

## English Department Procedures & Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Regular, Tenure-Track Faculty

### I. OVERVIEW.

The Department of English at Marquette University formally cultivates professional development of its faculty by a variety of means. This document describes those means as well as the procedures and criteria through which recommendations on promotion and tenure (P&T) take place. Ultimately, such recommendations rest on the *quality* as well as the *quantity* of an individual's accomplishments in publication, teaching, and service. Each of these three areas is given significant consideration in promotion to Associate and Full, with primary consideration given to publication and teaching. Ours is a Department where the teacher-scholar model is central, which means that faculty's undergraduate and graduate teaching efforts directly respond to and proceed from their scholarly activities.

### II. ASSISTANT PROFESSORS.

#### A. Procedures for Annual Review of Assistant Professors: English Department.

- (1) **Peer Review of Teaching.** Every academic year all Assistant Professors participate in the Department's peer review of teaching, by which senior faculty are assigned to (a) visit the classes of Assistant Professors; (b) invite Assistant Professors to visit their classes; (c) discuss teaching strategies; (d) write evaluative letters for Annual Review Files with copies for Assistant Professors.
- (2) **Preparation of File for Annual Review Meeting.** Annual Review Files are to be made available to senior faculty 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) **Assistant Professor** should provide: (i) confirmation that the above information is correct; (ii) a 1-p. cover memo, framing the year's activities in scholarship, teaching, and service for the audience of senior English faculty; (iii) updated curriculum vitae, with the academic review year's activities highlighted; (iv) publications and works in production; (v) any other relevant material (e.g., book contracts, readers' reports, letters from editors, or works in progress).
  - (c) **Senior faculty** should review all files before the Annual Review Meeting.
  - (d) **The Chair and Mentors** have particular responsibilities for the Annual Review Meeting.<sup>1</sup>
- (3) **Annual Review Meeting.** In the spring of every academic year (typically May), senior faculty attend a confidential meeting to evaluate the progress of all Assistant Professors individually, not comparatively. Senior faculty discuss each Assistant Professor's Annual Review File in terms of scholarship, teaching, and service. These meetings focus on (a) commendations and (b) recommendations, both of which the Chair may discuss in Annual Review Letters and Annual Review Conferences.
- (4) **Annual Review Letter.** Following the Annual Review Meeting, the Chair drafts a letter to each Assistant Professor, summarizing the senior faculty's discussion of each Assistant Professor's professional development during that year. The letters (a) commend Assistant Professors for their accomplishments and (b) make recommendations for successful promotion and tenure. Drafts of Annual Review Letters are made available to senior faculty for vetting and to each Assistant Professor for fact checking before the Annual Conferences. Annual Review Letters are put in Annual Review Files with copies distributed to each Assistant Professor and the Dean of A&S. These letters become part of a P&T dossier.
- (5) **Annual Review Conference with Chair.** After conducting the Annual Review Meeting and drafting Annual Review Letters, the Department Chair meets individually with each Assistant Professor to (a) provide an in-person summary of the senior faculty's deliberations; (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 P&T.

#### B. Other Procedures That May Affect Annual Reviews.

- (1) **Third-Year Review.** In accordance with University policy announced by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in October 1997, the third-year review of every Assistant Professor is formal and comprehensive.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For responsibilities of Assistant Professor, Mentor, and Chair, see [http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/ResponsibilitiesforJuniorFacultyReview\\_002.pdf](http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/ResponsibilitiesforJuniorFacultyReview_002.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> For University Third-Year Review evaluation criteria, see <http://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/thirdyearreviews.pdf>

**(2) Nominations for Early Promotion & Tenure.** There are two nomination processes for early promotion to Associate Professor and tenure.

**(a) Nomination by Senior Faculty.** At the Annual Review Meeting, after the completion of an Assistant Professor's annual review, any member of the senior faculty may advance a motion to initiate the process for an Assistant Professor's early promotion and tenure, provided that the Assistant Professor is not yet time-bound and that she/he meets criteria recorded in the *Faculty Handbook* and in this document (II.D).

If seconded, the motion is discussed and voted on by confidential ballot. The vote is advisory on the question of whether the case is ready to be put forward for promotion and tenure; this advisory vote is not a vote on tenure, and senior faculty are not bound by this advisory vote when they vote on tenure in the fall. The Chair reports the spring advisory vote to senior faculty at the meeting and later to the Assistant Professor, who decides whether to allow the early P&T review to proceed by having the Chair collect requisite letters from students and external faculty for formal consideration and a vote the following fall on the question of whether senior faculty support the case for promotion and tenure.

