

Introduction

The Department of English has formulated promotion and tenure policies 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 Manual of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the University. 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, College, and Department manuals. In accordance with the College Manual, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the departmental review as outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor in three areas: professional development, instruction, and service.

A recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor requires that the candidate be judged at least excellent in either professional development or instruction and at least very good in the other, and at least good in service. For promotion to professor, the candidate must be judged excellent in both professional development and instruction and at least very good in service. 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. The Department will give full consideration to dossier materials covering the periods as described in the College Manual, ll. 242-57, and to materials that have been completed and accepted for publication but not yet published; such materials must be accompanied by attesting documentation.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Professional Development

The candidate's professional development will be judged on the basis of publications, editorial work, and other professional activities. Although evaluations consider the quantity of publications and other dossier materials, the Department privileges quality over quantity. The publications relevant to promotion and/or tenure may include, for example, a lyric poem or a novel; a factual note, a book review, a critical essay, a book chapter, or a book-length work of scholarship; an anthology of creative writing or a collection of scholarly essays, a scholarly/critical edition of a text, or a hypertext project. The Department will assign greater weight to publications by refereed journals or presses (or publications that involve peer review or competitive selection) than to those that do not involve such review. Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to publish reputable work in those areas they have designated as their main professional fields (e.g., Renaissance, Eighteenth-Century British, Rhetoric, Nineteenth-Century American, Fiction). They also receive recognition for professional development if they publish in additional fields in which they have training or interest or in emerging areas of scholarship that may lie outside their original specializations. All publications should be of high quality and contribute to the faculty member's overall excellence as teacher and scholar. In evaluating the candidate's professional development, the committee will also consider membership and 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. Additionally, awards and grants are considered as evidence of professional development.

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 stature in the field of

professional development. The departmental evaluation committee should consider that such letters may be, at times, both more and less reliable than internal appraisals of a candidate's work: more reliable because the reviewer may be a more objective judge, but less reliable because the reviewer may lack an understanding of the specific context and conditions in which the professional development material was produced. Therefore, the departmental evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from outside reviewers accordingly, and shall use these letters, ultimately, to assist in the fullest possible appraisal of a candidate's record.

Instruction

The departmental evaluation committee will consider a variety of written evidence of effectiveness in the classroom the candidate submits. The candidate should include selected materials from the instructional portfolios he or she has compiled, as required in the College's Teaching Assessment Policy. Letters from students may not be included in the dossier. The candidate may include material illustrating the advisement of M.A. and Ph.D. theses; the preparation and grading of master's and doctoral examinations; official advising of students (as indicated, by, e.g., signed PACE forms); letters of recommendation written on behalf of students; acceptance of former students into doctoral programs, appointment to faculty positions, or recognition in the profession; student papers and related materials for Honors projects, independent studies, and doctoral colloquia; and course materials, handouts, and outstanding student papers for major courses in the candidate's field. Any student work in the dossier should be included only if the student has given permission.

Service

The departmental evaluation committee will review the candidate's service to the Department, College, University, and community. Departmental service may include administrative work (e.g., serving as graduate, undergraduate, or writing director); serving as section head; committee work; assistance to the candidate's colleagues; volunteering in the Writing Center; and admissions screening. The Department also values such service activities as involvement with student organizations; planning conferences; holding offices in professional associations; and development of or participation in new initiatives (e.g., Writing Across the Curriculum, South Atlantic Modern Language Association, Five Points, departmental web-page development, and teacher certification consultation). University service may include committee work and participation on the University Senate and its committees, or on College

committees. Community service may include guest-lectures at Georgia State or other schools; participation in workshops or conferences at Georgia State or other institutions; grading state or national exams; and consultation by external university, governmental, or legislative bodies. Extra remuneration for academic or public service should not preclude its inclusion.

Evidence of such service must not include letters solicited by the candidate for inclusion in the dossier. However, evidence of departmental and University committee service may include unsolicited letters from committee chairs; the minutes of meetings; committee assignments fulfilled by the candidate; and, if the candidate was a committee chair, documentation of the preparatory committee planning such as outside correspondence, background research, and memoranda sent to committee members. Evidence of community service may include unsolicited letters from the community organization served; copies of public lectures given and any related correspondence; materials for any workshops in which the candidate has participated or which the candidate has conducted; and reports given to governmental agencies and any related correspondence.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Professional Development

For promotion and tenure at the level of associate professor, an evaluation of **poor** means that the candidate has produced an unsatisfactory dossier that casts doubt on his or her commitment to the field and likelihood for progress. An evaluation of **fair** means that the candidate's work is of moderate significance. An evaluation of **good** means that the candidate has produced a body of work that shows commitment to activity in the field and that indicates the potential for progress.

