Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the College Manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
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INTRODUCTION

The Department of English has formulated promotion and tenure guidelines to conform to and supplement the general requirements established by the Board of Regents of the University System and the policies outlined in the current Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the University. Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the College Manual takes precedence. The Department will judge each candidate for promotion and/or tenure according to the criteria in these documents. Faculty should carefully study the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in the University and College manuals, and in the departmental guidelines.

As explained in the College Manual, all participants in the process should follow the principles of professional ethics associated with peer evaluations, which prohibit evaluations that would involve a conflict of interest.

All materials, discussions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, should divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved. E-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). In accordance with the College Manual, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the departmental review as outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor in three areas: Professional Development, Instruction, and Service.
A candidate for tenure at the rank of associate professor or for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor should include all relevant materials from both before and after the candidate’s initial appointment at Georgia State University.

A candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor or for tenure at this rank should include all relevant materials only since the candidate’s promotion to the rank of associate professor at Georgia State University or at a previous institution.

The Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure (hereafter known as the departmental review committee) shall consider all relevant materials in the dossier.

Letters from outside reviewers who are authorities in the candidate’s field (solicited in accordance with the procedures described in the College Manual) will be used to provide a supplementary perspective on the candidate’s achievements and impact upon his or her field of professional development.

The outside reviewers should ordinarily be affiliated with institutions in which the emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar to or more demanding than that at Georgia State University. Some institutions are particularly prominent in relation to specific fields, and the departmental review committee’s report should note this about the reviewer from such an institution if relevant to the candidate’s field. To assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate’s record, the departmental review committee shall consider the letters of the external reviewers to be an important complement to the internal estimate by the candidate’s departmental colleagues, and the committee report shall provide a detailed summary and analysis of the reviewers’ estimations of the candidate’s professional contributions.
All steps by all individuals and groups involved in the tenure and promotion process must be taken by the deadlines specified in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual. The reports of the departmental review committee, along with any minority reports, and of the chair shall be sent forward to the College Committee.

A candidate denied promotion should, before reapplying, demonstrate some qualitative and quantitative improvement, and should reassess his or her materials and record in consultation with colleagues and with the Chair.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The candidate’s professional development will be judged on the basis of publications, editorial work, and other professional activities. Collaborative work is often appropriate, and is valued as a legitimate form of inquiry and production. The successful candidate for tenure or promotion should demonstrate that he/she has continued as an active scholar after arriving at Georgia State University, no matter what the prior credentials.

Within the discipline, a substantial number of articles or book chapters ranks in significance with a book of original scholarship or a monograph. Thus the minimum requirement to earn promotion and tenure to Associate Professor is a body of original scholarship, either a monograph or a significant number of articles or comparable material as judged by peers, although no guarantee of this. In all cases, reputable publishing entails the independent vetting of manuscripts. Usually, original scholarship counts more than editing or summarizing the original scholarship of others. It should be noted, however, that some scholarly editions of literature contain substantial original scholarship. “Edition” can mean anything from a reprint of
an existing text or the re-publication of essays written by others with a new introduction, to an
authoritative edition of previously unpublished primary materials. The greater the amount of
original textual, scholarly, and interpretative work, the more weight the edition carries. In the
absence of substantial original scholarship, it is unlikely that any amount of purely editorial
work, or any number of book reviews or factual entries, would suffice.

While conference papers count as professional activities, they do not rank in significance
with published materials.

Textbooks and pedagogical materials are counted under Instruction, not Professional
Development. Textbooks may be defined as materials to be used in the classroom that sum up
information without proposing original research, with students as the targeted audience.

Publications about methods of instruction in one’s field count as Professional Development.
Part of the criteria for the evaluation of books and articles shall be the caliber of the venue in
which they are published.

In general, the reputation of the candidate within the scholarly community is measured by
reviews, citations, awards, and the like. For example, a short book that has received a
prestigious award counts more than a long book that has not been favorably reviewed. A work
of scholarship published outside a candidate’s initial specialty counts as long as the candidate has
established a reputation in the initial field. But high prestige of a candidate in one specialty is
preferred to modest prestige in two.

