

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Approved by the Department of English**

April 7, 1999

Revision: September 9, 2009

Amendment: January 13, 2010

**Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences  
Promotion and Tenure Review Board**

December 6, 1999

Revision: December 7, 2009

Amendment: January 25, 2010

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.

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CREATIVE WRITING.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>INSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SERVICE.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TENURE AT RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>TENURE AT RANK OF PROFESSOR.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>THIRD YEAR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY.....</b>	<b>29</b>

## 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.

23           A candidate for tenure at the rank of associate professor or for tenure and promotion to  
24 the rank of associate professor should include all relevant materials from both before and after  
25 the candidate's initial appointment at Georgia State University.

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

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

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

35           The outside reviewers should ordinarily be affiliated with institutions in which the  
36 emphasis on research and scholarship is of a rigor similar to or more demanding than that at  
37 Georgia State University. Some institutions are particularly prominent in relation to specific  
38 fields, and the departmental review committee's report should note this about the reviewer  
39 from such an institution if relevant to the candidate's field. To assist in the fullest possible  
40 appraisal of a candidate's record, the departmental review committee shall consider the letters  
41 of the external reviewers to be an important complement to the internal estimate by the  
42 candidate's departmental colleagues, and the committee report shall provide a detailed  
43 summary and analysis of the reviewers' estimations of the candidate's professional  
44 contributions.

45

46 All steps by all individuals and groups involved in the tenure and promotion process must  
47 be taken by the deadlines specified in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual. The reports of  
48 the departmental review committee, along with any minority reports, and of the chair shall be  
49 sent forward to the College Committee.

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

53  
54

## 55 **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

56

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

62 Within the discipline, a substantial number of articles or book chapters ranks in  
63 significance with a book of original scholarship or a monograph. Thus the minimum requirement  
64 to earn promotion and tenure to Associate Professor is a body of original scholarship, either a  
65 monograph or a significant number of articles or comparable material as judged by peers,  
66 although no guarantee of this. In all cases, reputable publishing entails the independent vetting  
67 of manuscripts. Usually, original scholarship counts more than editing or summarizing the  
68 original scholarship of others. It should be noted, however, that some scholarly editions of  
69 literature contain substantial original scholarship. "Edition" can mean anything from a reprint of

70 an existing text or the re-publication of essays written by others with a new introduction, to an  
71 authoritative edition of previously unpublished primary materials. The greater the amount of  
72 original textual, scholarly, and interpretative work, the more weight the edition carries. In the  
73 absence of substantial original scholarship, it is unlikely that any amount of purely editorial  
74 work, or any number of book reviews or factual entries, would suffice.

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

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

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

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

89 There are many different ways of satisfying the requirement that the candidate produce a  
90 work of original scholarship roughly equivalent to a book. Although each career is unique, there  
91 is agreement upon certain evaluative principles; and the following materials are ranked in  
92 general order of importance:

- 93 • an original single-authored scholarly book, refereed and published by a reputable university or trade  
94 press;
- 95 • the candidate's contribution to an original co-authored scholarly book. The candidate  
96 should state his or her role in the research. The greater the percentage of the work that is  
97 the candidate's own, the better. Candidates who produce co-authored or co-edited work  
98 must specify in their dossier the part of the work for which they are responsible;
- 99 • a single-authored scholarly edition of previously unpublished material, of published  
100 material that has never received scholarly editorial treatment, or an authoritative edition  
101 of previously edited material that provides substantial re-editing or annotating; a textual  
102 edition of comparable magnitude to such work, followed closely by the candidate's  
103 contributions to a co-edited treatment of such work;
- 104 • an essay containing original research appearing either as a chapter published by a  
105 reputable scholarly or trade press or as an article published by a reputable professional  
106 journal;
- 107 • a book-length critical bibliography aimed at a scholarly audience;
- 108 • a single-authored or co-authored book related to one's field and aimed at a general  
109 audience;
- 110 • a single-edited or co-edited book or journal collection of new scholarly essays by others.

111 Materials not involving original work may also be counted as Professional Development:  
112 collections of previously published essays, with significant introduction, headnotes, or  
113 appendices; book-reviews; or entries in encyclopedias or other reference books.

114 None of these materials may include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for  
115 publication. Materials accepted for publication must be accompanied by attesting documentation.

