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University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure

In all reviews for tenure and promotion Oakland will consider the candidate's entire record, emphasizing efforts and accomplishments since attainment of current rank. The candidate's record at Oakland University generally will be of particular importance. Oakland's evaluation of the candidate will consider:

- the programmatic and institutional setting of the candidate’s work at Oakland and the nature of the candidate’s assignments and responsibilities;
- the quality of the candidate’s accomplishments;
- the relation of all these factors to the objectives of the area or department, the goals of the college or school or institute, and the mission and long range vision of the university.

Oakland's evaluation focuses on the candidate's efforts and accomplishments in three areas:

- teaching or performance as a university librarian, as appropriate to the appointment;
- intellectual contributions such as scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- service.

Teaching and University Librarianship

The term "teaching" refers to all instruction and advising activities that affect or support the academic progress of students. These activities include classroom, laboratory, studio, field, and clinical teaching and evaluation; the supervision of research, writing, independent study, practica, and performance; individual and group advising and mentoring; preparation of courses; development of curricular and instructional materials; instructional innovations; and application of new educational technologies.

The phrase "performance as a university librarian" refers to initiating, planning, organizing, and implementing library programs, including application of technology and effective communication with and service to library users.

A candidate for tenure must show substantial evidence of achievement in teaching and/or performance as a university librarian. Such evidence must be obtained through use of systematic procedures for student and peer review. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, assessments of the instructor's preparation through peer review of syllabi, reading lists, class and library handouts, tests, examinations, and other course and library materials in all formats; student appraisals such as course evaluations and solicited and unsolicited letters; evidence of student achievement; and success in
sharing teaching philosophies and methodologies and in obtaining grant support relating to teaching and/or university librarianship.

**Intellectual Contributions – Scholarship, Research and Creative Endeavors**

Because of the comprehensive and diverse nature of Oakland University's mission, Oakland recognizes in its reviews a broad range of intellectual contributions. Such contributions improve theory and practice and support the present and future quality of instruction at Oakland University.

Scholarship and research include:

- basic, theoretical or applied research;
- scholarship that applies the research to the betterment of society, institutions, groups, and individuals;
- peer recognition of the above as reflected in publications in refereed journals, other peer-reviewed publications, and critical reviews as appropriate to the discipline;
- successful efforts in securing competitive or professionally significant external funding in disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grants;
- scholarship that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original research, gives meaning to isolated facts and puts them in perspective, or creates connections across disciplinary lines;
- scholarship that involves not only transmitting knowledge but transforming and extending it as well through carefully planned and continuously examined pedagogical procedures that stimulate active learning and encourage students to be critical and creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

"Creative activities" refers to works of artistic expression, production, or performance, and includes such activities as composing, writing, directing, performing, and conducting.

The most important evidence of scholarship, research, and creative activities is that authorities in the discipline(s) or field(s), including authorities outside the institution, have critically evaluated the work as meeting high standards (e.g., publications in refereed journals, grants and other funded research proposals). A candidate for tenure is expected to have made substantial progress toward maturity as a scholar or creative artist and to have established the presumption of continued growth in these areas.
Service

The term "service" refers to the following activities:

- public, institutional, and professional service through work that grows out of the university’s programs and mission and has the potential for substantial and positive effects on a community, profession, or external perceptions of the university, and that draws upon the candidate’s professional competence. Such service includes not only contributions to the organizational work of academic professional associations and societies at all levels but also activities that extend Oakland’s scholarly and instructional capabilities into various external agencies and communities.

- university service through committee work or governance activities in the area, department, school, institute, college, or the university; for faculty, university service includes service as a role model and mentor for colleagues and students.

Documentation of the candidate’s service should recognize these distinctions and, particularly in the case of public, institutional, and professional service, should indicate the relationship of the candidate’s service activities to the programs and mission of the university and to the candidate’s instruction, intellectual contributions, and professional responsibilities. A candidate’s involvement in university service should reflect an appropriate sharing of general faculty obligations in university governance.

