Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
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The Department of English has formulated promotion and tenure guidelines to conform to and supplement the general requirements established by the Board of Regents of the University System and the policies outlined in the current Promotion and Tenure Manuals of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the university. Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence. The department will judge each candidate for promotion and/or tenure according to the criteria in these documents. Faculty should carefully study the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in the university and college manuals, and in the departmental guidelines.

As explained in the college manual, all participants in the process should follow the principles of professional ethics associated with peer evaluations, which prohibit evaluations that would involve a conflict of interest.

All materials, discussions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, should divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved. E-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). In accordance with the college manual, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of professional development, teaching, and service. To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in professional development and teaching and evaluated as having provided good service. Further, to be promoted to the rank of professor, a candidate must be judged excellent in professional development and teaching and very good in the area of service.
Typically, candidates are expected to publish primarily in the field in which they were hired.

A candidate for tenure at the rank of associate professor or for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor should include all relevant materials from both before and after the candidate’s initial appointment at Georgia State University.

A candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor or for tenure at this rank should include all relevant materials only since the candidate’s promotion to the rank of associate professor at Georgia State University or at a previous institution.

The departmental committee on promotion and tenure (hereafter known as the departmental review committee) shall consider all relevant materials in the dossier.

Letters from outside reviewers who are authorities in the candidate’s field (solicited in accordance with the procedures described in the college manual) will be used to provide a supplementary perspective on the candidate’s achievements and impact upon his or her field of professional development.

The outside reviewers should ordinarily be affiliated with institutions in which the emphasis on research and scholarship/creative writing is of a rigor similar to or more demanding than that at Georgia State University. Some institutions are particularly prominent in relation to specific fields, and the departmental review committee’s report should note this about the reviewer from such an institution if relevant to the candidate’s field. To assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate’s record, the departmental review committee shall consider the letters of the external reviewers to be an important complement to the internal estimate by the candidate’s departmental colleagues, and the committee report shall provide a detailed summary and analysis of the reviewers’ estimations of the candidate’s professional contributions.
All steps by all individuals and groups involved in the tenure and promotion process must be taken by the deadlines specified in the college manual. The reports of the departmental review committee, along with any minority reports, and of the chair shall be sent forward to the college committee.

A candidate denied promotion should, before reapplying, demonstrate some qualitative and quantitative improvement, and should reassess his or her materials and record in consultation with colleagues and with the chair.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The candidate’s professional development will be judged on the basis of publications, editorial work, and other professional activities. Collaborative work is often appropriate, and is valued as a legitimate form of inquiry and production. The successful candidate for tenure or promotion should demonstrate that he/she has continued as an active scholar after arriving at Georgia State University, no matter what the prior credentials.

Within the discipline, a substantial number of articles or book chapters ranks in significance with a book of original scholarship or a monograph. Thus the minimum requirement to earn promotion and tenure to associate professor is a body of original scholarship or creative work, either a monograph or a significant number of articles or comparable material as judged by peers, although this quantity of scholarship/creative work does not guarantee promotion and tenure, since the qualitative assessment of the candidate’s dossier is equally important. In all cases, reputable professional development entails the independent vetting of manuscripts.

Usually, original scholarship counts more than editing or summarizing the original scholarship of
others. It should be noted, however, that some scholarly editions of literature contain substantial original scholarship. “Edition” can mean anything from a reprint of an existing text or the republication of essays written by others with a new introduction, to an authoritative edition of previously unpublished primary materials. The greater the amount of original textual, scholarly, and interpretative work, the more weight the edition carries. In the absence of substantial original scholarship, it is unlikely that any amount of purely editorial work, or any number of book reviews or factual entries, would suffice.

All references to published material (e.g. “book,” “chapter,” “poem,” “story,” “essay,” “review”) are understood to describe either print or electronic scholarship. The degree of value each work earns in the departmental assessment will be determined according to qualitative scholarly or creative standards. Both printed and digital publications may be judged as acceptable or unacceptable, depending on their scholarly or creative merit.

