

English Department Procedures & Criteria for Promotion of Participating Faculty

I. OVERVIEW.

The Department of English at Marquette University formally cultivates professional development of its participating faculty by a variety of means. This document describes those means as well as the procedures and criteria through which recommendations for promotion take place. Ultimately, as with the regular faculty, such recommendations rest on the *quality* as well as the *quantity* of an individual's accomplishments in publication, teaching, and service; however, unlike with regular faculty, these areas are considered in promotion to Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor as delineated by the specific terms of each individual participating faculty member's appointment. For most participating faculty in English, the primary consideration for promotion is evidence of teaching excellence, with research and service only coming into consideration for participating faculty members to the extent that their appointment includes those categories.

II. TEACHING ASSISTANT PROFESSORS.

A. Procedures for Annual and Triennial Review of Teaching Assistant Professors: English Department.

- (1) **Peer Review of Teaching.** Every academic year all Teaching Assistant Professors participate in the Department's peer review of teaching, by which regular and participating faculty at the Associate and Professor ranks are assigned to (a) visit the classes of Teaching Assistant Professors; (b) invite Teaching Assistant Professors to visit their classes; (c) discuss teaching strategies; (d) write evaluative letters for Annual Review Files with copies for Teaching Assistant Professors.
- (2) **Preparation of File for Annual/Triennial Review Meetings.** Teaching Assistant Professors will be reviewed in their first year of appointment and then at least once every three years thereafter.¹ Annual Review Files are to be made available to the Chair each year by April 1. The following steps should be taken to update the files:
 - (a) **Departmental office** should provide: (i) teaching data (courses taught, enrollments, etc.); (ii) scores from students' evaluations of teaching; (iii) peer review of teaching letters from current and previous years; (iv) annual review letters from all previous years.
 - (b) **Teaching Assistant Professor** should provide: (i) confirmation that the above information is correct; (ii) a 1-p. cover memo, framing the year's activities in the appointment-relevant categories of scholarship, teaching, and service for the audience of regular and participating English faculty at the Associate rank or above; (iii) updated curriculum vitae, with the academic review year's activities highlighted.
- (3) **Annual/ Triennial Review Letter.** For each Teaching Assistant Professor being reviewed that year, the Chair drafts a letter, summarizing each Teaching Assistant Professor's professional development during that year or years. The letters (a) commend Teaching Assistant Professors for their accomplishments and (b) make recommendations for successful promotion. Annual Review Letters are put in Annual Review Files with copies distributed to each Teaching Assistant Professor and the Dean of A&S. These letters become part of a promotion dossier.
- (4) **Annual Review Conference with Chair.** After conducting the Annual or Triennial Review Meeting and drafting the Review Letters, the Department Chair meets individually with each Teaching Assistant Professor to (a) provide an in-person summary of the chair's commendations and recommendations; (b) discuss the Annual Review Letter, (c) discuss a professional development plan for the up-coming year, and (d) clarify any additional issues relating to promotion.

B. Procedures for Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor: Department, College, University Reviews.

The Faculty Handbook describes the criterion for promotion to Associate Professor as follows:

- a. All pertinent qualifications indicated for Assistant Professors.
- b. Normally, seven years of teaching or other professional experience.

¹ See <https://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/FormalAppraisalProcessforFullTimeParticipatingFaculty.pdf>.

- c. Ongoing demonstration of competence across assigned duties as articulated in department or local criteria.
- d. Professional recognition as demonstrated by such achievements as board certification (if appropriate), election to a learned society in the relevant professional field, scholarly publications of quality, and/or other appropriate criteria.

In addition, the college guidelines indicate that four years at the Teaching Assistant Rank at Marquette are required for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor. These conditions must all be met before a promotion can be considered.

C. Participating faculty are not time-bound. They may request to initiate the promotion process when they have fulfilled the requirements for promotion as delineated by the Department, College, and Provost's office. Promotion dossier preparation begins in the spring following this request; the dossier proceeds from department to college to university reviews, as described below and in University Promotion Instructions:²

(1) **Compiling the Promotion Dossier.** In spring and summer before the English Department's fall promotion vote, the promotion dossier is compiled according to the process described in the University Promotion Instructions and the English Department's Promotion Checklist.³

(a) **Student reviews of teaching.** According to University Promotion Instructions, the Chair should obtain 10-15 letters from undergraduate students and, when representative of the candidate's teaching career, 5-10 letters from graduate students. To generate these letters, the Chair randomly selects names of students from a candidate's classlists. Students in current classes are not invited until semester grades are submitted.

