

Instructions for the Promotion and Tenure Process of Regular Faculty

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

University process and criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure are disseminated in the Faculty Handbook (See Chapters 301, 302, 303 and 304). This set of instructions does not supersede nor does it repeat information which is in the handbook, but rather, it is supplemental. Committee members and candidates are urged to review the statutes and apply criteria in a rigorous fashion.

University criteria and norms supersede college or department norms. College and department specific norms provide interpretation of the University criteria. They are formulated by faculty, approved and signed by the dean, submitted to the University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure for approval of fit with University statutes, and submitted to the Provost's Office with evidence of University Committee endorsement for final approval. New faculty must be clearly apprised of these norms by the chair or dean.

Departmental, college, and university promotion and tenure decisions must apply the written norms that are published in the unit and the criteria within the university statutes. Defacto or undocumented standards cannot be applied.

Promotion and tenure decisions should consider recommendations of all previous departmental/local promotion and tenure reviews when determining the final recommendation, and must report on any major discrepancies between previous reviews and the final recommendation.

Ordinarily, voting members of promotion and tenure committees (departmental, local, and university) should hold rank above those candidates being evaluated for promotion and tenure. In situations where this is not practical, an exception can be made with prior approval of the Dean of the College.

The proceedings of promotion and tenure review are to be honored by confidentiality about discussions in the departmental, local and university committees.

SEQUENCE OF PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

While various departments and colleges have additional steps, the following are common for regular faculty.

- All tenure-track faculty receive a comprehensive review at or near the end of the third year. A copy of the third year review evaluation and recommendation is submitted to the Provost Office by the dean.
- Academic units should develop a process whereby associate professors with tenure are given regular feedback regarding their progress toward promotion to professor.
- Faculty may be nominated or may self-nominate for review for promotion and/or tenure.
- The department (except in colleges without departments) has access to the dossier and reviews the candidate.
- The local committee reviews the candidate.

- The dean reviews the candidate.
- The University Committee reviews and recommends to the Provost.
- The Provost reviews and recommends to the President.
- The President reviews and decides whether or not to confer promotion and tenure.

Each of the above steps is advisory, except the last.

LOCAL PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEES

The local committee reviews the dossiers of all candidates and renders the official unit (College, or in the case of the Way Klingler College of Arts & Sciences, the Area) judgment on whether or not the candidate meets criteria for promotion and/or tenure. Local promotion and tenure committees should provide an impartial and thorough analysis of each case. Issues raised by external or internal evaluators, faculty colleagues and students should be fully debated; if possible, resolved by the committee, and addressed in the local committee report. College/area chairs will serve on the University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure, usually for three-year terms. Members of the local committee are required to vote. No abstentions will be tolerated.

- The department vote occurs after all evidence is gathered.
- With departmental or local committee voting, only current faculty vote. Normally associate professors and professors vote on promotion to associate professor and professors on promotion to the rank of professor. Situations that require a different voting group are approved in advance by the dean of the college and are explained in the dossier. Retired and emeritus faculty may write letters, but are not permitted to vote.
- When there is a split vote on the local committee, the nature of the split must be explained within the dossier in the Summary Report. Where the split is significant, it may be necessary to file a "Minority Report."
- As recommended by the Committee on Faculty: "When a local committee votes not to support a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, it must give the candidate a reasonable explanation of its action, i.e., one that is sufficiently specific to enable him or her to make appropriate plans for self-improvement, to decide to withdraw his/her nomination from consideration, or to reply to the Committee's criticism in a special section (Addendum) appended to the promotion and tenure file." The Dean (or Department Chair when delegated by the Dean) is required to communicate this information to the candidate, indicating whether there was a positive or negative vote and providing explanation of the basis for the vote. Within the discretion of the Dean, the actual vote may be provided.
- If the candidate has made prior unsuccessful attempts at promotion and/or tenure, those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies should be noted in the dossier.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PROMOTION & TENURE

The University Committee is chaired by the Vice-Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The chairs of each local committee are members of the University Committee. Members of the University Committee may not be reviewed for promotion during the year of service. (See Faculty Handbook section 7.04 of University Academic Senate statutes for further description of the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.)

The following is an explanation of how the University Committee functions when it gathers to consider regular faculty candidates in December. The candidates are grouped by college and considered by department. Members of the University Committee examine the case for each candidate by studying the candidate's dossier and publications. They come to the December meeting prepared with notes and questions on each case and discuss these issues before meeting with the Dean and Department Chair of the candidate. Each candidate is given individual consideration. Both the Dean and Department Chair are present to field questions from members of the University Committee. The Dean will be present for colleges without departments. The college or area member of the University Committee will offer additional comment. When these discussions conclude, the Dean and Department Chair are excused, and the University Committee considers all information before entering its vote. A vote is taken with respect to the particular candidate before considering any other case.

