



*The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA®*

*Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost*

**Policy Approval  
Department of English**

**Policy Document:** Department of English Handbook

**Approved by:**

Department of English Faculty

David Wrobel, Dean, Dodge Family College of Arts and Sciences

Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty

**Approved on:**

June 2, 2023

**Effective on:**

June 2, 2023

**File name:**

6-2-23 English Handbook

**Review Cycle:**

Annual review; Revision as necessary prior to the next unit APR review and in the case of University or College policy changes or other precipitating factors.

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH HANDBOOK**

### **Sections and Addenda on Faculty Evaluation<sup>1</sup>**

### **3. Annual Faculty Evaluation**

Revised in 2017 and 2022

Each year, Committee A is responsible for evaluation all tenured and tenure-track members of the department in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The usual percentages devoted to these areas are, respectively, 40, 40, and 20 percent. However, percentages differ for some faculty who, for example, have taken on greater administrative loads or have endowed chairs or professorships.

Tenured faculty have the option to increase their teaching percentage/load and have their distribution of effort altered accordingly.

Chaired professors will be evaluated according to the terms agreed to at their appointment.

Any exceptions to these divisions will be determined, after consultation with faculty members affected, by Committee A at the beginning of each academic year. Written statements of any changes will be part of the faculty member's permanent record and will be provided to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Provost.

#### **A. Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching in this department includes instruction of courses or seminars scheduled in the regular academic year; direction of undergraduate and graduate reading and research; advising and counseling; and all other activity involving the supervision of students in recognized academic pursuits.

Good teaching can be directly identified only when the results can be measured and specifically attributed to teaching activity. However, since such a procedure is impractical if not impossible, the evaluation of teaching must depend on inferences. To be as objective as possible, these inferences must be based on evidence of teaching behavior obtained from course materials, students and colleagues alike.

#### **Criteria**

All evaluations will measure teaching activity (e.g., classroom teaching, direction of reading courses, direction of theses and dissertations, membership on thesis,

---

<sup>1</sup> Page numbers of this document do not correspond with Handbook; however, section numbers are correct.

dissertation and exam committees) against the following criteria:

The teacher's knowledge of the material, considered according to the level and nature of the context in which it is presented.

The teacher's ability to establish suitable objectives, to present materials consistent with them, and to organize the materials coherently.

The teacher's effectiveness in instructing his/her students, including clarity of presentation, ability to motivate students to learn, sensitivity to students' response, and professional availability to students.

### **Student Experience Survey (SES)**

The SES is designed to provide developmental feedback to instructors and provide qualitative information to administrators that can inform evaluations. Students provide feedback through the SES which instructors should use to ascertain how various components of their courses are working for the students who responded to the survey and to make warranted changes based on student reactions, analyses, and judgments. Efforts to strengthen and improve teaching based on the SES are one criterion among many used to evaluate teaching. It should be kept in mind that student responses are highly influenced by student attitudes toward such factors as the race, ethnic, and national origin, gender, sexual orientation, creed or age of the instructor. Students' grade point average, major field of study, type of class and the time a class is offered can also influence student feedback.

### **Peer Evaluations**

Faculty may ask their senior colleagues to attend a class and write a letter evaluating their teaching. The visiting colleague should share a draft of the letter with the colleague being evaluated and solicit feedback. The letter will then be turned into the department chair to add to the faculty member's permanent file. Faculty may ask to be observed on a yearly basis if they wish. It is advisable for tenure-track faculty to get at least three letters from their peers. All tenure-track faculty **MUST** solicit a letter on their teaching for their third-year review from tenured faculty members. Post-tenure faculty, who have not yet come up for full professor, should solicit at least one or two new letters for their promotion file from full professors or emeritus full professors.

### **Procedures for Committee A Evaluation**

Since a teacher's knowledge, preparation, and competence can best be judged by his/her peers, the members of Committee A will carefully assess these aspects of his/her teaching as part of its annual evaluation of faculty for purposes of determining the progress of untenured faculty; merit recommendations for all faculty; and recommendations for promotion in rank.

To help Committee A do a full and fair assessment of teaching, faculty being evaluated should submit a teaching narrative that describes how the faculty member critically reflected on feedback from the SES and responded to concerns raised by students when applicable.

In addition, faculty may submit any of the following materials that will best represent their teaching:

Materials developed by faculty members related to their teaching, such as syllabi, tests, reading lists, course booklets, special trips or functions, student class publications, video, and any other supporting materials.

Reports on class visitation, if any.

Descriptions and reports of any faculty development efforts participated in by those being evaluated. These include participation in workshops on teaching (whether on or off campus); special seminars related to teaching; local, state and national meetings related to teaching; and faculty development efforts sponsored by the college or university.

In its assessment, Committee A will consider issues raised by course load, class size and lack of homogeneity between teacher and students.

If the faculty member wishes, Committee A will meet and discuss with that member such matters as course objectives and methods, as well as the teacher's own assessment of his/her success. If the faculty member desires a class visit and gives at least three month notice prior to the annual evaluations in February, visitation of the teacher's classes will be arranged. Committee A will then incorporate its conclusions in the annual evaluation.