**(b) Self-Nomination.** Assistant Professors are accorded the right of self-nomination for early promotion and tenure. An Assistant Professor must apprise the Department Chair of this self-nomination by April 1. In this case, discussion and voting proceed as described above (II.B.2.a).

**(3) Stopping the Tenure Clock.** The Department observes University regulations regarding the stopping of the seven-year tenure clock.

### C. Procedures for Promotion to Associate Professor & Tenure: Department, College, University Reviews.

Typically, the time-bound year for an Assistant Professor is his/her 7<sup>th</sup> full academic year as a full-time regular faculty member. P&T dossier preparation begins in the spring of the 6<sup>th</sup> year; the dossier proceeds from department to college to university reviews, as described below and in University P&T Instructions.<sup>3</sup>

**(1) Compiling the P&T Dossier.** In spring and summer before the English Department's fall tenure vote, the P&T dossier is compiled according to the process described in the University P&T Instructions and the English Department's P&T Checklist.<sup>4</sup>

**(a) External reviews of scholarship.** The Chair typically solicits 5 external review letters from experts in a candidate's field. To generate a pool of names, a candidate is invited to submit 5 names, no more than 2 of which will be used; senior faculty knowledgeable in a candidate's field are invited to submit multiple names. The Chair then selects a total of 5 names from these lists and invites external reviewers to evaluate the scholarship, not render a decision on P&T.

**(b) Student reviews of teaching.** According to University P&T 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 P&T Evaluation.** In mid-to-late September, senior faculty meet to discuss a candidate's P&T dossier and to vote on promotion and tenure by confidential ballot.

**(a) Purpose.** At this meeting, senior faculty review a candidate's P&T dossier to (i) establish reasons and evidence for the P&T 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 P&T dossier; (iii) provide faculty information for letters they will write to the Chair recording their votes.

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

**(c) Follow-up.** After this meeting, (i) the Chair reports the vote to the Assistant Professor; (ii) the Assistant Professor may choose whether or not to proceed with the P&T process; (iii) if a

<sup>3</sup> For University P&T Instructions, see

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

<sup>4</sup> For the English Department process of dossier preparation for junior faculty, see

[http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/PROMOTIONANDTENURECHECKLISTJrFac\\_001.pdf](http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/PROMOTIONANDTENURECHECKLISTJrFac_001.pdf)

candidate is time-bound but chooses not to proceed, the University issues to the candidate a terminal contract plus a letter designating that the 8<sup>th</sup> year is the terminal year; (iv) if the candidate chooses to proceed, the Chair completes a candidate's dossier; (v) each senior faculty member 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 P&T dossier, which is then advanced to the College.

- (3) **College Area P&T Evaluation.** In October, the Humanities Area Promotion and Tenure Committee meets to (a) review P&T dossiers; (b) question Department Chairs about the dossiers; (c) vote on whether to recommend each candidate for promotion and tenure. 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 P&T Evaluation.** Also in October, the Dean of A&S (a) reviews each P&T dossier; (b) writes a recommendation letter for each dossier; (c) forwards dossiers to the University P&T Committee.
- (5) **University P&T Evaluation.** In December, the University P&T Committee, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School, meets to (a) review tenure dossiers; (b) question Department Chairs and Deans about dossiers; (c) vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion and tenure. 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 P&T Evaluation.** The Provost reviews the reports and dossiers and consults with the University President, who makes all final P&T 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 Associate Professor and Tenure in the English Department.

University criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are generally stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (302.02, 302.03, and 304) and take specific form in the English Department according to the discipline of English studies. English Department criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure include: (1) sustained productivity in scholarship, (2) sustained effectiveness in teaching, and (3) initiative or sustained responsibility in service.

- (1) **Scholarship.** 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 Associate Professor and tenure, *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 Review Letters; (ii) P&T vote letters from senior English faculty; (iii) external review letters solicited from 5 senior faculty with expertise in a candidate's field; (iv) other reviews (optional), such as all readers' reports from a press or all available book reviews.  
When evaluating *quality*, internal and external 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.

- (2) **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 UCCS, English majors/minors, and English MA and PhD programs; (ii) Annual Review Letters attesting to a candidate's productive participation in consultative activities, such as serving on committees for MA Exams, DQEs, and dissertation committees; (iii) senior faculty P&T vote letters, also attesting to a candidate's curricular contributions.  
Directing internships and/or independent studies may be considered for P&T but are not required; directing dissertations is strongly discouraged for Assistant Professors.
  - (b) **Quality of Teaching** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment of teaching in (i) Annual 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, senior 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.
- (3) **Service.** A candidate meets the criterion of *initiative or sustained responsibility in service* if the dossier demonstrates:
- (a) **Contributions to Departmental work** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual Review Letters or (ii) senior faculty P&T vote letters.  
Required for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are 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 (optional)** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Annual Review Letters or (ii) senior faculty P&T vote letters.  
Considered but not required for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are 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.