There are many different ways of satisfying the requirement that the candidate produce a
work of original scholarship roughly equivalent to a book. Although each career is unique, there
is agreement upon certain evaluative principles; and the following materials are ranked in
general order of importance:
• an original single-authored scholarly book, refereed and published by a reputable university or trade press;

• the candidate’s contribution to an original co-authored scholarly book. The candidate should state his or her role in the research. The greater the percentage of the work that is the candidate’s own, the better. Candidates who produce co-authored or co-edited work must specify in their dossier the part of the work for which they are responsible;

• a single-authored scholarly edition of previously unpublished material, of published material that has never received scholarly editorial treatment, or an authoritative edition of previously edited material that provides substantial re-editing or annotating; a textual edition of comparable magnitude to such work, followed closely by the candidate’s contributions to a co-edited treatment of such work;

• an essay containing original research appearing either as a chapter published by a reputable scholarly or trade press or as an article published by a reputable professional journal;

• a book-length critical bibliography aimed at a scholarly audience;

• a single-authored or co-authored book related to one’s field and aimed at a general audience;

• a single-edited or co-edited book or journal collection of new scholarly essays by others.

Materials not involving original work may also be counted as Professional Development:

collections of previously published essays, with significant introduction, headnotes, or appendices; book-reviews; or entries in encyclopedias or other reference books.

None of these materials may include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for publication. Materials accepted for publication must be accompanied by attesting documentation.
In evaluating the candidate’s Professional Development, the committee will also consider professional service demonstrating that the candidate has a national reputation in the field. Such activities may include participation in the meetings of professional organizations, editorial activities, and other significant professional services appropriate to the discipline and to the candidate’s area(s) of specialization. Professional activities should be included in Professional Development rather than in Service if they engage the professional expertise, although university service engaging one’s professional expertise should be included under service. Serving as the President or Executive Director of a prestigious scholarly organization, for example, is evidence that the candidate is regarded as an important scholar even if the work of the President or Director is primarily administrative.

If an activity such as Professional Service or pedagogical publications could be legitimately included in more than one area, the candidate shall choose the area in which it shall count in consultation with the chair.

Evidence of a national reputation also may include membership on editorial boards; leadership roles in other scholarly projects; invitations to deliver keynote addresses; chairing sessions at professional meetings; extramural grants; and service as a manuscript reviewer or consultant for professional journals and scholarly presses. A distinguished national or international reputation as a leader in the field may also be indicated by a significant number of reviews of books by the candidate or a significant number of citations in scholarly publications of the candidate’s published research. Evaluators should bear in mind, however, that such reviews and citations usually take several years after the original publication to appear.

Scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many areas of English studies. The Modern Language Association “Guidelines for Evaluating Work with Digital Media in the
Modern Languages” specifies that vetted work published in a digital medium should be valued as being equal to print publications, and the candidate should indicate the peer review and publication guidelines for the digital media. Such technologies that may be employed in scholarship include multimedia productions and computer software. Such contributions should be read in the media for which they were intended.

The candidate who works with digital media should be prepared to make explicit the results, theoretical underpinnings, and intellectual rigor of the work. The candidate should take particular care to describe how the work may overlap with or redefine the traditional categories, and to describe the process underlying the creation of work in digital media (e.g., the creation of infrastructure as well as content). Any new collaborative relationships with other faculty members and students required by the candidate’s work in digital media should also be noted. As stated in the Modern Language Association “Statement on Publications in Electronic Journals,” online publications can have wide circulation. Their citation and scholarly impact may be documented by data, including whether a site has been adopted, endorsed, and linked by any relevant official sites, library-based subject-collections of resources, scholarly associations, or colleges and universities. Public impact may also be documented by how many people have visited the site.

Creative Writing

The candidate’s Professional Development will be judged on the basis of publications, awards and fellowships for creative writing, editorial work, invited readings/lectures, and other professional activities. The candidate who has co-authored a publication should state his or her role in the production. The greater the percentage of the work that is the candidate’s own, the
better. Candidates who produce co-authored work must specify in their dossier the part of the
work for which they are responsible. Usually, both a book of original creative writing from a
respected publisher and publications in reputable magazines or journals with national visibility
are minimum requirements to earn tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In the absence
of a book, it is unlikely that any number of journal publications, or any amount of purely
editorial work, or any number of book reviews or critical essays, would suffice. While invited
readings and lectures count as professional activities, they do not rank in significance with
published materials. Textbooks and pedagogical materials are counted under Instruction, not
Professional Development. Textbooks may be defined as materials to be used primarily in the
classroom that sum up information without proposing original research, with students as the
targeted audience.

Part of the criteria for evaluation of Professional Development materials shall be the
caliber of their press or journal. The higher the reputation of the candidate within the writing
community, as measured by reviews, citations, awards, and the like, the better. Evaluators
should bear in mind, however, that such reviews and citations usually take several years after the
original publication to appear.