While conference papers count as professional activities, they do not rank in significance with published materials.

Textbooks and pedagogical materials are counted under teaching, not professional development. Textbooks may be defined as materials to be used in the classroom that sum up information without proposing original research, with students as the targeted audience. Publications about methods of instruction in one’s field count as professional development.

Part of the criteria for the evaluation of books and articles shall be the caliber of the venue in which they are published.

In general, the reputation of the candidate within the scholarly or creative community is measured by reviews, citations, awards, and the like. For example, a short book that has received a prestigious award counts more than a long book that has not been favorably reviewed.
A work of scholarship or creative writing published outside a candidate’s initial specialty counts as long as the candidate has established a reputation in the initial field. But high prestige of a candidate in one specialty is preferred to modest prestige in two.

There are many different ways of satisfying the requirement that the candidate produce a work of original scholarship roughly equivalent to a book. Although each career is unique, there is agreement upon certain evaluative principles; and the following materials are ranked in general order of importance:

- an original single-authored scholarly book, refereed and published by a reputable university or trade press; awards and/or prizes for published work.
- the candidate’s contribution to an original co-authored scholarly book. The candidate should state his or her role in the research. The greater the percentage of the work that is the candidate’s own, the better. Candidates who produce co-authored work must specify in their dossier the part of the work for which they are responsible;
- a single-authored scholarly edition of previously unpublished material, of published material that has never received scholarly editorial treatment, or an authoritative edition of previously edited material that provides substantial re-editing or annotating; a textual edition of comparable magnitude to such work, followed closely by the candidate’s contributions to a co-edited treatment of such work;
- an essay containing original research appearing either as a chapter published by a reputable scholarly or trade press or as an article published by a reputable professional journal;
- a book-length critical bibliography aimed at a scholarly audience;
• a single-authored or co-authored book related to one’s field and aimed at a general audience;

• a single-edited or co-edited book or journal collection of new scholarly essays by others.

Candidates who produce co-edited work must specify in their dossier the part of the work for which they are responsible.

The department recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental disciplines. However, fellowships, grants, contracts, and awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate’s research.

A significant grant (which is the result of a rigorous peer-review of the candidate’s scholarship and credentials) enables the building of a scholarly community. International and national external awards and grants will generally weigh more heavily than regional or local.

Materials not involving original work may also be counted as professional development:

collections of previously published essays, with significant introduction, headnotes, or appendices; book-reviews; or entries in encyclopedias or other reference books.

None of these materials may include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for publication. Materials accepted for publication must be accompanied by attesting documentation.

In evaluating the candidate’s professional development, the committee will also consider professional service demonstrating that the candidate has a national reputation in the field. Such activities may include participation in the meetings of professional organizations, editorial activities, and other significant professional services appropriate to the discipline and to the candidate’s area(s) of specialization. Professional activities should be included in professional
development rather than in service if they engage the professional expertise, although university
service engaging one’s professional expertise should be included under service. Serving as the
President or Executive Director of a prestigious scholarly organization, for example, is evidence
that the candidate is regarded as an important scholar even if the work of the President or
Director is primarily administrative.

If an activity such as Professional service or pedagogical publications could be
legitimately included in more than one area, the candidate shall choose the area in which it shall
count in consultation with the chair.

Evidence of a national reputation also may include membership on editorial boards;
leadership roles in other scholarly projects; invitations to deliver keynote addresses; chairing
sessions at professional meetings; extramural grants; and service as a manuscript reviewer or
consultant for professional journals and scholarly presses. A distinguished national or
international reputation as a leader in the field may also be indicated by a significant number of
reviews of books by the candidate or a significant number of citations in scholarly publications
of the candidate’s published research. Evaluators should bear in mind, however, that such
reviews and citations usually take several years after the original publication to appear.