(2) **Department Promotion Evaluation.** In mid-to-late September, regular and participating English faculty at the Associate rank or above meet to discuss a candidate's promotion dossier and to vote on promotion by confidential ballot.

(a) **Purpose.** At this meeting, these faculty review a candidate's promotion dossier to (i) establish reasons and evidence for the promotion vote taken at the meeting after discussion of the candidate; (ii) provide the Chair with information to include in the Chair's Summary for the promotion dossier; (iii) provide faculty information for letters they will write to the Chair recording their votes.

(b) **Process.** At this meeting, these faculty (i) discuss a candidate's appointment-relevant scholarship, teaching, and service in terms of whether each area *meets* or *does not meet* departmental criteria for promotion (II.D.); (ii) vote by secret ballot *yes* or *no* on a candidate's promotion case, the results of which are announced to these faculty at the meeting.

(c) **Follow-up.** After this meeting, (i) the Chair reports the vote to the Teaching Assistant Professor; (ii) the Teaching Assistant Professor may choose whether or not to proceed with the promotion process; (iii) if the candidate chooses to proceed, the Chair completes a candidate's dossier; (iv) each regular and participating English faculty at the Associate rank or above writes a letter to the Chair to record his/her vote as well as the reasons and evidence for that vote in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service; these vote letters are inserted into a candidate's promotion dossier, which is then advanced to the College.

(3) **College Area Promotion Evaluation.** In October, the Humanities Area Promotion Committee meets to (a) review promotion dossiers; (b) question Department Chairs about the dossiers; (c) vote on whether to recommend each candidate for promotion. The Chair of the Humanities Committee writes a letter for each candidate, summarizing reasons for the Committee's vote; this letter is inserted into each candidate's dossier, which is then forwarded to the Dean of A&S.

(4) **Dean Promotion Evaluation.** Also in October, the Dean of A&S (a) reviews each promotion dossier; (b) writes a recommendation letter for each dossier; (c) forwards dossiers to the University Promotion Committee.

(5) **University Promotion Evaluation.** In December, the University Promotion Committee, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School, meets to (a) review promotion dossiers; (b) question Department Chairs

² For University Promotion Instructions, see

https://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/PART-P_and_T_InformationandInstructions_3.13.23.pdf.

³ For the English Department process of dossier preparation for junior faculty, see

http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/PromotionANDPROMOTIONCHECKLISTJrFac_001.pdf

and Deans about dossiers; (c) vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion. The Dean of the Graduate School writes a committee report summarizing each vote; these committee reports and dossiers are then forwarded to the Provost.

- (6) **Provost & President's Promotion Evaluation.** The Provost reviews the reports and dossiers and consults with the University President, who makes all final promotion decisions. All votes and recommendation prior to the President's decision are advisory. The decision is typically announced by March 1.

D. Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor in the English Department.

University criteria for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor are generally stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (302.05) and take specific form in the English Department according to the discipline of English studies. English Department criteria for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor include: (1) sustained effectiveness in teaching; (2) initiative or sustained responsibility in service, as appointment-relevant; (3) sustained productivity in scholarship, where appointment-relevant.

- (1) **Teaching.** A candidate meets the criterion of *sustained effectiveness in teaching* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) **Contributions to undergraduate and, as appropriate to a candidate's field, graduate curricula** – typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) teaching data showing coverage of courses needed to staff classes for the Marquette Core Curriculum, English majors/minors, and English MA and PhD programs when relevant; (ii) Annual Review Letters attesting to a candidate's productive participation in consultative activities, such as serving as a mentor for independent studies, internships, and student groups; (iii) faculty promotion vote letters, also attesting to a candidate's curricular contributions.