116 In evaluating the candidate's Professional Development, the committee will also consider  
117 professional service demonstrating that the candidate has a national reputation in the field. Such  
118 activities may include participation in the meetings of professional organizations, editorial  
119 activities, and other significant professional services appropriate to the discipline and to the  
120 candidate's area(s) of specialization. Professional activities should be included in Professional  
121 Development rather than in Service if they engage the professional expertise, although university  
122 service engaging one's professional expertise should be included under service. Serving as the  
123 President or Executive Director of a prestigious scholarly organization, for example, is evidence  
124 that the candidate is regarded as an important scholar even if the work of the President or  
125 Director is primarily administrative.

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

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

137 Scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many areas of English studies.  
138 The Modern Language Association "Guidelines for Evaluating Work with Digital Media in the

139 Modern Languages” specifies that vetted work published in a digital medium should be valued as  
140 being equal to print publications, and the candidate should indicate the peer review and  
141 publication guidelines for the digital media. Such technologies that may be employed in  
142 scholarship include multimedia productions and computer software. Such contributions should  
143 be read in the media for which they were intended.

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

156

### 157 **Creative Writing**

158 The candidate’s Professional Development will be judged on the basis of publications,  
159 awards and fellowships for creative writing, editorial work, invited readings/lectures, and other  
160 professional activities. The candidate who has co-authored a publication should state his or her  
161 role in the production. The greater the percentage of the work that is the candidate’s own, the

162 better. Candidates who produce co-authored work must specify in their dossier the part of the  
163 work for which they are responsible. Usually, both a book of original creative writing from a  
164 respected publisher and publications in reputable magazines or journals with national visibility  
165 are minimum requirements to earn tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In the absence  
166 of a book, it is unlikely that any number of journal publications, or any amount of purely  
167 editorial work, or any number of book reviews or critical essays, would suffice. While invited  
168 readings and lectures count as professional activities, they do not rank in significance with  
169 published materials. Textbooks and pedagogical materials are counted under Instruction, not  
170 Professional Development. Textbooks may be defined as materials to be used primarily in the  
171 classroom that sum up information without proposing original research, with students as the  
172 targeted audience.

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

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

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

- 183 • Book publication: the merit of a book publisher is best judged by the authors it publishes  
184 and the awards and fellowships those authors and their books garner. However, the best

185 measures of a book's merit are the newspaper and journal reviews, literary awards, and  
186 citations that the book receives.

187 • Journal publication: publication of creative writing in national magazines and premiere  
188 literary journals with substantial national distribution is more desirable than publication  
189 in respected literary magazines with a more limited national distribution, which is more  
190 desirable than publication in literary "little" magazines with local or very limited  
191 national distribution.

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

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

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

202 • Editorial projects: editorial work such as editing an anthology or literary magazine will  
203 count toward Professional Development but will count less than the publication of  
204 original creative work. The merits of magazine editing will be judged by the caliber of  
205 the writers the magazine has published, publishing awards the magazine has received,  
206 and reviews. The merits of fiction or poetry anthologies will be judged according to the  
207 caliber of the publisher, reviews received, and awards.

208 • Readings and lectures: invited readings and lectures are indicators of a candidate's  
209 visibility and reputation. The significance of such readings and lectures can be judged by  
210 the reputation of the hosting institution.

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

213

214

### INSTRUCTION

215

216 The departmental evaluation committee will consider a variety of written evidence  
217 submitted by the candidate of effectiveness in the classroom. The candidate should adhere  
218 closely to the "Categories for Instruction" as listed in the College Promotion and Tenure Manual.

219 The candidate should include the annual departmental instructional portfolios he or she has  
220 compiled for the previous four years and student evaluations, as required in the College Manual.

221 Letters from students may not be included in the dossier. The candidate may include material

222 illustrating the advisement of M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. theses; the preparation and grading of

223 graduate examinations; documented advising of student; acceptance of former students into

224 doctoral programs, appointment to faculty positions, or recognition in the profession;

225 commentary on student papers; direction of Honors projects, independent studies, and graduate

226 colloquia (e.g. MA pro-seminars and graduate conferences); course materials, handouts, or

227 materials designed for Web-based instruction created by the candidate; nominations of students

228 for awards; and invitations to teach a seminar at other universities.