Scholarship and creative writing adopting emerging technologies are essential to many
areas of English studies. The Modern Language Association “Guidelines for Evaluating Work
with Digital Media in the Modern Languages” specifies that vetted work published in a digital
medium should be valued as being equal to print publications, and the candidate should indicate
the peer review and publication guidelines for the digital media. Such technologies that may be
employed in scholarship include multimedia productions and computer software. Such
contributions should be read in the media for which they were intended.
The candidate who works with digital media should be prepared to make explicit the results, theoretical underpinnings, and intellectual rigor of the work. The candidate should take particular care to describe how the work may overlap with or redefine the traditional categories, and to describe the process underlying the creation of work in digital media (e.g., the creation of infrastructure as well as content). Any new collaborative relationships with other faculty members and students required by the candidate’s work in digital media should also be noted. As stated in the Modern Language Association “Statement on Publications in Electronic Journals,” online publications can have wide circulation. Their citation and scholarly impact may be documented by data, including whether a site has been adopted, endorsed, and linked by any relevant official sites, library-based subject-collections of resources, scholarly associations, or colleges and universities. Public impact may also be documented by how many people have visited the site.

Creative Writing

The candidate’s professional development will be judged on the basis of publications, awards and fellowships for creative writing, editorial work, invited readings/lectures, and other professional activities. The candidate who has co-authored a publication should state his or her role in the production. The greater the percentage of the work that is the candidate’s own, the better. Candidates who produce co-authored work must specify in their dossier the part of the work for which they are responsible. Usually, both a book of original creative writing from a respected publisher and publications in reputable magazines or journals with national visibility are minimum requirements to earn tenure and promotion to associate professor. In the absence of a book, it is unlikely that any number of journal publications, or any amount of purely editorial
work, or any number of book reviews or critical essays, would suffice. While invited readings
and lectures count as professional activities, they do not rank in significance with published
materials. Textbooks and pedagogical materials are counted under teaching, not professional
development. Textbooks may be defined as materials to be used primarily in the classroom that
sum up information without proposing original research, with students as the targeted audience.

Part of the criteria for evaluation of professional development materials shall be the
caliber of their press or journal. The higher the reputation of the candidate within the writing
community, as measured by reviews, citations, awards, and the like, the better. Evaluators
should bear in mind, however, that such reviews and citations usually take several years after the
original publication to appear.

A work published outside a candidate’s initial specialty counts as long as the candidate
has established a reputation in the initial field. But high prestige of a candidate in one specialty is
preferred to modest prestige in two.

Although each career is unique, there is agreement upon certain evaluative principles;
and the following materials are ranked in general order of importance.

- Book publication: the merit of a book publisher is best judged by the authors it publishes
  and the awards and fellowships those authors and their books garner. However, the best
  measures of a book’s merit are the newspaper and journal reviews, literary awards, and
  citations that the book receives.

- Journal publication: publication of creative writing in national magazines and premiere
  literary journals with substantial national distribution is more desirable than publication
  in respected literary magazines with a more limited national distribution, which is more
  desirable than publication in literary “little” magazines with local or very limited
national distribution.

- Awards and fellowships: awards and fellowships for creative writing are excellent indicators of a national reputation. The merit of the award or fellowship will be based on the reputation and reach of the awarding agency. National awards and fellowships are held in higher esteem than regional, which are valued above local awards.

- Reprints: reprints in anthologies and textbooks are excellent indicators of a national reputation. The significance of these publications will be judged by the caliber of the press and the nature of the publication.

- Reviews: reviews of creative work are excellent indicators of a national reputation, with the caveat noted earlier about the usual time required for such reviews to appear. The significance of reviews will be judged by the caliber of the reviewing journal or press.

- Editorial projects: editorial work such as editing an anthology or literary magazine will count toward professional development but will count less than the publication of original creative work. The merits of magazine editing will be judged by the caliber of the writers the magazine has published, publishing awards the magazine has received, and reviews. The merits of fiction or poetry anthologies will be judged according to the caliber of the publisher, reviews received, and awards.