### **Teaching Rubric Used by Committee A**

Committee A examines the SES, teaching narrative and all teaching materials submitted by the faculty member.

Faculty Member:	Score:
1. Narrative of teaching effectiveness based on materials presented and informed by the SES (0-5)	
2. Peer evaluations may also be considered (-.75 to +.75)	
3. Graduate Work (-.75 to +.75)	
4. Service and Development (-.5 to +.5)	
5. Bias Compensation (0-.75)	

6. Teaching Materials (-.5 to +.5)	
TOTAL	

### Explanation of Rubric Items

**Teaching Narrative:** Up to 5 points will be awarded for critically reflecting on teaching including feedback from the SES and other teaching materials. Points will be added or subtracted based on items 2-6 on the rubric above as described below.

**Graduate Work:** Upon completion of exam/thesis/dissertation/directed reading, Chair of Dissertation or MA/PhD Exam/Thesis- .75; Member of Committee- .5; Directed Readings- .25

**Service and Development:** Up to .5 points are awarded for people who are making notable contributions to the teaching mission such as service learning or community outreach in teaching. Also, points may be awarded to faculty who have availed themselves of opportunities within OU or outside to improve their teaching. Points should be deducted if the instructor does not respond to criticism in previous peer or annual evaluations.

**Bias Compensation:** Up to .75 points should be awarded if racist, sexist or inappropriate comments occur in student evaluations, since the numerical part of those evaluations will also be artificially low or if, in the judgment of Committee A, other factors suggest the score of a woman or minority is artificially low. It may be particularly appropriate for faculty who occupy the intersections of racial and gender discrimination.

**Teaching Materials:** Materials should be evaluated for content appropriate to the class. Committee A will consider, among other factors,

*Assignments*—15-20 pages of graded writing for most upper-level English classes and 10-15 for lower level; assignments suitable to the level and subject of the class.

*Syllabus*—quality and clarity; suitable to level and subject of the class.

*Policies*—fair, clear and appropriate guidelines for late papers, absences, etc.

Up to .5 will be added if materials are particularly impressive. Up to .5 will be deducted if there are significant problems with the materials. In such cases, Committee A should give clear directions for future improvement.

**Grade Distribution:** as low grades may contribute to a negative evaluation and vice versa, Committee A will take this factor into account.

**Nota Bene:** Where there is a case of exceptional merit that does not fit the established rubric or evidence of a significant recurring problem, Committee A may give a higher or lower score than is warranted by the numerical rubric. Some exceptional circumstances might include an instructor taking on extra work in substituting for an

ill colleague, an instructor not meeting basic professional standards such as providing a syllabus, providing timely feedback on assignments, meeting with classes except as covered by University policy on absences.

For the third-year review for tenure-track faculty, the faculty member must in consultation with Committee A solicit a letter from a colleague in the department who is familiar with the probationary faculty member's teaching. That colleague must provide Committee A with a letter that describes the merits and significance of the teaching.

## **B. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity**

Cases for promotion and tenure must be more than the sum of annual evaluations. It is very important to note that probationary faculty may receive high annual scores on Research/Creative Activity but still not present a tenurable case when they come up for assessment. Faculty may receive scores on activity that does not significantly count towards a positive tenure decision. Committee A will note this discrepancy in the comments section of the faculty member's annual evaluation form. The same discrepancy may obtain for faculty going up for promotion to full professor.

Research and creative activity in the discipline of English means, primarily, work published after peer review. Digital projects will be evaluated when the faculty member submits them for consideration.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, oral presentations, grant proposals submitted and/or accepted, essay length reviews, reprinted articles, educational software, scripts, video presentations, or exhibits are considered as evidence of scholarly activity. Quantity and quality of the work are equally important. Being subject to the professional standards of peer review is the first measure of published work as "significant." The second part of evaluating a published work's significance includes judging the degree to which it represents new knowledge or accomplishment in its field, as well as to what extent it contributes to English studies and/or the intellectual and scholarly endeavors of the department. It is recommended that faculty members indicate the quality of their published work by providing Committee A with pertinent information about the publication venue, such as journals', magazines', or anthologies' circulation and their ratio of acceptances to rejections. In case of community-based participatory research, which often is published in ethnic studies journals with smaller circulation, in edited collections from smaller presses, in reputable open-access journals, or even in community-specific venues such as tribal presses, faculty members should again document the quality of their work by providing Committee A with pertinent information about the publication venue that demonstrates its value in the faculty member's specific field. In the case of creative writing oral presentations, faculty members should inform Committee A whether the presentations were invited; at their discretion, they may in addition include other relevant information regarding the quantity and quality of the venues, as

---

<sup>2</sup> Some digital projects are "published" in the sense that they are posted, uploaded, or released (cf. Addendum on Evaluating Digital Scholarship and Creative Activity).

may also faculty members who deliver scholarly presentations.

