Tenure Standards and Expectations: English Department

(Approved by Department Vote: Wednesday, December 3, 2014)

According to the University bylaws, "Tenure and promotion in the professorial ranks will be granted only to persons of outstanding achievement consistent with standards expected of a top public research university. Specific evidence of superior performance in scholarship and in teaching is of primary importance. As a minimum standard for tenure and/or promotion, there must be evidence of strong performance in both scholarship and teaching and superior achievement in at least one of these areas."

To qualify for tenure in the English Department, candidates must meet high standards in the following areas:

- Research.
    - by beginning to build **scholarly reputations** in their fields.
    - by publishing their research according to one of the following models:
        - a **monograph** with a reputable, peer-reviewed press, accompanied by some peer-reviewed or invited publications
        - at least 7 **articles** in reputable, peer-reviewed venues, accompanied by other publications
        - a significant **digital project** with demonstrable impact, accompanied by publications in reputable, peer-reviewed venues
        - a substantial body of **creative work** (novel, poetry or short story collection, memoir, etc.) in a reputable venue, accompanied by other publications, or
        - a significant body of work consisting of some combination of the above.
    - by demonstrating tangible **progress on a significant post-tenure research agenda** by the time of final review.
- Teaching
    - by demonstrating the quality of their teaching with some combination of the following: teaching philosophy, student comments, syllabi, SET scores, etc. (During the course of Candidates' probationary period, the Department will arrange for at least two occasions on which tenured faculty will observe the Candidates' classes and write letters concerning their teaching for the Candidates' files.)
    - by teaching and advising graduate students (where possible)
- Service
    - by successfully completing limited pre-tenure assignments and demonstrating a willingness to contribute to post-tenure and university service.

Candidates should consult *at least* yearly with the department head about their research agendas.

Scholarly Reputation. Candidates can begin to build scholarly reputations with some combination of the following:
- presenting their work at national and international conferences (not just local or regional venues)

- publishing book reviews
- giving readings or invited lectures
- reviewing manuscripts for journals or book manuscripts for academic or literary presses
- applying for national grants
- serving in editorial positions
- serving on national or international prize committees
- serving in national or international scholarly organizations

<u>Published Research</u>.
- Unless the offer letter states otherwise, a candidate's research portfolio for tenure will consist of work published after their date of hire at UCONN, with the following exceptions: 1) for candidates in their first tenure-track position, work published before their date of hire at UCONN counts for tenure; 2) for candidates who come to UCONN with time in rank, the work published in the years credited counts towards tenure.
- If pursuing the ***monograph route*** or any others ending in a book publication, candidates should have their manuscripts accepted and *in production* by April 30 before their final probationary year at the latest. (We do not consider preliminary contracts laying out the publisher's right of first refusal as final acceptance, which is usually decided at a press's board meeting.) Under normal circumstances, this requirement means that candidates should be approaching publishers with book prospectuses no later than their third probationary year and should ideally use their junior faculty leaves (release from teaching, but not service) to prepare their manuscripts for submission.
- If pursuing the ***article route***, candidates must have secured final acceptance of their complete portfolio of articles by the May before their final probationary year—at the *very* latest. Since the peer-review process for journal articles and book chapters can take as long as three years in some cases, candidates should begin submitting their work in a timely fashion.
- If pursing the ***digital humanities route***, candidates should publish peer-reviewed research as well as their digital projects--how much depends to what extent their digital project approximates the heft and scope of a monograph.
- Candidates should place their work in respected peer-reviewed or literary venues. Though some fields rate book chapters below journal articles in importance because of a perception that the peer review process is less rigorous for collections, given the wide variations in the peer review process for both collections and journals the English Department rejects this general assumption and urges candidates to place their work in venues with a rigorous peer review process. Candidates should collect and submit all correspondence and readers' reports that document peer review.
- While the Department recognizes that some scholarly editions, translations, textbooks or collections may approach or match the contribution of the monograph, as a general rule such publications can strengthen the case for tenure but not serve as the main basis for it.

<u>Digital projects</u> will be evaluated by internal and external reviewers within the media in which they were conceived and developed. Given the inherently collaborative nature of most digital projects, the PTR committee should employ the most comprehensive model of attributing credit.

- Candidates should document a legible trail that articulates the nature, extent, and dates of their contributions to projects (which might include, but is not limited to, scholarly electronic editions, digital specifications like mark-up and text-encoding protocols, methodological advances like research tools and algorithmic developments, hypermedia and new media works, research blogs, and Web 2.0 activity) and maintain an archive of their evolving digital work.
- Scholarly blogs and websites with national and international impact will be considered under the rubric of research. Such blogging activity can be evaluated through a variety of measures including their participation in larger academic discourses and the ways they are linked to other related sites and projects, independent peer review (where possible), their citation in scholarly and journalistic publications, their ability to produce follow-up projects and inspire research by other scholars.
- Candidates pursuing the digital track are strongly encouraged to apply for major grants for their work. Both successful and unsuccessful applications will be considered as part of the candidate's digital research profile. Not only do they provide a form of scholarly evaluation very much like peer review, but they increase exposure of the work.
- In consultation with the candidate, who will be asked to identify possible evaluators, the department will commission independent peer-reviewed evaluation of digital projects for a candidate's third and final tenure reviews. Referees will be asked to assess the scope, depth, quality, importance, and impact of the work.

Post-Tenure Research. Candidates can demonstrate tangible progress on a significant post-tenure research agenda with some combination of the following…
- presenting portions of it at conferences
- submitting materials and notes related to research to the PTR committee
- submitting chapter or article drafts to the PTR committee
- applying for grants and fellowships to advance post-tenure research
- publishing strategic portions of the work in peer-reviewed venues

The PTR Committee's Role. The Committee will consider the candidates' record for evidence of a productive and creative mind as well as achievement and leadership in their respective fields. In forming its own assessment of the quality of a candidate's research, the Committee will be guided by the peer review process, the relative influence of publication venues, and the opinions of external reviewers.

The Third Year Review. At the end of their third probationary year at UCONN, candidates' achievements in research, teaching, and service in their first three years will be reviewed by the department and dean's council as usual but also by the provost. For this important review, candidates should document substantial progress towards their monographs or equivalent projects as well as their ability to publish their work in peer-reviewed venues.