An evaluation of **very good** means that the candidate has produced an acceptable body of work that shows strong achievement in the field and that indicates that progress is likely to continue in the near future. This work would feature writing of high quality published in respected journals, magazines, or internet forums, and might include a book-length manuscript published or accepted for publication by a university or trade press; or, if the candidate does not have such a manuscript, the materials in his or her dossier should provide convincing evidence of a research/creative agenda that would lead to the achievement of a project of this scope in the near future. Editorial work which involves the establishment of a critical text, substantial introductions, and the construction of scholarly apparatus are also evidence of significant professional development.

An evaluation of **excellent** means that the candidate has produced a considerable body of work, including a book-length manuscript, or a body of work in some other form reflecting a comparable scope of achievement, that is recognized as high in quality by leaders both within and outside the University, and that leads them to view the candidate as having the potential to be an important figure in his or her field in the near future. Such work will have been published by well-respected, significant national magazines, journals, and/or internet forums --

typically, refereed, invited, or otherwise competitively selected -- and trade or university presses. These publications might include individual articles, essays, poems, or short fiction, depending upon the candidate's area of specialization. The candidate's prominence would be evident by such activities and accomplishments as presentations at professional meetings and conferences; invited readings or presentations at other universities and professional organizations; commissioned writing; innovative work; reception of awards and grants; significant citations in reviews, articles and books; service on grants and awards committees; and editing of journals, magazines, and/or books.

An evaluation of **outstanding** means that the candidate has produced a considerable body of work recognized as high in quality and important by colleagues both within and outside the University, and that leads them to view the candidate as having begun to acquire a position of prominence in the field. This work, which might include one or more books, or a body of work in some other form reflecting a comparable scope of achievement, would exceed the criteria for an evaluation of excellent.

Instruction

An evaluation of **poor** or **fair** describes, respectively, an unacceptable and a minimally acceptable record of instruction.

A candidate is evaluated as **good** if the committee determines that his or her performance does not greatly exceed what could be described as adequate. Supporting material should give evidence of diligent preparation and pertinent, valid content.

A candidate is evaluated as **very good** if his or her performance is considered highly competent. Supporting material should include evidence of diligent preparation and a conscientious mentoring of students, as well as a commitment to enthusiastic, creative, and innovative pedagogy.

A candidate is evaluated as **excellent** if the committee determines that his or her teaching performance 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 may have won teaching awards, or have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction. Typically, the candidate's student evaluation numerical average meets or exceeds the departmental average. The candidate judged excellent should be recognized among students and colleagues as one of the most effective and committed teachers in the Department, and should demonstrate an engagement with teaching and the curriculum 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.

A candidate is evaluated as **outstanding** if the committee determines that the criteria for excellent are exceeded. The candidate's supporting materials demonstrate extensive involvement with mentoring, exceptional preparation and performance, and extensive direction of student work.

Service

In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must be evaluated as at least **good** in service. A candidate will be evaluated as **poor** if his or her service responsibilities have not been acceptably undertaken. A candidate will achieve a ranking of **fair** if he or she participates nominally in assigned committee and service duties.

A candidate will achieve a ranking of **good** if he or she responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

A candidate will be evaluated **very good** in service if he or she is considered effective in many of the following activities: rendering substantial service to colleagues; volunteering for departmental tasks beyond assigned committee responsibilities; rendering service at the

College or University level; rendering significant community service; participating in service activities in professional organizations.

A candidate who achieves most of the above criteria will be evaluated as **excellent**, and a candidate who achieves all of them will be evaluated as **outstanding**.

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 must have established a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization.

An evaluation of **poor** means that the candidate has produced an unsatisfactory dossier that casts doubt on his or her commitment to the field and likelihood for progress. An evaluation of **fair** means that the candidate's work is of moderate significance. An evaluation of **good** means that the candidate, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field.

An evaluation of **very good** means that the faculty member has begun to establish a national reputation as an emerging member in the field, who is beginning to make substantial and significant contributions to the discipline, and whose work is beginning to have an impact on the work of others in the field.

An evaluation of **excellent** means that the faculty member has established a solid national reputation as a leader in the field, has recently made substantial and significant contributions to the discipline, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The books, articles, and/or essays of the candidate judged as excellent are published in journals and by presses that are held in esteem by the profession, and the candidate judged as excellent has reviews and citations of his or her work attesting to this reputation.

An evaluation of **outstanding** means that the candidate has established a national or international reputation in the field, beyond

the standards of an evaluation as excellent. Evidence of an outstanding evaluation may include a significant number of references to and reviews of the candidate's publications; publications of distinguished books by university or trade presses and of a significant number of articles or creative writings in eminent national refereed scholarly journals, literary magazines, or electronic forums; key roles in significant editorial projects; and invitations to present keynote lectures or papers or to chair sessions at national or international meetings. The outstanding candidate may also submit additional evidence of professional activities, such as receiving extramural grants, serving as grant reviewer, being appointed to editorial or advisory boards of scholarly or creative journals, or refereeing manuscripts for leading presses or journals.