Voting is done by providing a ballot to each member of the University Committee. That ballot is pre-printed with the candidate's name. All members vote, with the exception of the Committee Chair. The Chairperson appoints a staff person to take notes, to distribute the ballots and to tally those ballots after the meeting. The voting is done in secret; all votes are collected and the vote is announced to the Committee but is kept in confidence among Committee members. Following the meeting, the Committee Chair prepares a synopsis of the main points of discussion and the Committee's vote on each candidate for the Provost. The vote of the University Committee is advisory. Thereafter, the Provost reviews the dossier and makes an independent judgment to recommend or not recommend to the President. The President makes the final decision to promote or not promote and to award tenure or not award tenure. There are occasions when the Provost or President has decided not to accept the vote of the Committee. In such instances the Provost may meet with the University Committee or may issue an explanatory memo to the chair. The Committee will be apprised of the decisions of the President prior to public announcement of those decisions.

PROMOTION AND TENURE CALENDAR DEADLINES:

Annually in July Promotion and Tenure deadlines for regular, participating and emeritus are promulgated by the Office of the Provost. ([Current year dates](#))

PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY

A review of the [Step by Step Instructions for Preparers](#) will assist in preparation of the dossier.

Review for promotion and/or tenure of regular faculty requires preparation of a comprehensive dossier providing evidence that the candidate has met criteria. The burden of proof in matters of tenure and/or promotion lies with the candidate and with those who prepare the dossier. As a matter of longstanding practice, if there are significant concerns, questions, or doubts which are not satisfactorily addressed in the dossier, the University will render a negative decision.

Although materials invited and received for inclusion in the dossier may not be redacted or culled, irrelevant material may be excised if the preparer believes it is not pertinent or was offered in error. Any omissions of this nature should be noted with an accompanying

explanation.

The dossier should note any leaves of absence (or other delays in time-bound year) granted to a particular candidate, and provide a full explanation of the rationale for such leave. The candidate is not expected to produce evidence of progress in teaching, scholarship, or service during the time of an approved leave of absence.

Primarily, each dossier must contain a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's work in teaching, scholarship, and service. The letters of the dean and department chair must address these three areas. The local and university committees evaluate teaching as rigorously as they do scholarship. A check of the dossier against the Dossier Checklist is urged before submission.

Evaluation of Teaching

The file should include a full evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including minimally the candidates' statement on teaching, the Instructional Assessment System (IAS), the Student Commentary on Teaching (SCOT), the Marquette Online Course Evaluation System (MOCES) (or other standard student evaluation instrument), reports of formal peer evaluations, and students letters. Other evidence may include departmental evaluations, classroom observations, teaching, portfolios, and other significant information that is deemed appropriate by the college or department. The candidates' statement on teaching should include values, goals, strengths and weaknesses in teaching. For persons seeking the rank of professor, include the IAS/SCOT/MOCES scores from the eight most recent semesters (or enough scores to establish a pattern). When the candidate seeks promotion to associate professor with tenure, provide IAS/SCOT/MOCES scores for the entire probationary period. Include an explanation if the IAS/SCOT/MOCES was not administered in a required semester.

In the case of promotion to professor, each dossier must provide a teaching load summary for the current semester and for at least eight preceding semesters, if possible. In cases involving promotion to associate professor and/or tenure, provide the entire teaching record. This should include courses taught, credit hours, and enrollment. Any reduction in teaching load should be explained.

For all candidates, if appropriate, theses and dissertations of graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal advisor should be displayed on a table with the names of the students, topics, and dates included. A table should summarize thesis/dissertation participation in numbers.

Remember that teaching should be comprehensively and qualitatively evaluated *beyond a simple IAS/SCOT/MOCES score analysis*. The teaching evaluation instrument is only one piece of information that needs to be considered. Comprehensive written peer reviews of teaching are also required in the promotion dossiers for all candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor. Peer reviews should be done annually on non-tenured regular faculty and periodically on tenured faculty. Peer review affords evaluation by a senior faculty member with recognized proficiency in teaching. It may or may not include classroom visitation. Useful information may be available from student surveys, course materials (syllabi, tests, etc.), and

faculty development projects. While not included in the dossier, teaching materials may be placed with publications in the Raynor Libraries.

Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

The file should contain a comprehensive evaluation of scholarship, including at least the candidate's description of own program of research and plan for future scholarship, a judgment on the candidate's habits of scholarship, as required in the unit's guidelines, by the chair, a listing of publications, grants and other scholarly products, and contributions to professional meetings.