- Readings and lectures: invited readings and lectures are indicators of a candidate’s visibility and reputation. The significance of such readings and lectures can be judged by the reputation of the hosting institution.

   Other professional activities might include the judging of literary competitions and evaluating manuscripts for reputable presses.
In all specializations, the department values public scholarship, and encourages candidates to submit documentation of such activity along with contextualization to explain how this work complements and embellishes their overall scholarly portfolios. Public scholarship may involve interactive work with groups outside the conventional realm of scholarly and creative publishers: museums, government organizations, civic groups, performance groups, schools, and media, for example. We affirm the recommendations developed by the consortium called “Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life,” in their report titled “Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University,” that provide a perspective for appropriately valuing public scholarship and engaged artistic creation. These guidelines describe “different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities,” and explain how to appraise such work based on how “it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value.” The report details how to define and assess public scholarship based on a continuum of professional activities and accomplishments, and how to compile a portfolio that best demonstrates the value of this work.

**TEACHING**

The departmental evaluation committee will consider a variety of written evidence submitted by the candidate of effectiveness in the classroom. The candidate should adhere closely to the "Categories for Teaching" as listed in the college manual. The candidate should include the annual departmental instructional portfolios he or she has compiled for the previous
four years and student evaluations, as required in the college manual. Letters from students may not be included in the dossier. The candidate may include material illustrating the advisement of M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. theses; the preparation and grading of graduate examinations; documented advising of student; acceptance of former students into doctoral programs, appointment to faculty positions, or recognition in the profession; commentary on student papers; direction of Honors projects, independent studies, and graduate colloquia (e.g. MA pro-
seminars and graduate conferences); course materials, handouts, or materials designed for Web-based instruction created by the candidate; nominations of students for awards; and invitations to teach a seminar at other universities.

A teaching award from a prestigious outlet is particularly strong evidence of teaching effectiveness. Additional evidence may include the creation of new areas of curriculum, the publication of textbooks, the adoption of such textbooks by other educational institutions; invitations to lecture about teaching; leading workshops on teaching; and consultations with publishers or institutions about the development of pedagogical materials.

SERVICE

The departmental review committee will review the candidate’s service to the department, college, and university, as well as to professional organizations and the community. Within the department, a faculty member may serve as an administrator (chair, associate chair, graduate director, etc.); as a section head; or as a committee chairperson. Other forms of
departmental service include membership on and contributions to committees, involvement with departmental student organizations, and mentoring or otherwise assisting colleagues.

Forms of service to the college or university include participation in the university Senate; chairing or serving on and contributing to an interdepartmental, college, or university committee, task force, or other such body; providing assistance to other departments or individual colleagues in other departments; mentoring colleagues in other departments; providing guidance to extra-departmental student organizations; and planning public lectures or conferences to be held at Georgia State.

Professional or community service includes serving in an administrative position in a professional organization, serving as a consultant to another educational institution or to a governmental body, professional organization, or other group; making practical arrangements for conferences; assisting colleagues at other institutions; grading SAT examinations or other national tests; delivering lectures to non-professional audiences, or participating in non-professional forums. Generally, a community service should be included only if it somehow places one’s professional expertise at the service of the general public. Other kinds of public service, admirable though they might be, are unlikely to carry much weight. Extensive public service will not compensate for a deficiency of departmental, college, or university service.