Tenured faculty are evaluated primarily for work that has appeared in print or for completed digital projects as well as for work presented at conferences during the previous year. Probationary faculty are evaluated for work published, accepted, or demonstrably in progress. For faculty doing community- based participatory research or participatory action research, time for the relationship building necessary to conduct research and/or to build grounded theory will be taken into account, as will the time necessary to work with community members to analyze data, determine results, and disseminate results back to the community. For all faculty, when there is evidence of substantial long-term projects (such as books, digital projects, or bibliographies), a longer period of time is taken into account. This is particularly true if such projects may have yielded articles already accepted for publication in the current year, produced publications for the previous year, or be likely to result in publications in the coming year. In a year when faculty members have published a book, they have the option of counting any additional scholarly or creative work (such as articles, poems, or nonfiction essays) published in the same year toward the evaluation in the next year.

Since Committee A evaluates faculty research or creative performance holistically, the ultimate scores assigned to faculty members will often represent a composite of their various activities, such as publishing both scholarly and creative work, or attending conferences. The scale below therefore represents a skeletal baseline, to which the committee will consider adding increments corresponding to faculty members' additional activities. Composites will reflect the variety of faculty members' activities, although they are not designed to be strictly numerically cumulative (e.g., 2 for an ongoing project, 1.5 for two conference papers, and 2.1 for one article do not "add up" to 5.6). Rather, the evaluation numbers represent a basic grid for minimum professional work which reflects ascending scales of achievement.

### **Research & Creative Activity Evaluation Scale**

5.0 = 1 authored scholarly book (single or co-authored); or 1 book of poems, fiction, non-fiction; or book-length literary translation; or 1 major digital installation or publication plus 1.5 additional points per year for the next 3 years

4.01 – 4.80 = 1 edited book or textbook; or collaborative book (multiple, i.e. 3 or more authors) and 1.0 additional point per year for the next two years

4.01 – 4.50 = 1 guest edited journal issue

1.50 – 4.01 = significant poems judged by number and quality of venues.

4.50 = major external grant for the year when the first semester of leave is taken or funding is drawn

2.01 – 2.70 = internal grant or minor external grant

3.5 – 4.5 = 2 significant articles; or 2 significant short stories; or 2 chapters or creative essays, or essay-length translations; or a revised edition of a book or anthology (single-authored/edited or collaborative, with at least 20% new material)

2.80 – 3.40 = 1 significant article; or 1 significant short story; or 1 creative essay; or 1 essay-length translation

2.01 – 2.70 = 1 minor article

1.0 – 3.0 = conference papers/invited lectures or readings (for a 2.1, at least 2 papers at national or international meetings or an invited lecture at a peer institution; 3.0 is normally reserved for a keynote address at a national or international conference)

2.01 = a substantial long-term project, including a scholarly book, a long poem, a novel, a collection of stories, creative nonfiction, literary translation, and a digital project that has yielded material already accepted for publication in the coming year or shows other evidence of progress, such as an advanced or full contract, or significant material uploaded on a digital project.

0.5= Book Contract

For the third-year review for tenure-track faculty, the faculty member in consultation with Committee A must solicit a letter from a colleague in the department who is familiar with the research. That colleague must provide Committee A with a letter that describes the merits and significance of the work as well as how that work will meet tenure requirements.

### **C. Evaluation of Service**

It is the policy of this department to protect probationary faculty from excessive service.

Tenured faculty are expected to do most of the necessary administration in the department, in the university, and in the profession. Each tenured faculty member and untenured members who are asked to serve the department will provide Committee A with a report on the duties performed in each component of service to help the committee evaluate, insofar as possible, not only the amount but the quality of service.

#### **Service Evaluation Scale**

4.01 – 5.00 = Substantial service (department + university + national/professional/community service) OR



3.50 – 4.00 = Successful and significant service in the department

For the third-year review for tenure-track faculty, the faculty member in consultation with Committee A must solicit a letter from a colleague in the department who is familiar with the person's service. That colleague must provide committee A with a letter that describes the merits and significance of service.

Each faculty member will receive a copy of the annual evaluation. Should faculty members have objections, they must ask, within a week of receiving the form, to meet with Committee A to discuss their concerns. If the issue is not resolved, the faculty member may contact the Dean.

## **APPENDIX**

Suggested reportable activities for faculty evaluation in addition to Mini-Vitae:

### **Research and Creative Activity**

- Research or creative work published
- Research or creative work accepted but not yet published
- Research or creative work submitted
- Papers presented at professional meetings or readings of creative work
- Papers to be presented at professional meetings
- Research in progress—not status of each project
- Research proposals submitted
- Research supported
- Book contracts
- Review essays published
- Special recognition of research activities
- Other research or creative activity

### **Teaching Effectiveness**

- Courses taught (note if newly developed)
- Academic committees chaired: MA, PhD
- Number of doctoral committees served on (other than Chair)
- Directed readings offered
- Effective teaching methods introduced
- Participation in activities (workshops, etc.) related to improvement of education
- Application of research results in teaching
- Funded grants for improvement of instruction
- Self-evaluation activities related to instruction
- Other teaching related activities

### **Professional and University Service**

- Professional responsibilities (note exceptional effort)
- University and department responsibilities
- Organization of special meetings, conferences, etc.
- Professional contributions to the general community
- Book reviews
- Other service-oriented activities

**Nota Bene:** Faculty members are responsible for submitting, in a timely manner, information required by the department. This includes, but is not limited to, long course descriptions, book lists, and grades as well as, by proxy, teaching evaluation forms. Compliance with this requirement will be considered in the annual evaluation of teaching.