Evidence of service should speak to its magnitude, complexity, and duration and may be derived from the testimony of those served; from evaluations provided by others involved in service work; from reports, articles, instructional materials and other documents produced through service; and from grants and funded projects, honors, and awards received in recognition of service.

Oakland regards teaching or performance as a university librarian and intellectual contributions as the most crucial areas of development for candidates for non-tenured reemployment or for tenure. Oakland normally will expect the record of candidates for tenure to show some accomplishments in service.

Beyond their achievements at the time of tenure all candidates for professor are expected to have continued their development in teaching or performance as a university librarian and in intellectual contributions and service. In addition, candidates for professor are expected to have demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching or performance as a university librarian including application of technology, or to have achieved wide recognition beyond the institution as authorities or leaders in intellectual contributions or wide recognition in public, institutional, and professional service. In disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grant support, external funding is desirable for consideration of promotion to professor. In addition, candidates for professor must demonstrate potential for sustained involvement in teaching, research, and service.
I. All provisions of this document conform to and are governed by the current Faculty Agreement. They apply to full-time, bargaining-unit faculty members except where otherwise stated.

II. The English Department considers its primary mission to be teaching, and its secondary mission to be scholarship and/or creative writing, followed by service.

III. Re-employment and Promotion Procedures

A candidate at any stage of her/his career at Oakland must be able to offer indications (potential or actual) of proficiency in the categories described in the Criteria section. The department recognizes that different expectations are realistic and appropriate at different stages of professional development. Thus a new member would be expected to be devoting a majority of her/his time to the preparation and development of courses, to research, and to committee assignments within the department. In successive reviews, a candidate would have to provide clear evidence of continued effectiveness in teaching or improvement; qualitative indication of scholarship and professional activity as defined below; and continued involvement in the life of the department and university through service activities as indicated elsewhere in this document.

After each review, the chair and the Reviewing Body (See B below.) shall be responsible for pointing out in the letter of recommendation those specific strengths and weaknesses observed in the faculty member’s performance. We expect the faculty member to demonstrate improvement in any area of weakness identified in any review.

A. The burden of assembling review materials (except as hereinafter noted) shall fall on the candidate with help and guidance from the chair and a Review Coordinator (tenured faculty member) appointed to assist the candidate.

B. The Reviewing Body shall consist of the tenured faculty of the department except in cases of promotion to professor, in which case it shall consist of all professors in the department.
C. All members of the department must be consulted during every review process.

IV. Review Criteria

A. Definitions of Review Categories: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Work, and Service

1. Teaching

All instructional, pre-instructional, and post-instructional activities, e.g. teaching itself; the preparations of classes, class materials, and syllabi; development of websites for student use; conferences with students; the grading of papers; the direction of student research projects; general preparation to teach in new areas or new methodologies; mentorship of students by encouraging them to publish and to participate in professional meetings.

2. Scholarship and Creative Work

a) Scholarship, defined as active involvement in and production of the theory and criticism of literature and related professional concerns, including composition theory and practice and studies in the English language. We conceive literature broadly as embracing film, folklore, and other related forms of expression. Scholarly activities characteristically pursued by faculty in English include the following, listed in unranked order:

Theory, which involves disciplined reflection on the nature and purposes of language and literature; it may represent a variety of perspectives, including historical, biographical, anthropological, psychological, sociological, or others and may find expression in development of new theoretical perspectives, application of theory to specific texts or situations, or critique of theoretical positions.

Criticism may involve the study of the individual work or groups of works in an effort to throw light on the internal structure of a literary text, the connections among works, or aspects of authorship.

Editing may include recovery and/or correction of literary texts and preparation of texts for scholarly readership. It may also entail development, selection, and correction of reference works, volumes of critical commentary, or web sites.
Translation includes renderings in accurate and aptly nuanced English of literary texts or critical works originally written in other languages as well as conversions of early English texts into modern English. It also encompasses creative transformations of poetry and prose from other languages.