The above are only a sample of possible services. A candidate should call attention to awards he or she received for service activities. Services for which financial remuneration was received may be included. If a brief description of a service on the candidate’s curriculum vitae does not give a clear indication of the nature and scope of the service, the candidate should provide a more detailed explanation in the introduction to the appropriate section of the dossier. A candidate is urged to exercise discretion in supplying documentation of service. Some form of
evidence should be provided to document each service activity, but the amount of evidence should be kept to the minimum necessary to give a clear sense of the nature and scope of the activity. Appropriate documentation of a public lecture, for example, might include a letter of invitation, a copy of the poster announcing the lecture, a letter of appreciation from the official organizer of the event, or a newspaper account, but should not include every email about the arrangements. If one served on a commission that produced a hundred-page report, one should not include the entire report, merely one’s letter of appointment to the commission and the brief introduction or conclusion of the report or the particular section of the report solely authored by the candidate.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Assistant professors must simultaneously apply for promotion and tenure. Tenure in the college for assistant professors will not be granted without promotion to associate professor.

Professional Development

To receive an evaluation of excellent, which is the minimum requirement for meeting university and college promotion and tenure standards, the candidate must have produced a book or a comparable body of original research and must present some substantial further evidence of an emerging national reputation. Such further evidence might include, for example, the publication of articles and book chapters in addition to the book (if the candidate has published a
book), or a number of articles and/or book chapters that are comparable to significantly more than a book (if the candidate has not published a book).

Other kinds of further evidence that might support promotion and tenure would be documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation and the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

For a more detailed explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the section of the guidelines above on “professional development.”

Professional Development in Creative Writing

For an evaluation of excellent, which is the minimum requirement for meeting university and college promotion and tenure standards, the candidate must have produced a body of work that shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future. Normally, this entails publication with a respected literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing and documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation. For a more detailed explanation of what might count as further evidence, see the section of the guidelines above on “professional development.”

Teaching

A candidate will meet university and college promotion and tenure standards if his or her teaching performance is evaluated as excellent, which suggests exceptional preparation and
prominent involvement with individual student work, especially service on committees for or the
direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, theses, and dissertations. The
candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out of 5 range. The candidate
should demonstrate an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses.
Such a candidate may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a
teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical
publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in
teaching.

Service

In order to be recommended for promotion to associate professor, a candidate must
responsibly and thoroughly execute assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities
and be of significant assistance to colleagues. Such service is evaluated as good.

TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of
associate professor.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Professional Development

In addition to maintaining the skills and level of achievement required of an associate
professor, a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor should have produced a book or a
comparable body of scholarship since his or her last promotion, and must have established a
distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. To meet university and college promotion and tenure standards, the faculty member must be evaluated as **excellent**, which means having established a solid national reputation as a leader in the field, continuing to be an active scholar, and having a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The books, book chapters, and/or articles of the candidate judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the candidate’s work attest to this reputation. Other evidence that might support promotion would be the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

**Professional Development in Creative Writing**

To meet university and college promotion and tenure standards, the candidate must be evaluated as **excellent**, which means having produced a body of work since his or her last promotion that shows strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. Normally, this entails publication with a respected literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing since his or her last promotion that receives significant newspaper and journal reviews and/or literary awards and/or citations.

**Teaching**

A candidate meets university and college promotion and tenure standards if his or her teaching performance is evaluated as **excellent**, which suggests exceptional preparation and
extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the supervision of theses and/or dissertations. The candidate’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4 out of 5 range. The candidate also will have demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative pedagogy. Such a candidate may demonstrate extensive involvement with individual student work and has a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; advancing in a timely fashion through their degree programs, completing the program, and advancing into a subsequent program or into the profession. Such a candidate advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

Service

Service will be evaluated as very good and thus meeting university and college promotion and tenure standards when a candidate demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as participating in professional associations. Serving in a substantial departmental administrative role illustrates leadership.

TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of professor.
The departmental process begins in March. The dates for the evaluation process shall be consistent with the calendar given in the college manual. The schedule for the process in the Department of English is as follows:

1. The chair will write a letter on or before March 1 to all faculty who are eligible for consideration for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure asking if they wish to be reviewed by the departmental review committee. Associate professors should consult with the chair and senior colleagues to assist in determining when it is appropriate for them to apply for promotion to professor, and should be mindful of relevant deadlines specified in the calendar of the college manual. The chair must receive written expressions of a candidate’s intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure no later than the time given in the college manual.

