

**Departmental Procedures
for
Tenure and Promotion
of Regular, Tenure-Track Faculty**

OVERVIEW

The Department of English formally cultivates professional development by a variety of means. This document describes those means as well as the procedures through which recommendations on tenure and promotion take place. Ultimately, such recommendations rest on the *quality* as well as the *quantity* of an individual's records in publication, teaching, and service. Ours is a Department where the teacher-scholar model is central and individuals' undergraduate and graduate teaching efforts directly respond to and proceed from their scholarly inquiries.

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

Annual review process

Every year all Assistant Professors participate in the Department's peer review of teaching, by which senior faculty members typically visit their classes, invite them to sit in on their own classes, discuss teaching strategies, and write evaluative reports for the annual review files.

In the spring of every year, senior faculty hold a confidential meeting to discuss the progress of all Assistant Professors. In preparation for these meetings, the Departmental office prepares profiles containing S.C.O.T. or IAS scores, grade distributions, curriculum vitae, annual review letters from all previous years, peer visitation letters from the current and previous years, and any other material that assistant professors deem relevant. Separate files for publications and work in progress are maintained in the Departmental office.

Following this meeting, the Departmental Chair drafts a letter to each Assistant Professor expressing the consensus judgment of the senior faculty on that Assistant Professor's professional development. These letters are made available for vetting by the senior faculty before they are passed on to the Assistant Professors and copied for their files, to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and, when appropriate, to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

After the annual review meeting, the Department Chair also meets individually with every Assistant Professor to provide an in-person summary of the senior faculty's deliberations and to clarify any additional issues relating to professional development.

In accordance with a University policy announced by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in October of 1997, the third-year review of every Assistant Professor is formal and comprehensive.

At the spring meeting, after the completion of any Assistant Professor's annual review, it is open to any member of the senior faculty present to advance a motion to collect the materials necessary for a vote on early tenure, provided that that Assistant Professor is not yet time-bound and does meet the criteria recorded in the Faculty Handbook; this is not a vote on tenure, and faculty members are not bound by this vote when they do cast a vote on tenure. If seconded, the motion is discussed and voted on by secret ballot. The Chair passes on the general character of this vote to the Assistant Professor, who decides whether or not to allow the tenure process to proceed by having the Chair collect the requisite letters from students and external faculty for formal consideration and a vote the

following fall.

Faculty are accorded the right of self-nomination to initiate or advance any stages in the Departmental processes leading to formal consideration for promotion.

The Department observes University regulations regarding the stopping of the seven-year tenure clock.

Criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure

Criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are generally stated in the Faculty Handbook, sections 302.02, 302.03, and 304, and take specific form in the Department according to the discipline of English studies.

Evidence of sustained scholarship takes several forms: on-going, substantive publication in an area or areas of study in language and literature; evidence of a continual, developing commitment to publication, whether in the form of works in press or in progress; active professional involvement as witnessed by activities like conference papers, panel organizations, or grant activity; and solicited, written evaluations of distinguished external scholars in a candidate's field. Publications are evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively, with attention given to an academic journal's or press's manuscript review process, to the credentials of the journal or press, and, when appropriate, to reader reports and published reviews.

Sustained effectiveness in teaching is determined through evaluation of a body of material that might include peer-review letters, student letters, S.C.O.T. or IAS scores, grade distributions, the range of courses taught (whether graduate or undergraduate), teaching portfolios, sample syllabi, and participation in consultative activities like Ph.D. dissertations, graduate exams, independent studies, and internships.

To evaluate an Assistant Professor's initiative and sense of responsibility in achieving service activities, senior faculty consider the range of Departmental service and, when applicable, College or University committee assignments; responsiveness to the Departmental and University missions; and the quality of participation in all these activities.