- (b) **Quality of Teaching** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment of teaching in (i) Annual and Triennial Review Letters; (ii) peer review of teaching letters; (iii) scores from students' teaching evaluations; (iv) student letters solicited by the Chair.

To interpret scores from students' teaching evaluations, faculty compare a candidate's means to the means of regular English faculty, the College, and the University; good teaching is indicated by scores near the regular English faculty mean, with no pattern of outlying low scores.

- (c) **Reflective self-assessment of pedagogy** – typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical practices; (ii) teaching portfolio, which may include syllabi, assignments, special project descriptions, student work, etc.

- (2) **Service (as appointment-relevant).** A candidate meets the criterion of *initiative or sustained responsibility in service* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) **Contributions to Departmental work (as appointment-relevant)** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual and Triennial Review Letters or (ii) faculty promotion vote letters. When appointment-relevant, promotion to Teaching Associate Professor will include contributions to some combination of the following: (i) major Department committee assignments, i.e., Graduate Studies Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, First-Year English Committee, or Executive Committee (elected); (ii) other Department service assignments, such as major advising or scholarship committees; (iii) volunteer activities on behalf of the Department, such as attending Preview or Open Houses.

- (b) **Contributions to College, University, or Community work (as appointment-relevant)** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual Review Letters or (ii) faculty promotion vote letters. When appointment relevant, promotion to Teaching Associate Professor will include contributions to some combination of the following: (i) College or University committee assignments; (ii) other College or University service assignments; (iii) volunteer activities on behalf of the College, University, or Community.

- (3) **Scholarship (where appointment-relevant).** A candidate meets the criterion of *sustained productivity in scholarship* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) **Ongoing, substantive publications** – typically evidenced by a book published by a University or other well-regarded press in a candidate's field plus 1 or 2 peer-reviewed articles or book

chapters; *or*, if circumstances merit, evidenced by a series of 5 or 6 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, creative works (if the latter is appropriate to a candidate's professional profile), or other publications and scholarly projects that establish a candidate's expertise in a field.

For purposes of promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, *book* is defined as a manuscript under contract and submitted in final revised form to a press for production.

- (b) **Quality of publications** – typically evidenced by generally positive reviews in (i) Annual and Triennial Review Letters; (ii) promotion vote letters from regular and participating English faculty at the rank of Associate and above; (iii) other reviews (optional), such as all readers' reports from a press or all available book reviews.

When evaluating *quality*, reviewers may render expert opinions about: (i) significance of publications to a field; (ii) peer review processes of academic journals and/or presses; (iii) credentials or reputation of journals and/or presses.

- (c) **Continuing research agenda** – typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) statement of research that defines future projects; (ii) c.v. that specifies work in production, under review, and in progress; (iii) other materials (optional), such as book proposals, invitations to publish, or grants.
- (d) **Active professional involvement** – typically evidenced by (i) at least 3 papers presented at conferences important to a candidate's field; (ii) other professional activities (optional), such as organizing/chairing panels, writing grants, serving on editorial boards or as an officer in a professional organization.