Bibliographic work includes development of comprehensive and accurate descriptive listings of primary literary texts and/or critical commentaries.

Pedagogical scholarship may involve preparation of textbooks, study guides, or teachers’ editions for college-level or secondary-school courses in language or literature, inquiry into teaching methods and their efficacy, research on literary learning and development of writing skills.

Professional commentary may reflect on the history, current state, and prospects of literary study broadly or any of its manifestations.

b) Creative work, defined as the writing of literature. In common with traditional values of departments of English, we view ourselves not only as literary theoreticians and critics but also as contributors to the ongoing production of literature. A department that teaches imaginative literature should have creative writers working in one or more literary modes: poetry, fiction, drama, screenwriting, and the personal essay.

The department expects each of its members to be engaged in one or more of these activities. The results may appear in books, articles in scholarly or pedagogical journals, reference works, colloquia, conferences, sessions or panels developed in conjunction with professional organizations, papers delivered to learned societies or other scholarly media, presentations to those engaged in pre-college English education, and performances or public readings of creative work in recognized outlets for serious poetry, fiction, and drama. On-line publication of scholarly or creative work also qualifies as scholarship so long as it is subject to peer review. The department is more interested in quality than it is in quantity.

The department encourages active participation in professional meetings as well as editing and reviewing for scholarly or creative journals. Particularly in the area of pedagogical scholarship, it encourages sharing of the person’s research discoveries through workshops and in-service programming directed toward secondary-school teachers, and it recognizes that such activity frequently involves teamwork. It also values its members’ participation in collaborative activities, such as by contributing solicited
entries for literary encyclopedias, biographical dictionaries, and similar reference works.

3. *Service*
   Any activity which is necessary for the welfare of the department, college, university, community, or profession and which does not fall under the previous two categories.

   a) The department expects each of its members to contribute to the welfare of the university by serving on departmental, college and university committees, as well as other administrative, judicial, and legislative bodies of the university; by advising students; by writing institutional proposals and by promoting the welfare of the university in the outside community wherever and whenever possible.

   b) Community service applying a faculty member’s capabilities as a scholar in language and literature includes delivering talks to public groups, leading book discussions, leading creative writing workshops, judging writing competitions, presenting in-service workshops for teachers, and developing and nurturing relationships with teachers of English in Michigan schools and colleges.

   c) Beyond this, the department encourages its members to contribute to the well-being of our profession by, among other things, holding office in professional societies, administering conferences and conference sessions, and maintaining scholarly websites.

   d) Junior faculty members are not required to expand their service activities beyond the department and the college. Senior faculty members are expected to take a part in the larger life of the university and the profession.

B. *Criteria for Specific Reviews*

The department expects each member to shape a distinctive career pattern which must include evidence of the three criteria below, but which will emphasize progress toward and achievement of outstanding or excellent teaching, coupled with continuing achievement in scholarship and ongoing contributions in service. Where reference is made to what may “normally” be expected of our colleagues, we recognize that faculty members with specialized responsibilities involving exceptional time commitments on a nearly twelve-month basis (e.g. the STEP
coordinator) will typically balance heavier teaching and/or service commitments with more modest expectations for scholarly or creative productivity. The criteria for promotion to professor represent the department’s highest standards and ultimate goals; earlier reviews will examine progress toward those goals.

1. **Criteria for Professorship 41.i**

   a) Sustained record of outstanding or excellent teaching demonstrated in her/his own classes and of commitment to high teaching standards and valuable academic opportunities for students within the department and university.

   b) Substantial post-tenure achievement in scholarship and/or creative work with evidence of intellectual growth and extended professional reputation. Achievement in scholarship might normally be demonstrated by several articles or a book of demonstrable quality testifying to the candidate’s commitment to high standards of scholarship as evidenced by the placement of the material in appropriate peer-reviewed outlets, and as confirmed by outside peer evaluation as specified in procedures.