All votes on tenure and promotion are done by secret ballot and take place early in the fall semester; if an Assistant Professor is time-bound, this vote will be in that Professor's seventh year as a member of the full-time, regular faculty. The Chair will relay the results of the vote to the Assistant Professor. In the case of a vote on an early-tenure decision, the Assistant Professor will decide whether or not to allow the process to continue by advancing the vote to the Humanities Area Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Humanities Area Tenure and Promotion Committee typically meets in October. After it evaluates a tenure file, it votes and makes a recommendation to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, which typically meets in early December. This Committee also evaluates and votes on individual tenure files, and then passes its recommendation to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Executive Vice President, and the University President. The ultimate judgment on a tenure case is made by the President, who typically announces his decision in late February.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Review process

In the spring of every third year, the Full Professors meet to discuss the progress of all Associate Professors. In preparation for these meetings, the Departmental office prepares files containing S.C.O.T. or IAS scores, grade distributions, curriculum vitae, triennial review letters from all previous years, peer visitation letters from the current and previous years, and any other material that associate professors deem relevant. Particularly for Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion, additional files for publications and work in progress are also prepared.

For each Associate Professor, the Chair of the Committee of Full Professors drafts a letter expressing the consensus judgment on that associate professor's professional development. These letters are made available for vetting by the other Full Professors before they are passed on to the Associate Professors and copied for their files.

At the triennial spring meeting, after the completion of any Associate Professor's review, it is open to any member of the Full Professors present to advance a motion to collect the materials necessary for a vote on promotion to Full Professor, provided that that Associate Professor meets the criteria recorded in the Faculty Handbook; this is not a vote on promotion, and faculty members are not bound by this vote when they do cast a vote on promotion. If seconded, the motion is discussed and voted on by secret ballot. If the motion passes with a majority, the Departmental Chair, subject to the approval of the Associate Professor, proceeds to prepare a full dossier for consideration in the fall.

In the years intervening between the formal, triennial reviews, the Full Professors may convene to discuss the status of any particular Associate Professor and to offer the possibility of setting into motion the processes leading to a recommendation for promotion.

Faculty are accorded the right of self-nomination to initiate or advance any stages in the Departmental processes leading to formal consideration for promotion.

Criteria and procedures for promotion

Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor is based on a *holistic assessment* of an Associate Professor's achievements in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Unlike the rank of associate professor, that of Full Professor is not mandated, for there is no clock limiting an individual's time as an Associate Professor.

Criteria for promotion to Full Professor are generally stated in the Faculty Handbook, sections 302.02, 302.03, and 304, and take specific form in the Department according to the discipline of English studies.

Distinguished fulfillment in scholarship is evaluated on the basis of the quantity, quality, breadth, and visibility of an individual's publication record. A Full Professor should publish regularly and in respected forums. The scholarship—e.g., a single-authored book, a series of articles establishing expertise in a particular area, or some combination of these—should be substantial, significant, and represent progress beyond the work considered in promotion to Associate Professor.

Several factors are used to determine whether a potential Full Professor has an established national or international reputation among scholars, including: requests for tenure reviews, external departmental reviews, or the vetting of manuscripts; grants or fellowships for scholarly activity; familiarity of an associate professor's publications in the discipline; visiting professorships; and invitations to give lectures or to chair or speak

on panels.

Distinguished fulfillment in teaching is determined by the same means used to evaluate the teaching of Assistant Professors: consultation of required peer-review letters, student letters, S.C.O.T. or IAS scores, grade distributions, the range of courses taught (whether graduate or undergraduate), enrollment patterns, and evidence of ability to direct substantive research and writing by graduate and undergraduate students in consultative activities, such as Ph.D. dissertations, graduate exams, independent studies, and internships.

Distinguished fulfillment in service includes evidence of a consistent record of generous and serious service in the duties and tasks that allow the department to run smoothly and efficiently—for example, contributions to major committee work and flexibility in the areas of scheduling and course preparation. In a broader sense, the demand for service requires that the candidate give evidence of having been a good colleague. This evidence is reflected in his or her willingness to work cooperatively for the good of the department, the college, and the university.

All votes on promotion are done by secret ballot and take place early in the fall semester. The Chair will relay the vote tally to the Associate Professor, who will decide whether or not to allow the process to continue by advancing the vote to the Humanities Area Tenure and Promotion Committee and the rest of the promotion procedure.

Approved unanimously, November 17, 1999

Clarifications added, March 3, 2008