229

230 A teaching award from a prestigious outlet is particularly strong evidence of teaching

231 effectiveness. Additional evidence may include the creation of new areas of curriculum, the  
232 publication of textbooks, the adoption of such textbooks by other educational institutions;  
233 invitations to lecture about teaching; leading workshops on teaching; and consultations with  
234 publishers or institutions about the development of pedagogical materials.

235

236

237

### **SERVICE**

238

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

251           Professional or community service includes serving in an administrative position in a  
252 professional organization, serving as a consultant to another educational institution or to a  
253 governmental body, professional organization, or other group; making practical arrangements for

254 conferences; assisting colleagues at other institutions; grading SAT examinations or other  
255 national tests; delivering lectures to non-professional audiences, or participating in non-  
256 professional forums. Generally, a community service should be included only if it somehow  
257 places one's professional expertise at the service of the general public. Other kinds of public  
258 service, admirable though they might be, are unlikely to carry much weight. Extensive public  
259 service will not compensate for a deficiency of departmental, College, or University service.

260         The above are only a sample of possible services. A candidate should call attention to  
261 awards he or she received for service activities. Services for which financial remuneration was  
262 received may be included. If a brief description of a service on the candidate's curriculum vitae  
263 does not give a clear indication of the nature and scope of the service, the candidate should  
264 provide a more detailed explanation in the introduction to the appropriate section of the dossier.  
265 A candidate is urged to exercise discretion in supplying documentation of service. Some form of  
266 evidence should be provided to document each service activity, but the amount of evidence  
267 should be kept to the minimum necessary to give a clear sense of the nature and scope of the  
268 activity. Appropriate documentation of a public lecture, for example, might include a letter of  
269 invitation, a copy of the poster announcing the lecture, a letter of appreciation from the official  
270 organizer of the event, or a newspaper account, but should not include every email about the  
271 arrangements. If one served on a commission that produced a hundred-page report, one should  
272 not include the entire report, merely one's letter of appointment to the commission and the brief  
273 introduction or conclusion of the report or the particular section of the report solely authored by  
274 the candidate.

275

276

277 **PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

278

279 Assistant Professors must simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure. Tenure in the  
280 College for Assistant Professors will not be granted without promotion to Associate Professor.  
281 A recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate  
282 be judged at least **excellent** in either Professional Development or Instruction and at least **very**  
283 **good** in the other, and at least **good** in Service.

284

285 **Professional Development**

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

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

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

295 To receive an evaluation of **excellent**, the candidate must have produced a book or a  
296 comparable body of original research and must present some substantial further evidence of an  
297 emerging national reputation. Such further evidence might include, for example, the publication  
298 of articles and book chapters in addition to the book (if the candidate has published a book), or a  
299 number of articles and/or book chapters that are comparable to significantly more than a book (if

300 the candidate has not published a book). Another kind of further evidence that might earn a  
301 rating of excellent would be documentation directly demonstrating one's emerging national  
302 reputation. For a more detailed explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the  
303 section of the guidelines above on "Professional Development."

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

307

### 308 **Professional Development in Creative Writing**

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

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

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

317 An evaluation of **excellent** means that the candidate has produced a body of work that  
318 shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in  
319 the long term as well as the near future. Normally, this entails publication with a respected  
320 literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing and  
321 documentation directly demonstrating one's emerging national reputation. For a more detailed

322 explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the section of the guidelines above on  
323 “Professional Development.”

324

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

328

329

### **Instruction**

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

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

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

341 A candidate is evaluated as **excellent** if his or her teaching performance suggests  
342 exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially  
343 service on committees for or the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers,  
344 theses, and dissertations. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out

345 of 5 range. The candidate should demonstrate an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or  
346 her assigned courses. Such a candidate may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his  
347 or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or  
348 producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation  
349 and creativity in teaching.

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

353

#### 354 **Service**

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

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

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

366 A candidate who performs several services, each of which requires a considerable  
367 expenditure of effort, and who performs these tasks well, will earn a rating of **excellent**.

368 A candidate whose services are significantly more substantial than those rated excellent  
369 will earn a rating of **outstanding**.

370

371 **TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

372

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

375

376 **PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

377

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

380

381 **Professional Development**

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

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

390 An evaluation of **excellent** means that the faculty member has established a solid national

391 reputation as a leader in the field, has continued to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact  
392 on the work of others in the field. The books, book chapters, and/or articles of the candidate  
393 judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals that are held in esteem by the  
394 profession, and reviews of and citations to the candidate's work attest to this reputation.