   Achievement in creative work might normally be demonstrated by evidence of high creative standards as confirmed by publication of works of fiction (short stories or a novel) or poetry (published in collections or in a separate collection), or drama (in performance and/or in separate publications), and by recognition within the community of her or his peers.

   c) A solid record of useful service to the department, the college, the university, and the profession.

2. **Criteria for Recommendation for Tenure 41.c.(4)**

   a) Evidence of progress toward outstanding or excellent teaching, as evidenced by:

   1) a thorough grounding in and understanding of the subject matter being taught;

   2) a clear, thorough, and interesting presentation in class, through lecture and/or discussion, of the major principles, issues, and viewpoints on the subject; and
3) a mature and compassionate consideration of student needs which will include fairness in dealing with students in the classroom, office, and in grading practices.

b) Demonstrable achievement in scholarship and/or creative work indicating that the candidate is professionally mature. Achievement in scholarship could be evidenced by the publication of several articles or a book in appropriate peer-reviewed outlets, or a combination of related publications and presentations. The candidate’s commitment to high standards of scholarship would be confirmed by outside peer evaluations as specified above.

Achievement in creative work could be demonstrated by publication of work of high quality in fiction, poetry, screenwriting, personal essay, or production of the candidate’s plays. The candidate’s commitment to high standards of creative work would be confirmed by outside peer evaluations as specified above.

c) Responsible record of service to the department and the college or the university.

3. Criteria for Recommendation for Optional Promotion and Granting of Tenure 41h

Early promotion may be recommended for those who meet the criteria for tenure in the area of teaching and who exceed criteria for tenure in the two other review areas.

4. Criteria for Pre-tenure Review 41c.(2)

a) Sustained record of responsible, effective teaching.

b) Demonstrable achievement in scholarship and/or creative work.

c) Service to the department.

5. Criteria for Initial Review 41c.(1)

a) Record of responsible, effective teaching.
b) Demonstrable progress toward achievement in scholarship and/or creative work.

c) Service to the department.

6. **Criteria for Review of Special Instructor with Job Security for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 41.h**

A special instructor may be reviewed for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Should the Department of English initiate a review of special instructor with job security under this provision, she or he must fulfill all criteria for a tenure review in the areas of teaching, scholarship or creative work, and service.

7. **Criteria for Review for Job Security for Special Instructor 42.c**

a) Evidence of progress toward outstanding or excellent teaching.

b) Contributions to creation and maintenance of an effective learning environment for students and faculty in the candidate’s program.

c) Administrative, programmatic, and/or service contributions in support of one or more departmental programs.

d) Evidence of intellectual activity related to her or his teaching field and/or programmatic responsibilities. Such activity might involve professional consulting, conference attendance, conference presentation, or publication for either a general or professional readership.

8. **Criteria for Review of Special Instructor for Second Re-employment 42.b**

a) Sustained record of responsible, effective teaching.

b) Service to the department.

c) Evidence of intellectual activity related to her or his teaching field and/or programmatic duties.
9. Criteria for Review of Special Instructor for First Re-employment 42.a

a.) Record of responsible, effective teaching.

b.) Service to the department.

c.) Evidence of intellectual activity related to her or his teaching field is encouraged.

V. Review Procedures

A. Mandated and Optional Reviews 41.c(1) – 41.h

1. Early during the review year, the chair shall notify the candidate of the coming review in writing, attaching to the letter a copy of this document. An optional tenure review may be initiated by the candidate or by the department in consultation with the candidate.

2. After consulting with the candidate, the chair shall appoint a Review Coordinator to assist the candidate in gathering and assembling such materials as are specified below. These materials must be ready for perusal by the Reviewing Body by the beginning of the term in which the review is conducted.