For publications, attention should be paid to quality and significance. The vitae should be current to October 1, of the current year. Do not list work in progress as a publication. Work "in press" may be noted as such in the publication record, but work in progress should be listed separately on the candidate's vitae. Also, please be sure to identify refereed journals and those works that were particularly commissioned.

The vitae should include all the authors in published order and number of pages of a work. Also, the vitae should differentiate pre and post Marquette and pre and post tenure publications. The dossier should also include a statement indicating the nature and reputation of the various journals. Publications (not refereed journals) by presses which require individual or institutional financial subvention as a requirement for publication should be identified as such. Similarly, there are presses that require purchase of a certain number of copies. Describe the system of review for such presses. In short, include any information that will assist the University Committee in understanding the nature of the publications and their selectivity or quality. If there are unusual factors pertinent to the candidate's research and scholarship, they should be noted. The impact of publications by citation count, journal impact score, or other measures should be included.

In addition to reporting on the standards and reputations of journals or presses which have published the candidate's works, comment on the significance of other materials listed as publications. These might include conference papers, conference proceedings, and abstracts. Since these materials are often treated differently from one discipline to the next, it will assist the University Committee if their significance is explained in the dossier. Likewise, although *textbooks* are often discussed under teaching, some may be scholarly as well and should be included within scholarly publications with an appropriate explanation.

Any material which is offered in a foreign language and included in the dossier must be translated into English. Such materials include letters of recommendation and book reviews. However, a candidate's scholarly articles or books need not be available in translation.

In many disciplines co-authorship is well accepted. In cases in which the majority of scholarship consists of co-authored publications, the candidate must provide an analysis of the contribution that he or she has made to each collaborative work. This can be accomplished with a form found in the sample dossier template on the Provost's web page. An exception may be in disciplines in which co-authored articles with students are expected

with every publication. Here a note in the candidate's statement of scholarship and concurrence of the local committee is sufficient.

Grant applications are increasingly co-authored, and collaborative work is often necessary for data collection. Candidates should report the nature of their contributions and/or responsibilities with respect to co-authored grants.

Papers in conference proceedings are assumed to be of less importance than articles in refereed journals. If this is not true in a given case, an explanation should be provided.

Some creative works will fall outside the boundaries of traditional outlets (e.g., scholarly journals and books). In these instances, please provide a thorough and comprehensive review together with supporting evidence. Work is not necessarily creative or original simply because it is non-traditional. When presented as grounds for tenure and/or promotion, creative work must be subject to rigorous peer review by professionals. Furthermore, since this peer review is not standard, the process itself must be clearly explained.

A file of the candidate's entire body of published works should be submitted to the Reserve Desk of Raynor Memorial Libraries *no later than November 3*. The files will be used by members of the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure in evaluating the candidates.

Evaluation of Service

Service includes a variety of activities that may involve students, the University, the candidate's profession, or the larger geographic community. In this regard, student advising is considered important, as is service on departmental, college or university committees.

At the assistant professor level, the service component may consist largely of work for the department. Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to contribute at the University level and to be involved in professional or related service activities. These may include leadership roles in civic or professional associations, reviewing manuscripts and/or grants, organizing and participating in professional meetings at national or international levels, and membership on editorial or professional boards.

Letters in the Dossier

▪ Letters from Faculty

All departmental faculty who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter clearly indicating their support or lack of support for that candidate, consistent with the particular vote. Too often the University Committee is faced with a divided faculty vote that is without explanation or based only on surmise. Consistent with its focus on process, the University Committee feels this is unfair to the candidate.

Furthermore, senior colleagues are expected to provide a thorough assessment of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service and should fully acquaint themselves with

the candidate's curriculum vitae before writing their letters for inclusion in the dossier. *If some senior faculty do not participate in the process, this fact should be explained in the dossier.*

- Letters from Students

Students requested to write letters should be **randomly selected** by the department or college. The sampling of students approached for teaching assessment should be representative of the candidate's teaching career (e.g., graduate and undergraduate) at a particular rank, i.e., not just those students who graduated the prior year. Where applicable, the person who prepares the dossier should strive to secure between ten and fifteen letters from undergraduate students and between five and ten letters from graduate students. Since only 20% of the students typically respond, however, a large mailing is sometimes necessary to secure sufficient letters. Also, those students selected on a random basis should be distinguished from any students who were solicited by the candidate for their comments. A copy of the solicitation letter should be included.

- Letters from Reviewers

External reviewers should be asked to evaluate both the quality and quantity of a candidate's scholarly publications. Though a reviewer may be asked to comment on a specific work, the reviewer should also be asked to consider the candidate's work in the context of a reasonable sampling of other works. If that is not possible, it may be necessary to ask one reviewer to provide a more thorough analysis of the candidate's research. The solicitation letter to reviewers and a brief biography of each reviewer should be included.