## 4. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Revised May 7, 2021

University regulations concerning tenure and promotion, including definitions of teaching, research, and service and the procedures to be followed, are listed in Section 3 of the **Faculty Handbook** and will not be repeated in the departmental Handbook.

The department is responsible for establishing and publishing specific criteria for evaluating the performance of its members. As a PhD-granting department in a research university, it is responsible for maintaining standards appropriate to its mission locally in the university and nationally in the profession.

Promotion and tenure decisions rely in part on the candidates' annual evaluations, but the dossier is far more than the sum of those evaluations. In fact, as stated above, faculty may receive high annual evaluations and still not meet the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The following procedures and criteria will be used in reaching decisions on tenure and promotion cases within the Department of English.

### Tenure

#### Probationary Period

Except in unusual cases, where specific criteria are established, in writing, by the dean and provost, faculty members on tenure-track appointments will be assistant professors. These appointments are made, by state law, on a yearly basis. (See **Faculty Handbook**, 3.7.3).

Reappointment is not automatic. The decision to reappoint will be based on careful review, by the Chair and Committee A, of the faculty member's satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching and research and of the department's needs, by means of formal, annual evaluation not only of the faculty member's performance but of her/his cumulative progress towards meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion

to associate professor. Annual Progress Toward Tenure (PTT) reviews will occur in a yearly meeting, the results of which are documented in a letter that goes into the faculty member's file. All PTT letters are reviewed as part of the Promotion and Tenure decision (which normally occurs in year 6).

### **First-year Review**

Soon after beginning a new appointment, the faculty member will meet with the Chair to discuss the tenure and promotion process, including the first annual progress toward tenure review. At this initial meeting, the Chair will consult with the faculty member about possible mentors and possible pathways toward tenure and promotion, as stipulated in the department's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and press upon the faculty member the need to consult with senior faculty members in their area about both issues.

At the first PTT meeting (no later than March 1), the Chair and Committee A will ask the faculty member to present a plan for obtaining tenure in the area of scholarship drawn from the department's Tenure and Promotion guidelines. The default pathway in LCS and Creative Writing is the publication of a book, but in consultation with senior scholars in the faculty member's area, the Chair and Committee A can approve other plans. At this meeting, a Mentoring Team of two senior faculty members, one of whom may be in another department, will be assigned to the faculty member for the duration of their probationary period. Committee A will consider the faculty member's preferences when assigning mentors.

Committee A will circulate the plan for obtaining tenure and promotion in the area of scholarship for feedback of the tenured members of the department within two weeks of the PTT meeting. Committee A will take this feedback into consideration when approving the faculty member's plan. Approval will appear in the first PTT review letter. Once faculty members have chosen a plan (e.g., a monograph or series of articles), future PTT reviews will measure their progress toward reaching this plan. Changing the plan (e.g., from a monograph to a series of articles) will only be possible under extraordinary circumstances. One example might be a Rhetoric and Writing faculty member who had proposed articles but is approached by a press about writing a book based on a particularly impactful article. Because of the time-sensitive nature of the probationary period, Committee A must be convinced that changing directions is possible.

### **Third-year review**

Not later than February 1 of the faculty member's third year, they will be asked to submit 1) a mini-vitae covering the faculty member's years in the department in the areas of research/creative activity, teaching, and service and 2) statements on research/creative activity, teaching, and service covering the faculty member's years in the department. These materials will be distributed to everyone involved in the reviewing process by the Chair.

The Chair and Committee A will, after consulting the faculty member and the Mentoring Team, appoint an external reviewer in an appropriate field. 1) The external reviewer will, after reviewing the probationary colleague's research/creative activity, write a letter describing the merit and significance of this work and how this work is on track to meet the department's tenure and promotion requirements; 2) A senior faculty member will review the probationary colleague's teaching record in the department and, after observing the colleague's in-class teaching, will write a letter on teaching during the probationary period; 3) A second senior faculty member, with knowledge of the probationary colleague's service, will write a letter describing the colleague's service commitments during the probationary period. The Mentoring Team normally will write the teaching and service review letters, though other faculty members may be chosen instead.

Each of the senior, tenured faculty and the external reviewer tasked with writing a letter will submit their respective letter to the Chair by April 1.

Finally, after reviewing this material, the Chair and Committee A will decide whether or not to appoint the probationary faculty member beyond a fourth year.

The goal of these reviews and of less formal mentoring and advising is to help tenure-track faculty develop professionally and to prepare a solid case for tenure. It is the sense of the department that the evaluation process should be used to advise and aid the probationary faculty member. It is expected that under normal circumstances appointment will be continuous up to the time of the tenure decision unless there is compelling evidence that the faculty member is failing to perform satisfactorily.

