in other genres is also accepted as part of their creative profiles. Collaborative work should be minimal in comparison with single-authored work.

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 Reviewers

Outside reviewers should be selected in accordance with CLA and Provost guidelines, but also in accord with the following additional guidelines in English:

1. The purpose of confidential external letters is to provide a disinterested view of the reputation and recognition of a candidate's scholarly work, a view which is especially helpful to faculty who specialize in other areas of study. They are *not* letters of recommendation. In keeping with this purpose, the tenured faculty in English encourage even *less* familiarity between candidate and potential external referee than is suggested by the *Faculty Handbook*: in general, *no one* should be suggested as a potential external referee who has
 - a. worked with the candidate as a colleague,
 - b. co-authored, co-edited, or worked in a close editorial relation with the candidate, or
 - c. served as a mentor or teacher to the candidate.

These strictures reinforce those outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding

- a. members of a candidates' graduate committee,
 - b. ongoing research partners,
 - c. and current/former students.
2. In January or February prior to making the bid for promotion and tenure, the candidate should produce two lists:
 - a. Candidates are required to generate, *first*, a list of 4-6 faculty members at peer or aspirational peer institutions who could reasonably be expected to provide a fair and informed reading of the candidate's scholarly/creative work. (See the *CLA P&T Handbook* for a list of acceptable institutions; occasional exceptions can be made for particularly strong potential referees at international or non-peer institutions.) All potential referees should—at the time the list is made—be ranked higher than the

- candidate (i.e., potential referees for a promotion and tenure case should be at least tenured associate professors).
- b. Candidates should also generate, second, a clearly separate list of individuals in the same field who are specifically *ineligible* to serve as external referees (i.e., faculty who served on their graduate committees or as mentors/teachers, ongoing research partners at other institutions, co-authors, co-editors). The goal of this second list is to avoid inadvertent recruitment of inappropriate referees.
 - c. Both lists should be provided at the same time in electronic form to the Department Chair.
3. The Department Chair will then work with the tenured faculty eligible to vote on a candidacy to develop an additional list of potential external referees able to provide a fair and informed reading of the candidate's scholarly/work. All faculty eligible to vote on a candidacy are *required* to participate. Working from *both* lists, the department chair will then contact sufficient potential external referees and secure agreements to review the candidate's work during the summer months, with confidential letters addressed and emailed to the department chair to arrive by an appropriate deadline (usually August 15th). In the Department of English, 3 external letters are required, a 4th is preferred. Candidate dossiers for external review may be made available by the Department Chair to the external referees at any time, but *must* be available by June 1st in hard copy or electronically (as preferred by the referee).
 4. Candidate dossiers for external review should be submitted to the department chair by mid-April, or by an appropriate alternate deadline set by the department chair.
 - a. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor these materials should include only the following:
 - i. an up-to-date CV;
 - ii. a one-page description of the candidate's scholarly research or creative program; and
 - iii. the candidate's selection of his/her available *published* scholarly/creative work. A candidate with a monograph or other individually-authored book under contract with an established press but not yet published may also submit a *completed* manuscript or proofs of that monograph with a copy of the contract. (An incomplete manuscript, or one that is not under contract, may *not* be submitted to external referees.)
 - b. In either kind of candidacy, published edited collections should be represented *only* by the front matter (including table of contents) and those portions of the text substantially produced by the candidate; the work of other contributors should *not* be submitted to external referees. Published scholarly editions or translations may be submitted entire.

d. Service

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member's merit weight assignment, but the Department expects a candidate for promotion or for tenure to perform service tasks at a high level of quality. For consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure, service is understood to include documented administrative duties as assigned by the Department Chair, unless those duties can be more properly understood and evaluated as contributions to teaching or to research/creative work. Administrative duties are not normally expected of candidates for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor.

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 Chair before taking on demanding service roles. The case for promotion may be strengthened if a faculty member engages in major service (such as significant, documented administrative duties) required by departmental needs. 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

Teaching is an essential activity of the Department of English, and often constitutes the greatest percentage of faculty effort. 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 DC 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 DC 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 DC before undertaking significant tasks in outreach.

Appropriately arranged and documented efforts in outreach will contribute to a candidate's 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 are crucial activities of the Department of English, occupying the most important area of effort for tenure-track 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; requests to blurb or endorse work based on the candidate's stature in the field
- 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.). A significant journal is one with a national and international reputation in its given general field (literature, technical and professional communication, creative writing, etc.), one with a similar reputation in a specific field (such as period, genre, or critical approach), or one recognized to be as a flagship journal for specialized research. An appropriate essay collection is one published by a respected academic press whose editors and contributors include scholars recognized as authorities in their fields.
- **Significant individual or lead authorship:** Strong evidence of independent or lead authorship is vital in all areas of English studies.
- **Collaborative work:** Collaboratively authored work, most common in writing studies, is of value in all areas of English studies simultaneously as a builder and indicator of national and international reputation. While candidates are required to indicate more precise percentages of responsibility in their dossiers, when adding up article-length scholarly contributions, the faculty in English normally count a two-authored work as equivalent to a whole publication, and an article-length scholarly contribution with three or more authors as equivalent to half a publication. Larger collaborative ventures such as edited collections and other booklength projects are counted in terms of the percentages accorded to each author.

- **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 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.
- **Significant Program Administration:** The Department recognizes the close relationship between scholarly expertise and some forms of program administration (e.g., program creation; curricular design; faculty development; program assessment and evaluation; program-related textual production). These activities constitute a valuable form of scholarly activity, especially when subject to peer review.