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

400

#### 401 **Professional Development in Creative Writing**

402

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

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

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

414 awards and/or citations.

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

421

#### 422 **Instruction**

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

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

436 A candidate is evaluated as **outstanding** if the criteria for excellent are exceeded. The

437 candidate's student evaluation scores will often be in the high 4 out of 5 range. The candidate  
438 may have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, or have been otherwise  
439 recognized for superior instruction.

440

441 **Service**

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

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

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

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

455

456 **TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR**

457 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of  
458 Professor.

459

460 **PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

461

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

465

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

473

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

479

480 3. Each candidate is responsible for assembling a dossier consistent with the instructions given  
481 in the College Manual and submitting it to the Department Chair by the time prescribed in the  
482 Manual. The candidate should note the required format for the curriculum vitae that is given in  
483 the College Manual.

484 4. The Chair shall place on file the dossiers and letters of evaluation of the outside reviewers of  
485 each prospective candidate for perusal by appropriate tenured Associate and Full Professors.  
486 Only Professors shall review the materials of candidates for the rank of professor. These  
487 materials are strictly confidential, and no faculty member should discuss their contents with the  
488 candidate.

489  
490 5. The departmental review committee shall consist of all tenured Associate Professors and  
491 Professors whose primary appointment is in the English Department. This committee shall  
492 review each candidate for promotion and tenure in the Department of English and shall  
493 evaluate the record of each candidate using criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the  
494 guidelines on promotion and tenure for the Department of English and in the manual of the  
495 College of Arts and Sciences. A subcommittee shall prepare a factual summary review of each  
496 candidate and make a recommendation regarding the candidate. This report will be used by the  
497 members of the full Committee as the basis for their own recommendations on the candidate.  
498 This Subcommittee shall consist of four members besides its chair: two tenured professors and  
499 two tenured associate professors, to be elected by the Committee at large. The Subcommittee's  
500 chair, holding the rank of professor, shall be appointed annually by the Department Chair, upon  
501 consultation with the Executive Committee. This Subcommittee shall evaluate the candidates  
502 for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor; only Subcommittee members at the  
503 rank of professor shall evaluate candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. *Robert's*  
504 *Rules of Order*, revised, shall be followed throughout the deliberations of the Subcommittee,  
505 except that all such deliberations are in executive session and are to remain confidential within  
506 the Subcommittee.

507 6. After due deliberations within the Subcommittee on all the information in the official record  
508 of each candidate, Subcommittee members shall prepare a summary report on the candidate's  
509 areas of professional development, instruction, and service and make a recommendation  
510 regarding the candidate. The subcommittee report shall provide a detailed summary and  
511 analysis of the reviewers' estimations of the candidate's professional contributions, and an  
512 assessment of the quality and standing in the profession of the journals, presses and the like in  
513 which the candidate's work has appeared. Additional facts may be added on the basis of the  
514 independent perusal of the dossier by members of the Committee. The Subcommittee shall  
515 then vote on an evaluation in each of the three categories, with the overall positive or negative  
516 recommendation following from these evaluations. All members of the Subcommittee  
517 normally must be present for any vote that involves evaluation of candidates. The  
518 Subcommittee shall submit its report and majority recommendation and any minority  
519 recommendation to the departmental review committee.

520

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

528 All final recommendations must be made by the departmental review committee as a  
529 whole. The departmental review committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its

530 final recommendation. E-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with  
531 the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). Each member of the  
532 departmental review committee normally either shall sign the committee's majority  
533 recommendation or shall submit or sign a minority recommendation when the committee submits  
534 the majority recommendation. The signatures must appear on separate and detachable pages so  
535 that they can be removed when a candidate is given copies of the majority and minority reports.

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

539

540 8. At the end of all deliberations in the Department, the Chair of the Department shall inform  
541 each candidate according to the College Manual.

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579

## INFORMATIONAL APPENDIX I

### 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**

580  
581  
  
582  
583  
584  
  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
  
590  
  
591  
592  
593  
  
594  
595  
596  
  
597  
  
598  
599  
  
600  
  
601  
  
602  
  
603

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.

604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619

**INFORMATIONAL APPENDIX II**

**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.