### III. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS.

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

- (1) **Peer Review of Teaching.** Each Triennial Review year Associate Professors participate in the Department's peer review of teaching, by which Full Professors are assigned to (a) visit the classes of Associate Professors; (b) invite Associate Professors to visit their classes; (c) discuss teaching strategies; (d) write evaluative letters for Triennial Review Files with copies for Associate Professors. In non-Triennial Review years, 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 Full Professors 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) **Associate Professor** should provide: (i) confirmation that the above information is correct; (ii) a 1-p. cover memo, framing the review period's activities in scholarship, teaching, and service for the audience of English Full Professors; (iii) updated curriculum vitae, with the review period's activities highlighted; (iv) publications; (v) any other relevant material (e.g., works in

- production, in review, or in process as well as contracts, readers' reports, letters from editors).
- (c) **Full Professors** should review all files before the Triennial Review Meeting.
- (d) **The Chair** should invite Associate Professors to consult before the Triennial Review Meeting.
- (3) **Triennial Review Meeting.** In the spring of every third year (typically April), Full Professors hold a confidential meeting chaired by the Chair of the Department<sup>5</sup> to evaluate the progress of all Associate Professors individually, not comparatively. Full Professors review each Associate Professor's file, which includes 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 Associate Professor, summarizing the Full Professors' discussion about the Associate Professor's professional development during the review period. The letters (a) commend Associate Professors for accomplishments and (b) make recommendations for successful promotion to Full Professor. Drafts of Triennial Review Letters are made available to Full Professors for vetting and to each 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 a promotion dossier.
- (5) **Triennial Conference with Chair.** After conducting the Triennial Review Meeting and drafting Triennial Review Letters, the Chair invites 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. Nomination Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor.**

There are two nomination processes for promotion to Full Professor.

- (1) **Nomination by a Full Professor.** In spring Triennial Review Meetings, after the completion of an Associate Professor's Triennial Review, any Full Professor may advance a motion to initiate the process for an Associate Professor's promotion to Full Professor, provided that the Associate Professor meets criteria recorded in the *Faculty Handbook* and in this document (III.D.).

If seconded, the motion is discussed and voted on by confidential ballot. This vote is advisory on the question of whether a case is ready to be put forward for promotion to Full Professor; this advisory vote is not a vote on promotion, and Full Professors are not bound by this advisory vote when they vote on promotion in the fall. The Chair reports the spring advisory vote to the Full Professors at the meeting and later to the Associate Professor, who decides whether to allow the promotion review to proceed by having the Chair collect requisite letters from students and external faculty for formal consideration and a vote the following fall on the question of whether Full Professors support the case for promotion.

In non-review years, any Full Professor may request a meeting to review the status of a particular Associate Professor and to vote on whether to initiate the promotion process.

- (2) **Self-Nomination.** Associate Professors are accorded the right of self-nomination for promotion to Full Professor. In both Triennial Review and non-Triennial Review years, an Associate Professor must apprise the Chair of self-nomination by March 1. In non-Triennial Review years, the discussion and voting proceed as described above (III.B.1).

#### **C. Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor: Department, College, University Reviews.**

Promotion to Full Professor is not time-bound in that there is no clock limiting an individual's time as an Associate Professor. When an Associate Professor is nominated for promotion to Full Professor, the promotion dossier proceeds from department to college to university reviews, as described below and in University P&T Instructions:<sup>6</sup>

- (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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> For University P&T Instructions, see

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

University P&T Instructions<sup>7</sup> and the English Department's P&T Checklist.<sup>8</sup>