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 continuing productivity in national or international venues *and* the publication of an additional scholarly monograph from a respected academic press. This book should be *in hand* before pursuing promotion. Rarely, the expectation of national reputation may be met by a cohesive and substantial mix of scholarly articles (in appropriate journals or essay collections), edited collections, editions, software development, digital media projects, major external research/creative grants, and other substantial scholarly work in appropriately prestigious venues that may, in sum, be seen as equivalent to the publication of a monograph. Collaborative work may play a larger (though still modest) role in this review than in earlier promotion reviews. Similarly, scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of practice, and textbooks or trade books may have a larger impact. The focus of faculty review is on work published after the awarding of tenure.
- **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 involves continuing productivity in national or international venues *and* may be clearly demonstrated by a minimum of 8 substantial articles in major national and flagship journals, major essay collections, or other venues that enhance impact and build national reputation, or by a scholarly book in hand from a respected academic press. The expectation of national reputation may also be met by an appropriately substantial and cohesive mix of single-authored articles with other kinds of research, including some co-authored articles (as appropriate for their context), textbooks or trade books; edited collections or special journal issues; substantial contributions in the area of writing

program administration; software development; digital media projects; conference proceedings; major external research grants. Although the case for promotion should include significant single-authored work, collaborative work is more prominent and valued in writing studies research. The focus of faculty review is on work published after the awarding of tenure.

- **Creative Writing:** For creative writers, evidence of national reputation and continued growth as a writer involves continuing productivity in national and international venues *and* may be clearly demonstrated by publication, after tenure, of an additional substantial book length project (e.g., a novel, memoir, collection of stories, or collection of poems) at a highly reputable press. This books should be *in hand* before pursuing promotion. The case for promotion may be further strengthened by a record of continued publishing activity such as stories, poems, or essays published in well regarded journals and/or an additional book contract. 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 profiles. Collaborative work may play a larger (though still modest) role in this review than in earlier promotion reviews. Similarly, scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of practice, and textbooks or trade books may have a larger impact. The focus of faculty review is on work published after the awarding of tenure.

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/international reputation in the humanities is a gradual process, the voting faculty will consider all of the candidate's publications, but will focus particularly on 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 Reviewers

Outside reviewers should be selected in accordance with CLA and Provost guidelines, but also in accord with the following additional guidelines in English:

1. The purpose of confidential external letters is to provide a disinterested view of the reputation and recognition of a candidate's scholarly work, a view which is especially helpful to faculty who specialize in other areas of study. They are *not* letters of recommendation. In keeping with this purpose, the tenured faculty in English encourage even *less* familiarity between candidate and potential external referee than is suggested by the *Faculty Handbook*: in general, *no one* should be suggested as a potential external referee who has
 - a. worked with the candidate as a colleague,
 - b. co-authored, co-edited, or worked in a close editorial relation with the candidate, or
 - c. served as a mentor or teacher to the candidate.

These strictures reinforce those outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding

- a. members of a candidates' graduate committee,
 - b. ongoing research partners,
 - c. and current/former students.
5. In January or February prior to making the bid for promotion to full professor, the candidate should produce two lists:
 - a. Candidates are required to generate, *first*, a list of 4-6 faculty members at peer or aspirational peer institutions who could reasonably be expected to provide a fair and informed reading of the candidate's scholarly/creative work. (See the CLA *P&T*

Handbook for a list of acceptable institutions; occasional exceptions can be made for particularly strong potential referees at international or non-peer institutions.) All potential referees should—at the time the list is made—be ranked higher than the candidate (i.e., potential referees for a promotion to full professor should be full professors at their home institution).

- b. Candidates should also generate, second, a clearly separate list of individuals in the same field who are specifically *ineligible* to serve as external referees (i.e., faculty who served on their graduate committees or as mentors/teachers, ongoing research partners at other institutions, co-authors, co-editors). The goal of this second list is to avoid inadvertent recruitment of inappropriate referees.
 - c. Both lists should be provided at the same time in electronic form to the department chair.
6. The Department Chair will then work with the tenured faculty eligible to vote on a candidacy to develop an additional list of potential external referees able to provide a fair and informed reading of the candidate's scholarly/work. All faculty eligible to vote on a candidacy are required to participate. Working from *both* lists, the department chair will then contact sufficient potential external referees and secure agreements to review the candidate's work during the summer months, with confidential letters addressed and emailed to the department chair to arrive by an appropriate deadline (usually August 15th). In the Department of English, 3 external letters are required, a 4th is preferred. Candidate dossiers for external review may be made available by the Department Chair to the external referees at any time, but *must* be available by June 1st in hard copy or electronically (as preferred by the referee).
 7. Candidate dossiers for external review should be submitted to the department chair by mid-April, or by an appropriate alternate deadline set by the department chair.
 - a. For promotion to full Professor these materials should include only
 - i. an up-to-date CV,
 - ii. a one-page description of the candidate's scholarly research or creative program, and
 - iii. the candidate's selection of scholarly/creative work published *during and after the calendar year in which tenure was awarded*. Significant earlier published work (e.g., a book published prior to tenure) may *only* be provided at the request of an external referee.
 - b. In either kind of candidacy, published edited collections should be represented *only* by the front matter (including table of contents) and those portions of the text substantially produced by the candidate; the work of other contributors should *not* be submitted to external referees. Published scholarly editions or translations may be submitted entire.

d. Service

Academic and professional service generally occupies the smallest percentage of effort in a faculty member's merit weight assignment, but the Department expects a candidate for promotion or for tenure to perform service tasks at a high level of quality. For consideration of candidates for promotion, service is understood to include documented administrative duties as assigned by the department chair.

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
- 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 circulation of any amendments in advance, and a two-thirds vote of eligible voters present at a called meeting of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of English.