

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost

TO: Academic Deans and Department Chairs

FROM: Dr. Madeline Wake, Provost

DATE: July 24, 2006

SUBJECT: Guidelines for the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process (2006-2007)

Dear Colleagues:

Questions involving promotion and tenure are critical to the future of this University. Tenure in particular represents an investment by the University in its faculty and constitutes a property right once conferred upon a faculty member. For these reasons, it is imperative that promotion and tenure be marked by close attention to substance and process. Each year at this time, guidelines for the promotion and tenure process are distributed to academic deans and department chairs for use in preparing the dossiers for faculty candidates. *There are some changes this year as recommended by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.* **All deans or department chairs must provide a copy of these materials to persons on the promotion and tenure review committee(s) and to each candidate who will be considered for promotion and/or tenure in 2006-2007.**

The packet of guidelines includes the following:

1. Notes on Criteria for Promotion & Tenure
2. Sequence of Review for Promotion
3. Local Promotion & Tenure Committees
4. University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure
5. Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines
 - A. Regular Faculty
 - B. Participating Faculty
 - C. Emeritus Faculty
6. Preparation of the Dossier for Regular Faculty
7. Preparation of the Dossier for Participating Faculty
8. Preparation of the Dossier for Emeritus Faculty
9. Format for Presentation of Materials for December Regular Faculty Review
10. Checklist for Dossiers of Regular, Participating and Emeritus Faculty

1. NOTES ON 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 memorandum does not supercede 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 supercede college or department norms. College and department specific norms 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.

2. 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.
- Faculty may be nominated or may self-nominate for review for promotion and/or tenure.
- The department (except in colleges without departments) 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 these steps is advisory, except the last.

3. LOCAL PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEES

The local committee review 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 senior faculty vote. 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 appended to the promotion and tenure file." The Dean or Department Chair is required to inform the

- candidate whether there was a positive or negative vote and provide some 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.

4. 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.

The following is an explanation of how the University Committee functions when it gathers to consider regular faculty candidates in December. 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. The candidates are grouped by college and considered alphabetically by department. Each candidate is given individual consideration. Both the Dean and Department Chair are present to discuss each candidate, present the candidate's file, and field questions from members of the University Committee. The Dean will 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 held until the entire meeting is concluded. No vote is announced during the meeting. 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.

5. PROMOTION AND TENURE CALENDAR DEADLINES 2006 - 2007:

A. REGULAR FACULTY

- May 15:** Deans should forward the names of college or area promotion and tenure committee chairs to the Provost.
- October 2:** Present to college or school promotion and tenure committees the dossier of any regular faculty to be considered for promotion to associate or full professor, and/or tenure.
- October 6:** Forward a list of candidates to be considered for promotion to associate or full professor and/or tenure to the Provost. Submit all published works of candidate to reserve desk of Raynor Memorial Libraries.
- November 3:** Forward an **original and thirteen (13)** copies of the complete dossier for each regular faculty candidate to the Provost.
- November 10:** Members of the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure may pick up the dossiers of the regular faculty from the Provost's Office. All sets should be retrieved no later than Monday, November 20.
- December 1 & 2: UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PROMOTIONS AND TENURE MEETS TO REVIEW REGULAR FACULTY CASES**

B. PARTICIPATING FACULTY

- November 3:** Forward a list of participating faculty candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the Provost.
- December 1:** Forward dossiers with recommendations for promotion to all ranks of **Participating Faculty** (includes Adjunct, Clinical and Research categories, but excludes Emeritus) to the Provost. Submit two (2) copies of each dossier. *Participating faculty will not be reviewed by the Provost and President in 2006-07 unless complete dossiers are submitted by this date. Review Item 10 for required materials.*

C. EMERTIUS CASES:

- February 2:** Forward a list of emeritus faculty candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the Provost.
- February 24:** Present to college/school promotion and tenure committees the dossier of anyone to be considered for Emeritus rank.
- February 27:** Forward an original and thirteen (13) copies of the complete dossier of each candidate under consideration for Emeritus status to the Provost.
- March 30: THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PROMOTIONS AND TENURE MEETS TO CONSIDER EMERITUS CASES.**

6. PREPATION OF THE DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY

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.

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 Item 10 (Dossier Checklist) is urged before submission.

A. Teaching

The file should include a full evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including minimally **the candidates' statement on teaching, the Instructional Assessment System (IAS) and the Student Commentary on Teaching (SCOT) (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 full professor, include the IAS/SCOT 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 scores for the entire probationary period. Include an explanation if the IAS/SCOT was not administered in a required semester.

A table should summarize SCOT/IAS scores as follows:

Semester/Year	Course Number	Number of Students	Average Grade	SCOT/IAS Rating	Dept. Average SCOT/IAS	College Average SCOT/IAS
---------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------	--------------------------

In the case of promotion to full 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, enrollment and **average grade**. Any reduction in teaching load should be explained.