2. By the time prescribed in the manual, the candidate’s professional development materials shall be submitted to the chair for forwarding to outside reviewers, along with a list of eight possible outside reviewers. According to the process specified in the college manual, the letters of evaluation written by these reviewers shall be provided to the departmental evaluation committee.

3. Each candidate is responsible for assembling a dossier consistent with the instructions given in the college manual and submitting it to the department chair by the time prescribed in the Manual. The candidate should note the required format for the curriculum vitae that is given in the college manual.
4. The chair shall place on file the dossiers and letters of evaluation of the outside reviewers of each prospective candidate for perusal by appropriate tenured associate and full professors. Only professors shall review the materials of candidates for the rank of professor. These materials are strictly confidential, and no faculty member should discuss their contents with the candidate.

5. The departmental review committee shall consist of all tenured associate professors and professors whose primary appointment is in the English Department. This committee shall review each candidate for promotion and tenure in the Department of English and shall evaluate the record of each candidate using criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the guidelines on promotion and tenure for the Department of English and in the manual of the College of Arts and Sciences. A subcommittee shall prepare a factual summary review of each candidate and make a recommendation regarding the candidate. This report will be used by the members of the full Committee as the basis for their own recommendations on the candidate. This Subcommittee shall consist of four members besides its chair: two tenured professors and two tenured associate professors, to be elected by the Committee at large. The Subcommittee’s chair, holding the rank of professor, shall be appointed annually by the department chair, upon consultation with the Executive Committee. This Subcommittee shall evaluate the candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor; only Subcommittee members at the rank of professor shall evaluate candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. Robert’s Rules of Order, revised, shall be followed throughout the deliberations of the Subcommittee, except that all such deliberations are in executive session and are to remain confidential within the Subcommittee.
After due deliberations within the Subcommittee on all the information in the official record of each candidate, Subcommittee members shall prepare a summary report on the candidate’s areas of professional development, teaching, and service and make a recommendation regarding the candidate. The subcommittee report shall provide a detailed summary and analysis of the reviewers’ estimations of the candidate’s professional contributions, and an assessment of the quality and standing in the profession of the journals, presses and the like in which the candidate’s work has appeared. Additional facts may be added on the basis of the independent perusal of the dossier by members of the Committee. The Subcommittee shall then vote on an evaluation in each of the three categories, with the overall positive or negative recommendation following from these evaluations. All members of the Subcommittee normally must be present for any vote that involves evaluation of candidates. The Subcommittee shall submit its report and majority recommendation and any minority recommendation to the departmental review committee.

All of the tenured faculty normally shall meet in person to discuss the candidates for promotion to associate professor. They shall together revise the Subcommittee report and vote on the revised evaluations. All of the full professors normally shall follow the same process for candidates for promotion to full professor. In regard to a candidate for the rank of associate professor, all tenured associate and full professors normally shall sign the recommendation of the departmental review committee, or an individual dissenting report, or a joint minority report in conjunction with faculty members.

All final recommendations must be made by the departmental review committee as a
whole. The departmental review committee of the whole must meet to discuss and vote on its final recommendation. E-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). Each member of the departmental review committee normally either shall sign the committee’s majority recommendation or shall submit or sign a minority recommendation when the committee submits the majority recommendation. The signatures must appear on separate and detachable pages so that they can be removed when a candidate is given copies of the majority and minority reports.

In addition to participating in the promotion and tenure evaluation process, the departmental review committee also conducts yearly renewal of contract reviews and third year promotion and tenure reviews of all untenured faculty members (see informational appendix).