A work published outside a candidate’s initial specialty counts as long as the candidate
has established a reputation in the initial field. But high prestige of a candidate in one specialty is
preferred to modest prestige in two.

Although each career is unique, there is agreement upon certain evaluative principles;
and the following materials are ranked in general order of importance.

- Book publication: the merit of a book publisher is best judged by the authors it publishes
  and the awards and fellowships those authors and their books garner. However, the best
measures of a book’s merit are the newspaper and journal reviews, literary awards, and citations that the book receives.

- Journal publication: publication of creative writing in national magazines and premiere literary journals with substantial national distribution is more desirable than publication in respected literary magazines with a more limited national distribution, which is more desirable than publication in literary “little” magazines with local or very limited national distribution.

- Awards and fellowships: awards and fellowships for creative writing are excellent indicators of a national reputation. The merit of the award or fellowship will be based on the reputation and reach of the awarding agency. National awards and fellowships are held in higher esteem than regional, which are valued above local awards.

- Reprints: reprints in anthologies and textbooks are excellent indicators of a national reputation. The significance of these publications will be judged by the caliber of the press and the nature of the publication.

- Reviews: reviews of creative work are excellent indicators of a national reputation, with the caveat noted earlier about the usual time required for such reviews to appear. The significance of reviews will be judged by the caliber of the reviewing journal or press.

- Editorial projects: editorial work such as editing an anthology or literary magazine will count toward Professional Development but will count less than the publication of original creative work. The merits of magazine editing will be judged by the caliber of the writers the magazine has published, publishing awards the magazine has received, and reviews. The merits of fiction or poetry anthologies will be judged according to the caliber of the publisher, reviews received, and awards.
• Readings and lectures: invited readings and lectures are indicators of a candidate’s visibility and reputation. The significance of such readings and lectures can be judged by the reputation of the hosting institution.

Other professional activities might include the judging of literary competitions and evaluating manuscripts for reputable presses.

INSTRUCTION

The departmental evaluation committee will consider a variety of written evidence submitted by the candidate of effectiveness in the classroom. The candidate should adhere closely to the "Categories for Instruction" as listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual. The candidate should include the annual departmental instructional portfolios he or she has compiled for the previous four years and student evaluations, as required in the College Manual. Letters from students may not be included in the dossier. The candidate may include material illustrating the advisement of M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. theses; the preparation and grading of graduate examinations; documented advising of student; acceptance of former students into doctoral programs, appointment to faculty positions, or recognition in the profession; commentary on student papers; direction of Honors projects, independent studies, and graduate colloquia (e.g. MA pro-seminars and graduate conferences); course materials, handouts, or materials designed for Web-based instruction created by the candidate; nominations of students for awards; and invitations to teach a seminar at other universities.

A teaching award from a prestigious outlet is particularly strong evidence of teaching
effectiveness. Additional evidence may include the creation of new areas of curriculum, the publication of textbooks, the adoption of such textbooks by other educational institutions; invitations to lecture about teaching; leading workshops on teaching; and consultations with publishers or institutions about the development of pedagogical materials.

SERV\_ICE

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the candidate’s service to the Department, College, and University, as well as to professional organizations and the community. Within the department, a faculty member may serve as an administrator (Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate Director, etc.); as a section head; or as a committee chairperson. Other forms of departmental service include membership on committees, involvement with departmental student organizations, and mentoring or otherwise assisting colleagues. Forms of service to the College or University include participation in the University Senate; chairing or serving on an interdepartmental, College, or University committee, task force, or other such body; providing assistance to other departments or individual colleagues in other departments; mentoring colleagues in other departments; providing guidance to extra-departmental student organizations; and planning public lectures or conferences to be held at Georgia State.

Professional or community service includes serving in an administrative position in a professional organization, serving as a consultant to another educational institution or to a governmental body, professional organization, or other group; making practical arrangements for
conferences; assisting colleagues at other institutions; grading SAT examinations or other national tests; delivering lectures to non-professional audiences, or participating in non-professional forums. Generally, a community service should be included only if it somehow places one’s professional expertise at the service of the general public. Other kinds of public service, admirable though they might be, are unlikely to carry much weight. Extensive public service will not compensate for a deficiency of departmental, College, or University service.