3. The chair shall solicit three outside evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative work for tenure reviews and promotion to professor, in accordance with the guidelines concerning external reviewers stated in the FRPC Statement to Candidates and Academic Units. The evaluators will be chosen from a list of at least six possible reviewers submitted to the Review Coordinator by the candidate. The chair of the department in consultation with the candidate’s Review Coordinator may solicit a fourth reviewer. The Review Coordinator shall ask for evaluations of the candidate’s service both outside and inside the department.

Candidates for the first and second re-employment reviews who wish outside evaluation of scholarship and/or creative work may submit up to three names to the chair or the review coordinator assisting in the review. All those whose names are submitted by the candidate for the first and second re-employment reviews shall be consulted. Outside evaluations of scholarship and/or creative work are not required for the first and second re-employment reviews.
4. All materials identified above shall be available to the Reviewing Body at the beginning of the semester in which the review occurs. All members of the Reviewing Body shall be responsible for examining this evidence.

5. The chair shall be a member of the Reviewing Body, ex officio, and non-voting (in the event of a tie vote, however, the chair shall cast the tie-breaking vote). She/he shall chair all meetings of that body.

6. The Reviewing Body shall meet twice concerning each candidate. The first meeting will consist of a discussion, based on the candidate’s dossier, of the candidate’s fitness for re-employment and/or promotion. The second meeting may involve a continued discussion, but its principal function will be to vote on the candidate’s fitness for re-employment and/or promotion. All votes shall be taken by secret ballot. In the event of a tie vote, the chair shall cast the tie-breaking vote. The final vote of the Reviewing Body shall be recorded in the letter of recommendation. (See paragraph 9, below.)

7. Immediately subsequent to the vote, the chair shall inform the Reviewing Body whether he/she agrees or disagrees with the Reviewing Body’s recommendation, and whether he/she will forward a separate recommendation.

8. The chair shall then inform the candidate in writing, giving reasons in the case of a negative vote and/or a negative recommendation of the chair.

9. If the chair concurs with the Reviewing Body’s recommendation, the chair shall formulate the letter of recommendation to the dean. The letter shall be available to all members of the Reviewing Body for their advice before it is submitted to the dean or the CAP. If the chair disagrees with the Reviewing Body’s recommendation, the Reviewing Body will select one of its members to draft the letter of recommendation. The letter shall be available to all members of the Reviewing Body for their advice before it is submitted to the dean or the CAP.

10. The candidate shall receive a copy of the Reviewing Body’s letter of recommendation to the dean, and of the chair’s letter of recommendation to the dean (if the chair elects to forward his/her own recommendation). The candidate may respond to either or both of these letters to the dean, and the candidate’s response shall be included in the dossier forwarded to other reviewing bodies.

B. Promotion to Professor 41.i
1. The Reviewing Body shall consist of the professors of the department. The chair of the department shall be an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the Reviewing Body and shall chair all meetings. In the event that the chair is under review, the dean, after consulting with the professors, shall appoint one of them to chair the review.

2. The review may be initiated by the candidate, the chair, the Reviewing Body, or by Oakland.

3. Normally, reviews will not be initiated by the chair or the Reviewing Body until the candidate has completed at least five years at the rank of Associate Professor.

4. Once the review process is initiated, the procedures and submission of materials shall be the same as those prescribed for the tenure reviews, except that the review process shall begin no later than the spring of the review year so that materials may be available to the Reviewing Body by October 1.