III. TEACHING ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS.

A. Procedures for Triennial Review of Teaching Associate Professors: English Department.

- (1) **Peer Review of Teaching.** Each Triennial Review year, Teaching Associate Professors participate in the Department's peer review of teaching, by which regular and participating faculty members at the rank of Professor are assigned to (a) visit the classes of Teaching Associate Professors; (b) invite Teaching Associate Professors to visit their classes; (c) discuss teaching strategies; (d) write evaluative letters for Triennial Review Files with copies for Teaching Associate Professors. In non-Triennial Review years, Teaching Associate Professors are encouraged but not required to have their teaching reviewed by a Full Professor.
- (2) **Preparation of File for Triennial Review Meeting.** In the spring of every third year, Triennial Review Files are to be made available to regular and participating faculty members at the rank of Professor by March 15. The following steps should be taken to update the files:
 - (a) **Departmental office** should provide: (i) teaching data (courses taught, enrollments, etc.); (ii) scores from students' evaluations of teaching; (iii) peer review of teaching letters from current and previous years; (iv) triennial review letters from all previous years.
 - (b) **Teaching Associate Professors** should provide: (i) confirmation that the above information is correct; (ii) a 1-p. cover memo, framing the review period's activities in appointment-relevant scholarship, teaching, and service for the audience of regular and participating English faculty members at the rank of Professor; (iii) updated curriculum vitae, with the review period's activities highlighted; (iv) any other appointment-relevant material.
 - (c) **Full Professors** should review all files before the Triennial Review Meeting.
 - (d) **The Chair** should invite Teaching Associate Professors to consult before the Triennial Review Meeting.
- (3) **Triennial Review Meeting.** In the spring of every third year (typically April), regular and participating faculty members at the rank of Professor hold a confidential meeting chaired by the Chair of the Department⁴ to evaluate the progress of all Teaching Associate Professors individually, not comparatively. Regular and participating Full Professors review each Teaching Associate Professor's file, which includes appointment-relevant information on scholarship, teaching, and service. Review meetings focus on (a) commendations and (b) recommendations, both of which the Chair may discuss in Triennial Review Letters and Triennial Review Conferences.
- (4) **Triennial Review Letter.** After the Triennial Review Meeting, the Chair drafts a letter to each Teaching Associate Professor, summarizing the Full Professors' discussion about the Teaching Associate Professor's professional development during the review period. The letters (a) commend Teaching Associate Professors for accomplishments and (b) make recommendations for successful

⁴ If the Department Chair is a Full Professor, he/she is a voting member of this committee; if not, he/she is a non-voting member.

promotion to Teaching Professor. Drafts of Triennial Review Letters are made available to Full Professors for vetting and to each Teaching Associate Professor for fact checking before the Triennial Conferences. Triennial Review Letters are put in Triennial Review Files with copies distributed to each Associate Professor and the Dean of A&S. These letters become part of the promotion dossier.

- (5) **Triennial Conference with Chair.** After conducting the Triennial Review Meeting and drafting Triennial Review Letters, the Chair invites Teaching Associate Professors to meet individually with the Chair to
- (a) provide an in-person summary of the Full Professor's deliberations
 - (b) discuss the Triennial Review Letter;
 - (c) discuss a professional development plan for the next three years;
 - (d) clarify any issues relating to professional development.

B. Procedures for Promotion to Teaching Professor. The Faculty Handbook describes the criterion for promotion to Teaching Professor as follows:

- a. All pertinent qualifications indicated for Teaching Associate Professors.
- b. Normally, ten years of distinguished teaching or other appropriate professional experience.
- c. Ongoing demonstration of competence across assigned duties as articulated in department or local criteria.

In addition, the college guidelines indicate:

- a. A minimum of ten years of teaching or other professional experience and employment at Marquette University for at least four years in rank as Teaching Associate Professor.
- b. Evidence of sustained excellence and continued growth, innovation, and leadership in teaching, scholarship, or clinical instruction and practice, as measured by the criteria described above.
- c. A demonstration of significant service and leadership in the Department, the College or University, and/or the candidate's discipline, as measured by the criteria described above.

These conditions must be met before a promotion to Teaching Professor can be considered.

C. Procedures for Promotion to Teaching Professor: Department, College, University Reviews.

Promotion to Teaching Professor is not time-bound in that there is no clock limiting an individual's time as an Associate Professor. Teaching Associate Professors may request to initiate the promotion process when they have fulfilled the requirements for promotion as delineated by the Department, College, and Provost's office. Promotion dossier preparation begins in the spring following this request; the dossier proceeds from department to college to university reviews, as described below and in University Promotion Instructions.⁵

- (1) **Compiling the Promotion Dossier.** In the spring and summer before the English Department's fall promotion vote, the promotion dossier is compiled according to the process described in the University Promotion Instructions⁶ and the English Department's Promotion Checklist.⁷
- (a) **Student reviews of teaching.** According to University Promotion Instructions, the Chair should obtain 10-15 letters from undergraduate students and, when representative of the candidate's teaching career, 5-10 letters from graduate students. To generate the letters, the Chair randomly selects names of students from a candidate's classlists since promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.
- (2) **Department Evaluation.** In mid-to-late September, the regular and participating English faculty at the Associate rank or above meet to discuss a candidate's promotion dossier and to vote on promotion by confidential ballot.
- (a) **Purpose.** At this meeting, these faculty review a candidate's promotion dossier to (i) establish reasons and evidence for the promotion vote taken at this meeting after discussion of the

⁵ For University Promotion Instructions, see

https://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/PART-P_and_T_InformationandInstructions_3.13.23.pdf.