Reviewers should usually be above the current rank of the candidate. Where possible, external reviewers should not have personal ties to the candidate. It is not appropriate to solicit letters from the candidate's dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor. If personal or professional ties exist, those should be explained. While the candidate may suggest some reviewers, the committee should also select others. Furthermore, those reviewers selected by the candidate should be **clearly distinguished** from those selected by the person assembling the dossier or the college committee. NOTE: *The University Committee believes that care should be taken to use some economy when selecting external reviewers. Since Marquette University does not offer a stipend to accompany the external reviews, some reviewers are reluctant to undertake such work. This may affect future candidates. Thus, in the usual case, there is no need for more than five (5) external reviewers.*

- Department Chair Letter (not required in units without departments)

The Department Chair letter is written on behalf of the department and should present the departmental vote and the department's evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service. The chair may write an additional separate personal judgment letter when differing from the department's evaluation.

- Local Committee Letters

The chair of the local committee writes a letter on behalf of the committee which notes committee membership, e.g., all tenured faculty and presents the vote of the committee and its evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

- Dean's Summary

The Dean is to review the entire dossier. After the vote and summary of the college or area committee, the dean makes a separate judgment regarding the candidate's meeting of criteria and gives a recommendation. The dean's letter should address any weaknesses which have been identified in faculty letters, letters from external reviewers, or student commentary.

Substitutive Norms

Substitutive norms, while rarely used, may apply to the highest degree or to the requirement of scholarship. Candidates for whom substitutive norms apply for the requirement of scholarship are likely to be faculty with high administrative responsibility, such as deans. *These individuals should have been informed that substitutive norms would apply to them at the time of their appointment. Lengthy service as an administrator is not sufficient to warrant promotion on substitutive norms.* Thus, when applicable, substitutive norms must be invoked specifically from the beginning of the review process and included as such in the dossier. These norms may not be invoked later in the review process.

FORMAT FOR PRESENTATION OF MATERIALS FOR DECEMBER REGULAR FACULTY REVIEW

To be delivered to the Office of the Provost on ([check annual date](#)): 1 original hard copy (containing original letters and signatures on the *Proposal for Faculty Promotion/Tenure* form). dossier for each candidate. An electronic dossier should be completed for each candidate at the same time. Care should be taken as well to economize a candidate's supporting materials. Please keep dossiers under 200 pages.

Presentation of the Dossier:

- A. Responsibility for preparation of the dossier belongs to the Dean, but it may be delegated to the Department Chair, the University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure Chair, or a senior faculty member. A new dossier should be prepared, even in the event the candidate is making a successive attempt at promotion and/or tenure.
- B. Where a candidate is facing a successive attempt, the new dossier should contain relevant material from the previous dossier(s), as well as new material which indicates how teaching, scholarship and service have changed since the prior review.
- C. The original hard copy dossiers for the Provost should be submitted in one inch binders that are three holed punched on the left side of the page. The name of the candidate should be affixed to the binding edge. The document should be printed in readable fashion, carefully edited, indexed, tabbed, and fully paginated. The Provost's copy should remain unmarked by annotations from other readers.

- D. The candidate should not prepare the dossier but may have access to factual material in the dossier to insure that it is complete and factually accurate. The candidate may also wish to add material in a discrete section at the conclusion of the dossier. The candidate may include such information in an “Addendum” and should explain why such information is provided.

- E. Confidential letters or evaluations must remain confidential. Letters inviting external review should indicate that the reviewer’s letter will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by a judicial or adjudicatory body or unless the reviewer specifies the conditions under which its contents may be disclosed to the candidate.

ORDER AND CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO BE INCLUDED IN DOSSIER:

Please see separate checklist document

DOSSIER CHECKLIST	
Key: R=Required O=Optional	Case Type
Item	Regular
01 Proposal Form	R
02 Department Recommendation Including Department Vote (Chair's Summary)	R
03 Local (Area/College) Committee Recommendation	R
04 Dean's Summary with Recommendation	R
05 Department and/or College Norms	R
06 Candidate Curriculum Vitae (current work first)	R
07 Third Year and Annual Reviews	R
08 Teaching Evaluation	R
09 Candidate Teaching Philosophy Statement	R
10 Required Data on Teaching	R
11 Research and Scholarship Evaluation	R
12 Candidate's Research Philosophy Statement and Research Agenda	R
13 Required Data on Research and Scholarship	R
14 Service Evaluation	R
15 Listing of Service Activities	R
16 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching	R
17 Faculty Letters	R
18 Student Letters	R
19 External Reviewers Letters	R
20 Candidate Addendum	O