The above are only a sample of possible services. A candidate should call attention to awards he or she received for service activities. Services for which financial remuneration was received may be included. If a brief description of a service on the candidate’s curriculum vitae does not give a clear indication of the nature and scope of the service, the candidate should provide a more detailed explanation in the introduction to the appropriate section of the dossier. A candidate is urged to exercise discretion in supplying documentation of service. Some form of evidence should be provided to document each service activity, but the amount of evidence should be kept to the minimum necessary to give a clear sense of the nature and scope of the activity. Appropriate documentation of a public lecture, for example, might include a letter of invitation, a copy of the poster announcing the lecture, a letter of appreciation from the official organizer of the event, or a newspaper account, but should not include every email about the arrangements. If one served on a commission that produced a hundred-page report, one should not include the entire report, merely one’s letter of appointment to the commission and the brief introduction or conclusion of the report or the particular section of the report solely authored by the candidate.
Assistant Professors must simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure. Tenure in the College for Assistant Professors will not be granted without promotion to Associate Professor. A recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate be judged at least **excellent** in either Professional Development or Instruction and at least **very good** in the other, and at least **good** in Service.

### Professional Development

Evaluations of **poor**, **fair**, or **good** describe an unacceptable record of Professional Development. None of these ratings is adequate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. An evaluation of **good** means that the candidate, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field.

An evaluation of **very good** means that the candidate has produced a strong body of work indicating that progress is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future. This entails a body of original scholarship: a book or a significant number of articles or comparable material appropriate to the subdiscipline.

To receive an evaluation of **excellent**, the candidate must have produced a book or a comparable body of original research and must present some substantial further evidence of an emerging national reputation. Such further evidence might include, for example, the publication of articles and book chapters in addition to the book (if the candidate has published a book), or a number of articles and/or book chapters that are comparable to significantly more than a book (if
the candidate has not published a book). Another kind of further evidence that might earn a rating of excellent would be documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation. For a more detailed explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the section of the guidelines above on “Professional Development.”

An evaluation of outstanding means that the candidate has actually achieved eminence (as evidenced by national or international awards, reviews in major review venues, invited lectures and so on) in his or her field.

Professional Development in Creative Writing

Evaluations of poor, fair, or good describe an unacceptable record of Professional Development. None of these ratings is adequate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

An evaluation of good means that the candidate, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field.

An evaluation of very good means that the candidate has published a book of original creative writing from a reputable literary publisher and has produced a strong body of work indicating that progress is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future.

An evaluation of excellent means that the candidate has produced a body of work that shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future. Normally, this entails publication with a respected literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing and documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation. For a more detailed
explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the section of the guidelines above on “Professional Development.”

An evaluation of **outstanding** means that the candidate has published two or more books and has achieved eminence (as evidenced by national or international awards, reviews in major review venues, invited lectures and so on) in his or her field.

**Instruction**

An evaluation of **poor, fair, or good** describes an unacceptable record of instruction. None of these ratings is adequate for promotion to Associate Professor.

A candidate is evaluated as **good** if his or her performance does not greatly exceed what could be described as adequate. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the high 3- to the 4-out of 5 range. Supporting material should give evidence of diligent preparation and pertinent, valid content.

A candidate is evaluated as **very good** if his or her performance is considered highly competent. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the low 4-out of 5 range. Supporting material should include evidence of diligent preparation and a conscientious mentoring of students, as well as a commitment to enthusiastic, creative, and innovative pedagogy.

A candidate is evaluated as **excellent** if his or her teaching performance suggests exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially service on committees for or the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, theses, and dissertations. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out
of 5 range. The candidate should demonstrate an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a candidate may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in teaching.

A candidate is evaluated as outstanding if the criteria for excellent are significantly exceeded, if, for example, the candidate has won a teaching award from a prestigious outlet. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the high-4 out of 5 range.

Service

An evaluation of poor or fair describes an unacceptable record of Service. Neither of these ratings is adequate for promotion to Associate Professor.

In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least good in Service. A candidate will achieve a ranking of good if he or she responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

A candidate will be evaluated very good in Service if he or she is considered effective in many of the following activities: rendering substantial service to colleagues; volunteering for departmental tasks beyond assigned committee responsibilities; rendering service at the College or University level; rendering significant community service; participating in service activities in professional organizations.

A candidate who performs several services, each of which requires a considerable expenditure of effort, and who performs these tasks well, will earn a rating of excellent.
A candidate whose services are significantly more substantial than those rated excellent will earn a rating of outstanding.

TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor are the same as those for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

For promotion to professor, the candidate must be judged excellent in both Professional Development and Instruction and at least very good in Service.

Professional Development

In addition to maintaining the skills and level of achievement required of an associate professor, a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor should have produced a book or a comparable body of scholarship since his or her last promotion, and must have established a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization.