⁶ For University Promotion Instructions, see

https://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/PART-P_and_T_InformationandInstructions_3.13.23.pdf.

⁷ For Department process of dossier preparation, see

https://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/PART-P_and_T_InformationandInstructions_3.13.23.pdf.

candidate; (ii) provide the Chair with information to include in the Chair's Summary for the promotion dossier; (iii) provide these faculty information for the letters they will write to the Chair to record their votes.

- (b) **Process.** At this meeting, these faculty (i) discuss a candidate's appointment-relevant scholarship, teaching, and service in terms of whether each area *meets* or *does not meet* departmental criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor (III.D.); (ii) vote by secret ballot *yes* or *no* on a candidate's promotion case, the results of which are announced to the faculty at the meeting.
- (c) **Follow-up.** After this meeting, (i) the Chair reports the vote to the Teaching Associate Professor; (ii) the Teaching Associate Professor may choose whether or not to proceed with the promotion process; (iii) if a candidate chooses to proceed, the Chair completes a candidate's dossier; (iv) each regular and participating English faculty at the Professor rank or above writes a letter to the Chair to record their vote as well as the reasons and evidence for the vote in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service; these vote letters are inserted into a candidate's promotion dossier, which is then advanced to the College.
- (3) **College Area Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor (II.C.3).
- (4) **Dean Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor (II.C.4).
- (5) **University Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor (II.C.5).
- (6) **Provost & President's Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor (II.C.6).

D. Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor in the English Department.

University criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor are generally stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (302.05). English Department criteria for promotion to Full Professor include (1) distinguished scholarship, (2) distinguished teaching, and (3) distinguished service, as appointment-relevant.

(1) Teaching. A candidate meets the criterion of *distinguished teaching* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) **Contributions to undergraduate and, as appropriate to a candidate's field, graduate curricula** — typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) teaching data showing coverage of courses needed to staff classes for the Marquette Core Curriculum, English majors/minors, and English MA and PhD programs when applicable; (ii) Triennial Review Letters attesting to productive participation in undergraduate and graduate consultative activities, such as serving as a mentor for independent studies, internships, and student groups; (iii) faculty promotion vote letters, also attesting to a candidate's curricular contributions.
- (b) **Quality of Teaching** — typically evidenced by generally positive assessment of teaching in (i) Triennial Review Letters; (ii) peer review of teaching letters; (iii) scores from students' evaluations of teaching; (iv) student letters solicited by the Chair; (v) public recognition of teaching via awards, committee appointments, etc.
To interpret scores from students' teaching evaluations, Professors compare a candidate's means to the means of regular English faculty, the College, and the University; good teaching is indicated by scores near the regular English faculty mean, with no pattern of outlying low scores.
- (c) **Reflective self-assessment of pedagogy** — typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical practices and (ii) teaching portfolio, which may include syllabi, assignments, special project descriptions, student work, etc.

(2) Service (as appointment-relevant). A candidate meets the criterion of *distinguished service* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) **Serious contributions to Departmental work (as appointment-relevant)** — typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual and Triennial Review Letters or (ii) faculty promotion vote letters. When appointment-relevant, promotion to Teaching Associate Professor will include contributions to some combination of the following: (i) major Department committee assignments, i.e., Graduate Studies Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, First-Year English Committee, or Executive Committee (elected); (ii) other Department service assignments, such as major advising or scholarship committees; (iii) volunteer activities on behalf of the Department, such as attending Preview or Open Houses.
- (b) **Serious contributions to College, University, or Community work (as appointment-relevant)** — typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual Review Letters or (ii) faculty

promotion vote letters. When appointment relevant, Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor will include contributions to some combination of the following: (i) College or University committee assignments; (ii) other College or University service assignments; (iii) volunteer activities on behalf of the College, University, or Community.