### **Tenure Decision**

Departmental tenure votes are normally held in the fall semester of the candidate's sixth year of appointment. The candidate, with the advice of the Chair and Committee A, should begin preparation of the tenure dossier in the preceding spring. The candidate will suggest names of scholars outside the University who are acquainted with the candidate's research and professional standing. The Chair and Committee A will select an equal number of outside referees and request evaluations from both lists. The dossier must contain letters from at least six referees who are outside the University.

The College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's Office have copies on their websites of the format in which dossier materials are to be presented.

For other details about procedure, see **Faculty Handbook 3.7.5**.

The tenure decision is based primarily upon the candidate's record in research/creative activity and teaching. To qualify for tenure, the faculty member must have a) engaged in research or creative activity that has won national recognition in significant refereed

publication or by other means of accepted evaluation in the field. This work must demonstrate in concrete fashion promise of continuing achievement; b) established herself/himself as a successful teacher. Committee service within the department is expected, but on departmental, college, and university levels, it is less important than teaching and research/creative activity.

### **Research and Creative Activity**

See **Faculty Handbook**, 3.6.2. In order to meet the criteria for tenure and promotion, research/creative activity must be subjected to peer review and to the evaluation of outside referees as part of the tenure process.

Quality and quantity are important. Because the department is comprised of distinct scholarly communities with different traditions of research and creative activity, the guidelines for research and creative activity are separated by discipline.

In all areas of Literary and Cultural Studies, a book in production will be expected for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. If a candidate can present a compelling case that a body of publications is equivalent to the accomplishment represented by a book, such as multiple articles in top journals in a field or subfield in which articles are the norm rather than a book, that work may likewise form the basis for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In cases in which faculty work in emerging fields such as the digital humanities, they may be considered for tenure and promotion based on articles in top journals as well as significant peer reviewed digital projects that may not appear in traditional venues (see Addendum: Evaluating Digital Scholarship and Creative Activity). Likewise, in cases in which faculty work in emerging fields that value community-engaged scholarship, a significant public humanities project supplemented by scholarly articles in well-respected, peer-reviewed scholarly journals may be considered for tenure and promotion (see Addendum: Evaluating Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity).

In the area of Creative Writing, a candidate will be expected to have published a book beyond the publications required for his or her initial appointment. If a candidate can present a compelling case that a body of publications is equivalent to the accomplishment represented by a book, that work may likewise form the basis for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

In the area of Rhetoric and Writing Studies, a candidate will be expected to choose one of the following four pathways of scholarly production: 1) a book in production; 2) at least 5-6 articles in well-respected, peer-reviewed scholarly journals (one or two chapters in prestigious edited collections may also be considered in this total), demonstrating a unified scholarly narrative and original research contribution equivalent to a monograph; 3) a large, digital humanities project supplemented by at least 3 scholarly articles in well-respected, peer-reviewed scholarly journals that document and interpret the research (see Addendum: Evaluating Digital Scholarship

and Creative Activity); or 4) a public humanities project supplemented by at least 3 scholarly articles in well-respected, peer-reviewed scholarly journals that document and interpret the research (see Addendum: Evaluating Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity).

## **Teaching**

Teaching is defined and discussed in **Faculty Handbook**, 3.6.1, and the department's method of assignment in "Evaluation of Teaching." In order to be granted tenure, the candidate should demonstrate teaching effectiveness in general education and lower division courses and a high quality of performance in his/her area of specialization. Evaluation of teaching is based upon the following: a) student evaluations; b) annual classroom visits by a member of the tenured faculty, chosen in consultation with Committee A, conducted in the manner prescribed in "Peer Evaluations" c) course materials submitted by the candidate; d) other relevant indications of success (e.g., publications or conference presentations by graduate students).

## **Professional and University Service**

While service plays a secondary role in the tenure decision, and therefore probationary candidates are cautioned not to overburden themselves with service responsibilities outside the department, either for the university or for regional or national organizations, candidates are expected to perform duties within the department.

## **A. Promotion**

### **Associate Professor**

Consideration of promotion to associate professor will normally coincide with the decision to grant tenure. In cases where promotion is being considered separately, the decision will be based on the criteria for tenure.

### **Professor**

The candidate for promotion to the rank of professor should provide evidence of continued growth as a scholar or creative writer and should have warranted national or international recognition for those publications. Both quality and quantity are important. Work used in the tenure dossier may not, except in extraordinary cases, such as cumulative work on a digital project, be used to justify promotion to professor.

A successful dossier for promotion in any field may include a book, multiple articles in journals in a field or subfield, and/or significant peer reviewed digital projects written and published after tenure is granted. Translations, critical editions, film production, co-authored books, edited collections, chapters in scholarly collections, publicly-oriented scholarship and community-engaged projects may also be considered for promotion. The candidate for promotion may include a combination of

these items in the portfolio, keeping in mind the importance of quality and quantity of production.

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate promise for continued contributions in teaching and service that will enhance the reputation of the unit and the university. Evaluation of teaching, including peer evaluation, will be conducted as set forth in "Evaluation of Teaching." Evidence of service may include mentoring other faculty members and students, leadership of committees or other units (department, college, and university), leadership roles and other forms of service to the profession, building collaborations (locally, nationally, and internationally), and community engagement.