For all candidates, essays, 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 as follows.

	Masters Thesis Committees		Doctoral Dissertation Committees	
Year	Chair	Member	Chair	Member

If a candidate has not taught at the graduate level in programs that regularly offer graduate courses, the lack of graduate teaching should be explained in the dossier.

Remember that teaching should be **comprehensively and qualitatively** evaluated *beyond a simple IAS/SCOT score analysis*. Peer review is **required**. Comprehensive written peer reviews of teaching are 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.

B. 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 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, 2006. **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 or other measures may 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 order to provide evidence of the candidate's **contribution to co-authored works**, letters from co-authors are required in cases in which the majority of scholarship is co-authored publications. Verbal statements of the candidate are insufficient. 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 October 6, 2006**. The files will be used by members of the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure in evaluating the candidates.

C. 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 full 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.

D. Other Considerations

- 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. 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 or Committee Letters
Please describe committee membership, e.g., all tenured faculty, etc. (Not required for Colleges which do not have departments.)
- 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.

E. 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.

7. PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER FOR PARTICIPATING FACULTY

Review for promotion of participating faculty requires preparation of a dossier providing evidence that the individual has met criteria. Normally, full time participating faculty will not be considered for promotion to associate rank until after their fifth year of employment at Marquette. Part-time participating faculty will not be considered for promotion to associate until after their 10th year of employment at Marquette. Generally, the following is required: recommendations, a curriculum vitae, teaching and service evidence, and letters of support from full-time faculty and others who can attest to the quality of the candidate's work. University criteria supercede college or department criteria. College or department criteria should be included in the dossier. A check of the dossier against Item 10 (Dossier Checklist) is urged before submission.

- Possession of an earned doctorate or terminal degree is judged the same as it is for regular faculty in a given discipline.

- Teaching is to be judged the same as it is for regular faculty, with an explanation of standards used for other than classroom teaching, such as clinical teaching. Student evaluations and **reports of formal** peer reviews are required.
- Service is to be judged the same as it is for regular faculty, but with attention to roles and committees for participating faculty.
- Evidence of other contributions to the profession or discipline should be described, including publications, leadership in national or international organizations, and prestigious awards.
- The recommendation of the dean **and** the college/area committee **and** the department chair are required for the dossier to go forward to the Provost.
- The Provost will review the dossier and make a recommendation to the President. The University Committee does not review participating faculty.

8. PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER FOR EMERITUS FACULTY

Recommendations of regular senior faculty for appointment to Emeritus rank should proceed in the same fashion as those for senior rank and/or tenure (See Item 10, checklist). Although dossiers need not be as comprehensive as those supporting faculty who seek tenure or promotion in the regular ranks, evidence of high quality work must be provided (as noted in the Faculty Statutes/Handbook). Subject to exception, only full professors will be granted emeritus rank.

- Evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of distinctive scholarship
- Evidence of distinguished service to the University, profession/disciple and/or community.

9. FORMAT FOR PRESENTATION OF MATERIALS FOR DECEMBER REGULAR FACULTY REVIEW

To be delivered to the Provost by November 3, 2006: fourteen (14) packets (dossier) for each candidate. Of the 14 packets, 13 packets may be copies, but 1 packet must contain original letters and original signatures on the "Proposal for Faculty Promotion/Tenure" form. (*Please note: If the "Proposal for Faculty Promotion/Tenure" form is reproduced for the other 13 packets, it should be reproduced on yellow paper.*) 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. Dossiers should be properly bound with a 2 ¾" ACCO fastener at the top. They should be printed in readable fashion, carefully edited, indexed and fully paginated. Dossiers intended for use by the University Committee 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.

10. ORDER AND CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO BE INCLUDED IN DOSSIER:

DOSSIER CHECKLIST			
Key: R=Required O=Optional N=Not Requested	Case Type		
Item	Regular	Participating	Emeritus
Proposal Form	R	N	N
Cover Sheet	N	R	R
Local (Area/College) Committee Recommendation	R	R	R
Dean's Summary with Recommendation	R	R	R
Table of Contents and Persons who Prepared Dossier	R	O	O
Department or College Norms, if specified	R	R	R
Candidate Curriculum Vitae (current work first)	R	R	R
Department Chair's Summary	R	R	R
Third Year and Annual Reviews	R	O	O
Teaching Evaluation	R	R	R
Candidate Statement on Teaching	R	R	O
Scholarship Evaluation	R	O	R
Candidate's Program of Research	R	O	O
Service Evaluation	R	R	O
Faculty Letters	R	R	R
Student Letters	R	O	N
Letters of External Reviewers	R	O	N

cc: Rev. Robert Wild, S.J.
 University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure Members