8. At the end of all deliberations in the department, the chair of the department shall inform each candidate according to the college manual.
APPENDIX I:

Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A1. Professional Development

**Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

**Fair:** The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

**Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are insufficient.

**Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a book or a comparable body of original research. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications, as scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many areas of English studies. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Further evidence for a rating of excellent includes documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation and the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate’s research. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.
A2. Professional Development in Creative Writing

**Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

**Fair:** The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

**Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are insufficient.

**Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; but there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent creative profile in the near future.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a body of work that shows national recognition and strong achievement in the field and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as the near future. Normally, this entails publication with a respected literary publisher of at least one single-authored book of original creative writing and documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation. Peer-reviewed digital and other new media forms of publication are also valid venues. Securing external support, an extremely competitive undertaking, is valued highly as acknowledgment of success and prominence. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has published two or more books and has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and so on.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of *excellent*, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master’s theses, and dissertations. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess and show innovation and creativity in teaching.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent* at either level, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department as well as participating in professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A1. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member’s record indicates no activity in maintaining a program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is somewhat active in maintaining a program of professional development, but the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are not far-reaching or extensive. There are some publications and other professional accomplishments appearing sporadically, but not enough, or not of high enough quality, to indicate that the faculty member’s scholarly agenda remains on a strong upward trajectory.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development but s/he falls short of completing major high quality projects. Qualitatively and quantitatively, the faculty member’s publications are steady, reflecting an even and stable trajectory; the dossier of a “very good” candidate, though, lacks a sense of increasingly ambitious research and writing, and does not manifest increased reputation or prominence.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to advance a distinguished reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. This faculty member is an active scholar with a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The articles, book chapters, digital publications, or books of the faculty member judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. Other important evidence might include securing fellowships, grants, contracts, or awards from internal and external regional, national, or international agencies; invited lectures at prestigious venues; being named to a strong leadership role in a disciplinary organization; editing books and journals in the field. The “Excellent” candidate convincingly demonstrates that promising future publications are under development and will be completed.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, being invited to give keynote or plenary lectures at significant conferences, and so on. Significant publications (such as a book or several substantial articles) have appeared, or are forthcoming, during the period under review, and projected future research seems likely to be of similar caliber.
A2. Professional Development in Creative Writing

Poor: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates no activity in maintaining a program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates minimal activity in professional development: there may be occasional, but not steady, publications.

Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates some activity in maintaining a program of professional development. “Good” activity should include publication of creative work, or demonstrable progress toward the completion of a creative project or projects, or readings or lectures, but need not include all of these categories.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates that she or he is actively engaged in a program of professional development, but since her or his last review has not achieved or maintained national recognition. A “Very Good” program of professional development should include the publication of creative work in respected journals or magazines or demonstrable progress toward the completion of a creative project or projects, and readings or lectures.

Excellent: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates that she or he has achieved national recognition and indicates that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. An “Excellent” program of professional development should include the publication of creative work in magazines and journals and digital/multimodal media that are held in esteem by the profession or demonstrable progress toward the completion of a creative project or projects, and invited readings or lectures. It may also include grants, awards, and other professional recognition. Special attention and recognition will be given to publications in premier venues.

Outstanding: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates that she or he has achieved national and international recognition in her or his field, and indicates that this achievement embodies a momentum that is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. An “Outstanding” program of professional development should include the publication or acceptance for publication of one single-authored book of original creative writing, or the publication in magazines and journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession of a number of poems or pieces of fiction or creative nonfiction or multimodal creative writing comparable to one single-authored book of original creative writing; significant reviews of her or his works; invited readings or lectures at prestigious venues; grants, awards, and other professional recognition; reprints of her or his works; citations of her or his works; etc. Special attention and recognition will be given to publications in premier venues.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Fair: The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member's supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.

Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors and master’s theses and/or dissertations to completion. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member evaluated as excellent also will have demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative pedagogy. Such a faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion; securing fellowships at the graduate or postgraduate level; presenting or publishing their work, completing their programs, and advancing into subsequent programs or into the profession. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as participating in professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.