When a candidate for promotion has exhibited exemplary achievements in the area of service or administration either in the university (department, college, and/or university-wide) or the profession (e.g., long-term editing of a scholarly journal or other leadership in the profession), that intellectual work can likewise be considered alongside other forms of scholarly production, provided that achievement in the area of service or administration is well documented.

## **Procedures**

Mentoring for promotion begins in the year following tenure. Committee A shall meet with the newly promoted (or newly hired) associate professor to discuss a choice of pathway to promotion and a potential mentoring team. Unlike the formal process during the probationary period, the appointment of a mentoring team is recommended but not required.

No later than the fifth year after tenure and promotion (or hire at the associate professor level), Committee A shall meet with the candidate with a goal of assessing whether the candidate has the necessary dossier to apply for promotion. This review should consider alternative pathways, such as promotion based on the intellectual work of administration, where appropriate.

Each year the Chair and/or Committee A shall notify members of the faculty of deadlines for the promotion process in the coming academic year. Those wishing to be considered for promotion will be given a copy of the schedule and format for assembling a dossier.

As in tenure cases, both the candidate and Committee A will prepare a list of external referees of scholars able to judge the amount and significance of the candidate's work.

The dossier, including external evaluations, the candidate's vita and narrative of accomplishments since promotion to associate professor, and copies of published work, will be available to all full professors in the department.

# **Addendum: Evaluating Digital Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Adopted December 4, 2020

## **Digital Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Under whatever name it is known—Digital Humanities, Humanities Computing, Computational Humanities, Multimodal Composition, etc.—scholarship and creative activity involving digital tools and resources has an important and vital place in a research institution. The Department of English at the University of Oklahoma unequivocally supports efforts to advance the field and encourages faculty members to pursue digital scholarship if their research leads them in that direction.

Although there are some outlets for peer review of digital projects, not every digital project is suitable for those publications. Moreover, the criteria for assessment are not broadly applicable, since the task is rarely as straightforward as critiquing the quality of an argument and its supporting scholarship. Rather, digital scholarship often takes the form of research, interactive, and/or performative objects such as computer programs for acquiring, processing, and analyzing data, or curated databases. The impact of these research objects and media may be difficult to quantify, given that their use may be limited to a specific context or research problem. Accordingly, different measures of success must be taken into account, and they must be selected and applied appropriately to individual projects. Nevertheless, scholars who work in digital scholarship are producing and refining peer-review strategies appropriate to digital projects, and the views and policies of learned societies in this regard continue to evolve. Accordingly, the Department of English will review new standards as they develop and adopt them where appropriate.

In recognition of these issues and the fact that, the Department of English provides this document as guidance to individual faculty members and the colleagues who must assess their work.

## **Definition**

For the purposes of this policy, “digital scholarship” applies not to online journals for publishing articles, reviews, and other traditional forms of scholarship, nor to creative work (including performances) that is simply released in digital formats, since the existing policy on tenure and promotion covers those forms of publication. Rather, “digital scholarship” applies to work in which the use of technology is central to the project’s mission. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Computer code for analyzing or manipulating data
- Creating and making datasets available
- Databases created and curated with a view to supporting research
- Visualizations of information



- Data models for encoding and representing information
- Experiential video games that make arguments through play and interactivity
- Multimodal productions that make arguments using an innovative mix of aural, visual, and verbal communication.

Digital scholarship may reach a broader public, but it must advance knowledge *in the field* to be considered scholarship under this category.

### **Assessment**

Above all, digital scholarship should be evaluated in the context for which it was designed, developed, and executed. Unfortunately, owing to many factors beyond the control of individual scholars (e.g., ongoing development and lifecycles of computer languages and technology in general), the nature of some digital scholarship is ephemeral. Accordingly, reasonable steps must be taken by scholars to ensure that their work is documented and made available in an accessible and stable format, at least during a period specified and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the members of Committee A for evaluation. It is the responsibility of the department to take this into consideration and to evaluate scholarship in a timely manner.

Digital scholarship may be documented in a variety of ways, not all of them appropriate for every project. If the project involves the use of existing tools and methods to analyze data, results of the study should be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. In the case of digital tools, games, and resources, it is expected that computer code will be documented according to the standards and practices in place for a given platform, and that instructions will be provided for installation and use. Documentation of the related technologies and their potential effect on the lifecycle of the project should also be included. As for the purpose and results of the project, opportunities for submitting them to a peer-reviewed publication should be pursued, but the overriding concern is that documentation about the project should be openly available and accessible (e.g., in a code repository or on a project's blog).

The department recognizes that making a project available in an accessible and stable format depends on many factors beyond the control of any one person. Planned obsolescence, after all, is a reality of hardware and software development, and a scholar should not be penalized if a product ceases to function as expected because of the development cycle of a related technology. This is especially the case for projects dependent on grant funding for continued development. However, if a faculty member wishes to receive credit for digital work, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to work with Committee A to agree upon a window of time for review of a project in a functional, accessible environment by members of the department and, in some cases, external reviewers. Faculty members engaging in digital scholarship are also expected to consult the staff of relevant units (e.g., OU Libraries, the OU Supercomputing Center for Education and Research) in the university regarding long-term storage and availability of their projects.