An evaluation of poor, fair, good, or very good describes an unacceptable record of Professional Development. None of these evaluations are adequate for promotion to Full Professor.

An evaluation of excellent means that the faculty member has established a solid national
reputation as a leader in the field, has continued to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The books, book chapters, and/or articles of the candidate judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the candidate’s work attest to this reputation.

An evaluation of outstanding means that the candidate has established a national or international reputation in the field beyond the standards of an evaluation as excellent. The outstanding candidate has had success in seeking extramural grant support, particularly from national sources. Grant support is a means to an end, so that publications and other forms of reporting findings are expected to follow.

Professional Development in Creative Writing

An evaluation of poor, fair, good, or very good describes an unacceptable record of Professional Development. None of these ratings is adequate for tenure and promotion to professor.

In addition to maintaining the skills and level of achievement required of an associate professor in Creative Writing, a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor must be judged excellent or outstanding in Professional Development.

An evaluation of excellent means that the candidate has produced a body of work since his or her last promotion that shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. Normally, this entails publication with a respected literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing that receives significant newspaper and journal reviews and/or literary
awards and/or citations.

An evaluation of **outstanding** means that the candidate has published two or more books since his or her last promotion. The outstanding candidate has had success in seeking extramural grant support, particularly from national sources. Grant support is a means to an end, so that publication is expected to follow. The candidate has achieved eminence (as evidenced by national or international awards, reviews in major review venues, invited lectures and so on) in his or her field, not merely begun to achieve a national reputation.

**Instruction**

An evaluation of **poor, fair, good** or **very good** describes an unacceptable record of Instruction. None of these evaluations is adequate for promotion to Professor.

A candidate is evaluated as **excellent** if his or her teaching performance suggests exceptional preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the supervision of theses and/or dissertations. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4 out of 5 range. The candidate evaluated as excellent also will have demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative pedagogy. Such a candidate may demonstrate extensive involvement with individual student work and has a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; advancing in a timely fashion through their degree programs, completing the program, and advancing into a subsequent program or into the profession. Such a candidate advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

A candidate is evaluated as **outstanding** if the criteria for excellent are exceeded. The
candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the high 4 out of 5 range. The candidate may have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, or have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

Service

An evaluation of poor, fair, or good describes an unacceptable record of Service. None of these evaluations is adequate for promotion to Full Professor.

Service will be evaluated as very good when a candidate demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the Department, and either the College or the University levels as well as participating in professional associations. Serving in a substantial departmental administrative role illustrates leadership.

Service will be evaluated as excellent when a candidate significantly surpasses the standards of the very good ranking and in addition has performed well in leadership roles at the College or University level.

Service will be evaluated as outstanding when a candidate meets all the standards of the excellent ranking and in addition demonstrates a sustained and forceful commitment to some particular aspect of service that results in innovation and growth that significantly benefits the University or larger community.

TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor.
PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The departmental process begins in March. The dates for the evaluation process shall be consistent with the calendar given in the College Manual. The schedule for the process in the Department of English is as follows:

1. The Chair will write a letter on or before March 1 to all faculty who are eligible for consideration for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure asking if they wish to be reviewed by the departmental review committee. Associate professors should consult with the Chair and senior colleagues to assist in determining when it is appropriate for them to apply for promotion to professor, and should be mindful of relevant deadlines specified in the calendar of the College Manual. The Chair must receive written expressions of a candidate’s intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure no later than the time given in the College Manual.

2. By the time prescribed in the Manual, the candidate’s professional development materials shall be submitted to the Chair for forwarding to outside reviewers, along with a list of six possible outside reviewers. According to the process specified in the College Manual, the letters of evaluation written by these reviewers shall be provided to the departmental evaluation committee.

3. Each candidate is responsible for assembling a dossier consistent with the instructions given in the College Manual and submitting it to the Department Chair by the time prescribed in the Manual. The candidate should note the required format for the curriculum vitae that is given in the College Manual.
4. The Chair shall place on file the dossiers and letters of evaluation of the outside reviewers of each prospective candidate for perusal by appropriate tenured Associate and Full Professors. Only Professors shall review the materials of candidates for the rank of professor. These materials are strictly confidential, and no faculty member should discuss their contents with the candidate.