C. *Materials Included in Review Dossier*

1. *Materials originating with the candidate*

   a) A *curriculum vitae* that follows the format approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. [spacing can't be fixed]

   b) A personal statement (in accordance with FRPC guidelines) containing of the candidate's professional goals (including those related to teaching, scholarship, and service) together with a description of the ways in which the activities under review relate to these goals as well as the progress made to date in achieving them and future plans to achieve them.

   c) Representative course materials (syllabi, assignment sheets, handouts, etc.) from three courses the candidate considers typical of her/his teaching responsibilities: when possible, a writing course, a general education course, and a specialized departmental course.

   d) Offprints or copies of publications.

   e) Copies of all available reviews of the candidate's publications.

   f) Description and documentation of works identified as “in progress,” “under review,” “in circulation,” or “accepted for publication.”
g) Any other evidence of the impact of the candidate’s work in her/his field (e.g., citations or requests to participate in scholarly conferences or to submit scholarly papers or creative writing).

h) Copies of any committee reports or other significant public documents written by the candidate while engaged in university service and/or copies of reports calling specific attention to the candidate’s contributions.

2. Materials originating with the chair

a) A letter describing, from the point-of-view of the chair and the department, the candidate’s activities in the department, the college, the university, and the profession which records the recommendation of the Reviewing Body. If the chair’s recommendation differs from that of the Reviewing Body, the chair then has the option of forwarding a letter expressing his/her own recommendation.

b) All teaching evaluations from the candidate’s classes in the case of first reviews, all teaching evaluations since the last review in the case of other reviews, and, in the case of promotion to professor, all teaching evaluations from the past five years. All evaluations are distributed and collected by someone other than the candidate. After being returned to the department, the evaluations can be read after the candidate has turned in her/his final grades. The department retains all evaluations. The department uses a non-numeric evaluation form, consisting of eleven evaluative and qualitative questions.

c) Relevant materials from previous reviews such as letters from the chair and from CAP.

d) An evaluation by the department of all teaching evaluations since the last review. The candidate and the chair will determine which tenured faculty member will conduct the evaluation.

e) Evaluations of teaching by tenured English faculty or special instructors with job security who have visited the candidate’s classes. The candidate and the chair will determine which members will visit classes. The candidate and the faculty member(s) visiting will determine the times and classes. Such evaluations are required for all reviews up to and including the tenure review.

f) Solicited and unsolicited letters from students regarding the candidate. Only students suggested by the candidate may be contacted by the chair or the Review
Coordinator assisting the candidate assembling materials. Students shall be informed that their letters are available to the candidate.

g) Outside evaluations of the candidate’s scholarly and professional contributions. The chair, in consultation with the candidate and Review Coordinator, shall solicit evaluations as specified in Section V., A. 3. Indication should be given of any close professional relationship between the candidate and the reviewer. Outside evaluators shall be informed that their letters are available to the candidate. The evaluator should append a *curriculum vitae* to her/his response. Outside evaluations for scholarship and creative work are not required for the first and second re-employment reviews. Outside consultation shall be required only for conversion to associate professor (in which case evidence of creative or scholarly writing is required).

h) Letters from chairs and/or members of committees and other service organizations on which the candidate has served. Outside evaluators of service shall be informed that their letters are available to the candidate.

3. *Materials originating with the Reviewing Body*

a) A letter describing, from the point-of-view of the department, the candidate’s activities in the department, the college, the university, and the profession which records the recommendation of the Reviewing Body. This letter is necessary only in the event that the chair and the Reviewing Body are forwarding different recommendations.

VI. **Appeal Procedures**

A. A candidate not recommended for re-employment and/or promotion shall be notified as soon as possible in writing by the chair.

B. Within 48 hours of notification, the candidate may file an appeal with the chair on either or both of the following grounds:

1. Failure on the part of the Reviewing Body to follow the criteria and procedures established in this document;

2. Presentation of new evidence which could reasonably lead to a change in the previous vote.
C. As soon as possible, the chair shall schedule another meeting of the Reviewing Body; the candidate shall have the right to appear at this meeting and to be accompanied and/or represented by any member of the university community.

D. As soon as possible after hearing the appeal, the Reviewing Body shall, in a subsequently scheduled meeting, take a re-vote on the candidate by secret ballot.

E. The candidate shall be notified in writing of the result of the re-vote.

F. A record of the appeal shall become part of the candidate’s dossier.