### **Criteria for Evaluation**

The department recognizes that the criteria for evaluating digital scholarship are different for each project. Faculty members working on digital scholarship should consult Committee A early in the

development of a project and establish mutually agreed upon goals and criteria for assessment. Those criteria **must** include some or all the following:

- Peer review of the work, whether in the form of a published review or an independent assessment by reviewers identified by the faculty member and the department.
- Conference presentations and/or publications related to the work.
- Evidence of adoption by, use by, and/or impact on members of the scholarly community and/or wider public.
- Use of internationally accepted coding and encoding standards for data and metadata.
- Openness and accessibility of data.

Examples of other factors that may be considered include:

- Grant funding received.
- Evidence of a strategy for long-term accessibility and use.
- Collaboration with scholars at OU and/or other institutions.
- Contribution to the field.
- Technical innovation.
- Pedagogical applications.

The procedure shall be to document the agreed upon criteria for evaluation in a letter to the faculty member from the members of Committee A. Those criteria, along with a copy of this policy, will also be shared with any external referees invited to review the project.

# **Addendum: Evaluating Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Adopted May 7, 2021

## **Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Under whatever name it is known—Public Humanities or Community-Engaged Scholarship—scholarly activity involving the public as a significant partner has an important and vital place in a research institution. The Department of English at the University of Oklahoma unequivocally supports efforts to advance the field as well as the welfare of our community partners, wherever they may be, and therefore encourages faculty members to pursue community-engaged scholarship if their research leads them in that direction.

### **Definition**

Community-engaged scholarship takes the form of research, interactive, and/or performative work that enhances the public interest. Ernest Boyer uses the term “engaged scholarship” to describe research that connects “the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems” (19). Sometimes this scholarship overlaps work in the Digital Humanities (see Addendum: Evaluating Digital Scholarship and Creative Activity). One example is The Emmett Till Memory Project, one of the many public humanities projects listed on the Humanities For All website. Developed by rhetorician David Tell with community partners, the innovative digital app curates narratives associated with significant sites in the Mississippi Delta, preserving and raising awareness of Till’s murder. Sometimes, the project is characterized by the development of resources for the public good, such as community literacy centers. What makes a project community *scholarship* rather than community *service* is that it is “scholarly work tied to a faculty member’s expertise . . . [that] is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution” (University of Oklahoma Office of Community Engagement). Furthermore, like all scholarship, community-engaged scholarship must break new ground or in other ways show innovation, have impact, be documented and disseminated, and be peer reviewed. For the purposes of this addendum, community scholarship does not apply to traditional scholarly or creative activity (e.g., a monograph or a novel) that is *about* community-engaged scholarship, for this work is covered under existing policy on tenure and promotion, which covers those forms of publication. Rather, “community-engaged scholarship” applies to work in which the engagement of the public is central to the project’s mission. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Creating original language resources by collecting traditional texts and recording conversations between elders with the goal of inspiring new language learners of endangered languages, such as the Standing Rock Lakota/Dakota Language Project
- Projects that connect a community to its own literary history, such as An American Literary Landscape: Life, History, and Memory in Putnam County, Georgia, which focuses on the life of Alice Walker

## **Assessment**

Community-engaged scholarship should be evaluated in the context for which it was designed, developed, and executed. Like digital scholarship, there are factors beyond the control of individual scholars that may make community-engaged scholarship ephemeral. Accordingly, reasonable steps must be taken by scholars to ensure that their work is documented and made available in an accessible and stable format, at least during a period specified and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the members of Committee A for evaluation. For example, if the culmination of community-engaged scholarship is some kind of event, members of Committee A should be invited to attend and devise assessment measures should be employed to capture the impact of the event (e.g., surveys of audiences). Opportunities for submitting community-engaged scholarship for peer-reviewed publication should be pursued, but the overriding concern is that the documentation about the project should be openly available and accessible (e.g., documentation should occur online, such as on a blog).

If a faculty member wishes to receive credit for community-engaged scholarship, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to work with Committee A to agree upon a window of time for review of a project in a functional, accessible environment by members of the department, members of the community (as relevant) and, in some cases, external reviewers. Faculty members engaging in community-engaged scholarship are also expected to consult staff of relevant units (e.g., Office of Community Engagement) for help with documenting their work.

## **Criteria for Evaluation**

The department recognizes that the criteria for evaluating community-engaged scholarship are different for each project. Faculty members working on community-engaged scholarship should consult Committee A early in the development of a project and establish mutually agreed upon goals and criteria for assessment. Those criteria must include some or all of the following:

- Peer review of the work, whether in the form of a published review or an independent assessment by reviewers identified by the faculty member and the department.
- Conference presentations and/or publications documenting and disseminating the work.
- Evidence of impact of the work, such as adoption of the method by other scholars or the community partners
- Openness and accessibility of the project.
- Evidence of community engagement with the project.

Examples of other factors that may be considered include:

- Grant funding received
- Evidence of a strategy for preservation of the project or continuation of the project (e.g., through online dissemination or ongoing partnerships)
- Letters and other evidence of impact on the community
- Contribution to the field
- Innovation
- Applications beyond the scope of the project (pedagogical or otherwise).