- (a) **External reviews of scholarship.** The Chair typically solicits 5 external review letters from noted Professors in a candidate's field. To generate a pool of names, a candidate is invited to submit 5 names, no more than 2 of which will be used; other Full Professors are invited to submit multiple names. The Chair then selects a total of 5 names from these lists and invites external reviewers to evaluate the scholarship, not render a decision on promotion.
  - (b) **Student reviews of teaching.** According to University P&T 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 Associate Professor.
- (2) **Department Evaluation.** In mid-to-late September, the Full Professors meet to discuss a candidate's promotion dossier and to vote on promotion by confidential ballot.
- (a) **Purpose.** At this meeting, Full Professors review a candidate's promotion dossier to (i) establish reasons and evidence for the promotion vote taken at this meeting after discussion of the candidate; (ii) provide Chair with information to include in the Chair's Summary for the promotion dossier; (iii) provide Full Professors information for the letters they will write to the Chair to record their votes.
  - (b) **Process.** At this meeting, Full Professors (i) discuss a candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service in terms of whether each area *meets* or *does not meet* departmental criteria for promotion to Full Professor (III.D.); (ii) vote by secret ballot *yes* or *no* on a candidate's P&T case, the results of which are announced to senior faculty at the meeting.
  - (c) **Follow-up.** After this meeting, (i) the Chair reports the vote to the Associate Professor; (ii) the 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 Full Professor writes a letter to the Chair to record the Full Professor's 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 Associate Professor (II.C.3).
- (4) **Dean Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.4).
- (5) **University Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.5).
- (6) **Provost & President's Evaluation.** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor (II.C.6).

#### D. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor in the English Department.

University criteria for promotion to Full Professor are generally stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (302.02, 302.03, and 304). English Department criteria for promotion to Full Professor include:

(1) distinguished scholarship, (2) distinguished teaching, and (3) distinguished service.

- (1) **Scholarship.** A candidate meets the criterion of *distinguished scholarship* if the dossier demonstrates:
- (a) **Ongoing, substantive publications**—evidenced by publications beyond those considered for promotion to 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 Full Professor is not time-bound, *book* is defined here as a manuscript in print.

- (b) **Quality of publications in respected forums**—typically evidenced by generally positive reviews in (i) Triennial Review Letters; (ii) promotion vote letters from Full Professors; (iii) external

<sup>7</sup> For University P&T Instructions, see

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

<sup>8</sup> For Department process of dossier preparation for senior faculty, see

[http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/PROMOTIONANDTENURECHECKLISTSrFac\\_000.pdf](http://www.marquette.edu/english/documents/PROMOTIONANDTENURECHECKLISTSrFac_000.pdf)

review letters solicited from 5 noted Full Professors in a candidate's field; (iv) published reviews of a book (optional)

When evaluating *quality*, internal and external 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.

- (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) ***Professional Visibility in terms of a candidate's having an established national or international reputation among scholars***—typically evidenced by (i) external review letters in their evaluation of an Associate Professor's prominence; (ii) requests for tenure reviews, external departmental reviews, or vetting of manuscripts; (iii) grants or fellowships received for scholarly or creative activity; (iv) visiting professorships; (v) invitations to give keynotes, lectures, or workshops at conferences important to a candidate's field, at universities, or at other academic-related institutions; (vi) professional service on editorial boards, as an officer of professional organization, etc.

(2) **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 UCCS, English majors/minors, and English MA and PhD programs; (ii) Triennial Review Letters attesting to productive participation in undergraduate and graduate consultative activities, such as directing internships or independent studies, designing/assessing MA Exams, and, especially, directing DQEs and dissertations; (iii) Full Professor 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, Full 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 (optional), which may include syllabi, assignments, special project descriptions, student work, etc.

(3) **Service.** A candidate meets the criterion of *distinguished service* if the dossier demonstrates:

- (a) ***Serious and Voluntary Contributions to Departmental Work***—typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Triennial Review Letters and (ii) Full Professors' promotion vote letters.

Required for promotion to Full Professor are 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; (iv) volunteer activities on behalf of the Department, such as attending Preview or Open Houses.

- (b) ***Serious and Voluntary Contributions to College, University, or Community Work*** – typically evidenced by generally positive assessment in (i) Triennial Review Letters and (ii) Full Professors' promotion vote letters.

Required for promotion to Full Professor are contributions to and leadership for some combination of the following: (i) College or University committee assignments; (ii) other College or University service or administrative assignments; (iii) volunteer activities on behalf of the College, University, or Community.

#### IV. Emeritus/a 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 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 P&T Dossier, the Department Chair collects only the following material:

*From candidate:*

- i. Current c.v.
- ii. Research Statement (1 p.).
- iii. 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 tenure or 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 April 16, 2007. Faculty considered for Emeritus are those with 'sustained high quality performance' and have normally attained rank of full professor."<sup>9</sup> English Department criteria are the same as those listed in the *Faculty Handbook*:

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

Approved unanimously, 11/17/1999.

Clarifications added, 3/3/2008.

Revisions approved unanimously, 4/11/2011.

Updates approved unanimously, 4/3/2019.

<sup>9</sup> For Emeritus process and criteria, see

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