(3) Scholarship (where appointment-relevant). A candidate meets the criterion of *distinguished scholarship* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (c) **Ongoing, substantive publications**—evidenced by publications beyond those considered for Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, typically including a book published by a University or other well-regarded press in a candidate's field plus 2 or 3 articles; *or*, if circumstances merit, including a series of 7 or 8 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, creative works (if the latter fits the faculty's professional profile), or other publications and scholarly activities that establish a candidate's expertise in a field. Also considered as secondary evidence are conference presentations.

Because promotion to Teaching Professor is not time-bound, *book* is defined here as a manuscript in print.

- (d) **Quality of publications in respected forums**—typically evidenced by generally positive reviews in (i) Triennial Review Letters; (ii) Promotion vote letters from regular and participating English faculty at the Professor rank; (iii) published reviews of a book (optional).

When evaluating *quality*, internal reviewers may render expert opinions about (i) significance of publications to a field; (ii) peer review processes of academic journals and/or presses; (iii) credentials of journals and/or presses.

- (e) **Continuing research agenda**—typically evidenced by a candidate's (i) statement of research that defines future projects; (ii) c.v. that specifies work in production, under review, and in progress; (iii) other materials (optional), such as book proposals, invitations to publish, or grants.
- (f) **Professional Visibility in terms of a candidate's having an established national or international reputation among scholars**—typically evidenced by (i) requests for promotion reviews, external departmental reviews, or vetting of manuscripts; (ii) grants or fellowships received for scholarly or creative activity; (iii) visiting professorships; (iv) invitations to give keynotes, lectures, or workshops at conferences important to a candidate's field, at universities, or at other academic-related institutions; (v) professional service on editorial boards, as an officer of professional organization, etc.

IV. Emeritus/a Teaching Professor.

A. Nomination Process.

- (1) **Nomination by a Faculty Member.** In the fall semester of a candidate's final academic year, a faculty member may nominate the retiring candidate for the rank of Emeritus/a.
- (2) **Self-Nomination.** In the fall of a candidate's final academic year, he/she may inform the Chair that she/he would like to be considered for the rank of Emeritus/a.

B. Procedures for Department, College, & University Reviews: Designation of Emeritus/a Status.

(1) Department Evaluation.

- (a) **C.V. Review.** In January of his/her final academic year, a nominated faculty member submits a current c.v., which will be made available to regular faculty at and above a candidate's rank.
- (b) **Vote.** After individually reviewing a candidate's c.v., regular and participating faculty at and above a candidate's rank write letters to the chair, recording their votes and reasons in terms of criteria listed below (IV.C.)
- (c) **Compiling Emeritus/a Dossier.** Because an Emeritus/a Dossier is not as extensive as a regular promotion dossier, the Department Chair collects only the following material:

From candidate:

- i. Current c.v.
- ii. Teaching Statement (1 p.).

From English office:

- i. Teaching Data

From faculty

i. Vote letters, addressed to the chair and recording vote and reasons for the vote in terms of scholarship, teaching, service, and mission (IV.C.1-4).

- (2) **College Area Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.3); spring timeline.
- (3) **Dean Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.4); spring timeline.
- (4) **University Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.5); spring timeline.
- (5) **Provost & President's Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.6); spring timeline.

C. Criteria for Emeritus/a Status in the English Department.

University criteria for designating the status of Emeritus/a are defined on the Provost web site: "Although dossiers for emeritus need not be as comprehensive as those supporting faculty who seek promotion in the regular ranks, evidence of sustained high quality performance throughout a career must be provided as noted in the *Faculty Handbook* section 301.03 as revised by Academic Senate on November 21, 2016. Faculty considered for Emeritus are those with 'sustained high quality performance' and have normally attained rank of full professor."⁸ English Department criteria are the same as those listed in the *Faculty Handbook*:

- (1) ***Sustained teaching effectiveness.***
- (2) ***Distinguished service to the University, profession/discipline and/or community.***
- (3) ***A career congruent with the University mission.***

⁸ For Emeritus process and criteria, see

<http://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/PREPARATIONOFTHEDOSSIERFOREMERITUSFACULTY.pdf>