5. The departmental review committee shall consist of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors whose primary appointment is in the English Department. This committee shall review each candidate for promotion and tenure in the Department of English and shall evaluate the record of each candidate using criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the guidelines on promotion and tenure for the Department of English and in the manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. A subcommittee shall prepare a factual summary review of each candidate and make a recommendation regarding the candidate. This report will be used by the members of the full Committee as the basis for their own recommendations on the candidate. This Subcommittee shall consist of four members besides its chair: two tenured professors and two tenured associate professors, to be elected by the Committee at large. The Subcommittee’s chair, holding the rank of professor, shall be appointed annually by the Department Chair, upon consultation with the Executive Committee. This Subcommittee shall evaluate the candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor; only Subcommittee members at the rank of professor shall evaluate candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. Robert’s Rules of Order, revised, shall be followed throughout the deliberations of the Subcommittee, except that all such deliberations are in executive session and are to remain confidential within the Subcommittee.
6. After due deliberations within the Subcommittee on all the information in the official record of each candidate, Subcommittee members shall prepare a summary report on the candidate’s areas of professional development, instruction, and service and make a recommendation regarding the candidate. The subcommittee report shall provide a detailed summary and analysis of the reviewers’ estimations of the candidate’s professional contributions, and an assessment of the quality and standing in the profession of the journals, presses and the like in which the candidate’s work has appeared. Additional facts may be added on the basis of the independent perusal of the dossier by members of the Committee. The Subcommittee shall then vote on an evaluation in each of the three categories, with the overall positive or negative recommendation following from these evaluations. All members of the Subcommittee normally must be present for any vote that involves evaluation of candidates. The Subcommittee shall submit its report and majority recommendation and any minority recommendation to the departmental review committee.

7. All of the tenured faculty normally shall meet in person to discuss the candidates for promotion to Associate Professor. They shall together revise the Subcommittee report and vote on the revised evaluations. All of the full Professors normally shall follow the same process for candidates for promotion to full Professor. In regard to a candidate for the rank of Associate Professor, all tenured Associate and full Professors normally shall sign the recommendation of the departmental review committee, or an individual dissenting report, or a joint minority report in conjunction with faculty members.

All final recommendations must be made by the departmental review committee as a whole. The departmental review committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its
final recommendation. E-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). Each member of the departmental review committee normally either shall sign the committee’s majority recommendation or shall submit or sign a minority recommendation when the committee submits the majority recommendation. The signatures must appear on separate and detachable pages so that they can be removed when a candidate is given copies of the majority and minority reports.

In addition to participating in the promotion and tenure evaluation process, the departmental review committee also conducts yearly renewal of contract reviews and third year promotion and tenure reviews of all untenured faculty members (see informational appendix).

8. At the end of all deliberations in the Department, the Chair of the Department shall inform each candidate according to the College Manual.
THIRD YEAR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

Introduction

The Department of English reviews all faculty during their third year of employment. The purpose of this review, which assesses the faculty member’s effectiveness in Professional Development, Instruction, and Service, is to ensure that junior faculty have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

While the faculty member under review should be familiar with the Department’s promotion and tenure guidelines, and use the guidelines as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. While extremely important, the third-year review is more informal: it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member’s achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, he or she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure.
PROCESS

1. By January 1 the Chair will ask third-year faculty in writing to prepare and submit, by the sixth week of Spring semester, a dossier for third-year promotion and tenure review.

2. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas of Professional Development, Instruction, and Service, including such materials as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications/creative achievements, and evidence of teaching effectiveness as described in the “Criteria for Promotion and Tenure, Instruction,” above.

3. After due deliberations, Departmental Advisory Committee members shall prepare an objective summary report on the dossier and shall vote on a positive or negative recommendation.

4. The Chair shall hold a conference to inform the faculty member how well he or she is progressing toward a positive promotion and tenure decision. The Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of his or her report.

5. The Chair shall forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.
POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

The University Policy on Promotion, Tenure, and Development for Tenure Track Faculty mandates a cumulative review of tenured faculty members after every five years, except in certain specific circumstances. In general, preparation of the dossier and evaluation criteria is similar to those for the promotion and tenure process. Faculty should refer to the Post-Tenure Review Policy statement of the College of Arts and Sciences, accessible through the College web site, for specific guidelines and information about procedures and evaluative categories.

The Post-Tenure Review is designed to enhance the opportunities for development of tenured faculty members. The University policy underlines the opportunity that the assessment represents to assess faculty development goals and achievements and to render assistance to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth.

Faculty who will undergo a Post-Tenure Review will be notified in the early spring that they will be reviewed in the next academic cycle and informed of deadlines and policies for preparation of materials.