The procedure shall be to document the agreed upon criteria for evaluation in a letter to the faculty member from the members of Committee A. Those criteria, along with a copy of this policy, will also be shared with any external referees invited to review the project.

## **Resources**

Boyer, Ernest. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service & Outreach* v. 1, no. 1, 1996, pp. 11-20.

Humanities for All. National Humanities Alliance. 19 Mar. 2021.

O'Meara, KerryAnn, Timothy Eatman, and Saul Petersen. "Advancing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure: A Roadmap and Call for Reform." *Liberal Education* v. 101, n. 3, Summer 2015. 19 Mar. 2021.

"OU Community Engagement Promotion and Tenure Resources." Community Engagement. The University of Oklahoma. 19 Mar. 2021.

Public Humanities. Special Issue of *Profession* (Spring 2019). Modern Language Association. 19 Mar. 2021.

## Addendum: Evaluating Scholarship and Creative Activity in Film, Television, or Related Media

### **Definition**

Research and creative activity can take the form of work in professionally and/or critically recognized productions of film, television, or related media, in areas such as screenwriting, directing, cinematography, editing, and other work. To be submitted in the category of research and creative activity for tenure and promotion, work on them must garner regional, national, and/or international recognition, such as through official selection at film festivals. This could mean a significant body of work aired in professionally and/or critically recognized film, television, or related media outlets. The categories of film may be broadly understood to include narrative/fiction, documentary, experimental, essay and other types of visual and auditory media. Major areas of contributions might include screenwriting, directing, cinematography, editing, producing, and/or other roles in consultation with Committee A in which the candidate can demonstrate significant creative control.

### **Assessment**

With their frequent dependence on unreliable funding structures and the contributions of many collaborators, film projects might take significantly longer than, for instance, traditional book publication. Candidates on the tenure track are encouraged to be mindful that there is little flexibility to the length of the probationary period, so the likelihood of shepherding a film project to completion should inform the scope of the project and how prominently it will factor in the tenure and promotion dossier. It is the candidate's responsibility to convey the scholarly and/or creative contours of their project to the evaluating bodies (i.e., Committee A and the Campus Tenure and Promotion Committee), to support their account with appropriate evidence, and to secure clear understanding with Committee A that expectations for productivity in scholarship are being met, beginning early and continuing throughout the tenure and promotion processes. Committee A might elect to consult with colleagues with expertise in appropriate fields outside the department to aid in the evaluation of creative filmic activity at any point, as it would in selecting external evaluators for tenure and promotion dossiers.

In terms of evaluation, scholarly and creative work in film should be assessed by a reasonable and equitable mix of the candidate's efforts relative to elements such as:

### **Production:**

- Quality of the film: Evaluators might ask similar questions of film and traditional scholarly projects: e.g., is the project intellectually engaging, does it bring new information to light, does it spark new questions in its area, is it engaged with current scholarly/artistic conversations, are its claims supportable, has it undergone peer review?
- Originality/innovation in theme or filmmaking approach
- Degree of creative control/input
- Technical proficiency, relative to the target media outlet: The polish of broadcast and theatrical distribution demands extremely high and detailed technical requirements,

whereas a film created for a film festival circuit run, which is a reasonable aspirational level, might be far less exacting.

- Project scope: A film's length can index the labor involved in its creation, but it is neither the only indicator nor is it always reliable. A project's scope should be therefore be contextualized. A limited role in a mammoth project does not necessarily represent a greater contribution than multiple roles on a short film; a ten-minute animation might require as many production hours as full-length documentary.
- Documented amount of field-appropriate scholarly labor: Not every role on a film is appropriately categorized as Scholarship for the purposes of the English department. The candidate will need to articulate how their contributions are relevant to and advance the field.
- Evidence of scholarly and/or creative engagement
- Thoroughness/reliability of research
- Community outreach
- Attentiveness to legal requirements for distribution and/or screening (e.g., appearance, materials, and location permissions; copyright securing)

### **Recognition/Distribution/Impact:**

Distribution and acquisition are to peer-reviewed publication as film is to traditional scholarship. The profile, selectivity, impact, and prestige of venues and reviewers are relevant considerations in evaluating the recognition and impact of filmic work in the field.

- Public screenings: Venues might include movie theaters, film festivals, museums, art galleries, curated exhibits, screening series, or conferences; or broadcast via television, streaming platforms, or other digital media outlets. Documentation of viewership and reception (numbers of audience members, downloads, number of screenings, etc.) will aid in evaluation.
- Prestige of inviting host institutions, scholars, or professionals
- Selectivity of venue
- Peer/professional review: Possible reviewers might include juries, curators, scholars, or distributors.
- Published reviews
- Project acquisition/optioning by agency or distribution entity
- Grant or fellowship funding
- Awards (audience, jury, critic, professional, e.g.)
- Entry into/recognition at competitions (for screenwriting or film slams, e.g.)
- Reception among target and general audiences (which might include specific communities or organizations)
- Impact (for the field, target audiences, scholarly/creative trajectory, e.g.)