Instruction

An evaluation of **poor** or **fair** describes, respectively, an unacceptable and a minimally acceptable record of instruction.

A candidate is evaluated as **good** if the committee determines that his or her performance does not greatly exceed what could be described as adequate. Supporting material should give evidence of diligent preparation and pertinent, valid content.

A candidate is evaluated as **very good** if his or her performance is considered highly competent. Supporting material should include evidence of diligent preparation and a conscientious mentoring of students, as well as a commitment to enthusiastic, creative, and innovative pedagogy.

A candidate is evaluated as **excellent** if the committee determines that his or her teaching performance suggests exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work. The candidate may have won teaching awards, or have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction. Typically, the candidate's student evaluation numerical average meets or exceeds the departmental average. The candidate evaluated as excellent should demonstrate a commitment to advising

students, and should demonstrate an engagement with teaching and the curriculum 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 actively mentoring students, leading workshops, consultation, or producing pedagogical publications based upon his or her teaching prowess. The candidate evaluated as excellent has demonstrated 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.

A candidate is evaluated as **outstanding** if the committee determines that the criteria for excellent are exceeded. The candidate's supporting materials demonstrate extensive involvement with mentoring and exceptional preparation.

Service

A candidate will be evaluated as **poor** if his or her service responsibilities have not been acceptably undertaken. A candidate will achieve a ranking of **fair** if he or she participates nominally in assigned committee and service duties.

Service will be evaluated as **good** when a candidate serves conscientiously on committees at the Department, College, and/or University levels, and participates in professional associations.

Service will be evaluated as **very good** when a candidate demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the Department, College, and University levels as well as participating in professional associations. Such activities as chairing committees or serving as graduate director, undergraduate director, or writing director

illustrate leadership.

Service will be evaluated as **excellent** when a candidate meets all the standards of the very good ranking and in addition demonstrates strong participation and leadership outside the University. Significant and sustained community activities such as lectures, seminars, readings, or consulting illustrate service outside the University. So also does significant leadership in professional associations at the state, regional, national, or international levels.

Service will be evaluated as **outstanding** when a candidate meets all the standards of the excellent ranking and in addition demonstrates a sustained and forceful commitment to some particular aspect of service that results in innovation and growth that benefits the University or larger community.

PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

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 Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. 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 six 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.

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 faculty members. 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 Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall consist of all tenured associate professors and professors whose primary appointment is in the English Department. The 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 manuals on promotion and tenure for the Department of English and the College of Arts and Sciences. A subcommittee shall prepare an objective summary review of each candidate and make a recommendation 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. All members of

the subcommittee must be present for any vote that involves evaluation of candidates.

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

6. After due deliberations within the subcommittee on all the information in the official record of each candidate, subcommittee members shall prepare an objective summary report on the candidate's areas of professional development, instruction, and service. This report will be used by the members of the full committee as the basis for their own recommendations on the candidate. The subcommittee shall then vote on a positive or negative recommendation, and submit its report and majority recommendation and any minority recommendation to the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Each subcommittee member either shall sign the majority recommendation or submit a minority recommendation at the same time the subcommittee submits the majority recommendation.

7. For a candidate for the rank of associate professor, all tenured associate professors and professors either shall sign the majority recommendation or submit a minority recommendation. For a candidate for the rank of professor, all tenured professors either shall sign the majority recommendation or submit a minority recommendation. All appropriate faculty may submit individual minority recommendations on candidates.

8. At the end of all deliberations in the Department, the Chair of the Department shall hold a conference with each candidate to inform the candidate of the decision of the committee and of his or her own decision. At this time the Chair will also give the candidate a copy of the written evaluations of the Chair and the Departmental Advisory Subcommittee.

9. At the time prescribed by the College Manual, the Chair of the Department shall forward the departmental nomination on appropriate forms to the Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure, along with his or her own assessment of the candidate, and shall send copies to the Departmental Advisory Committee. The Chair shall forward to the Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure both the committee's and the Chair's recommendations.

10. Normally the Chair of the Department will make all nominations. A faculty member who has been evaluated according to the approved departmental procedures but whose name the Chair of the Department has not forwarded may himself or herself forward a self-nomination to the Chair of the Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Such self-nominations must be made on the standard form no later than the time prescribed in the College Manual. At the same time the candidate must send a copy to the Dean of the College and to the Chair of the Department.

11. The Chair of the Departmental Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure must forward the committee's recommendations to the Chair of the Department no later than the time prescribed by the Manual.

12. The Chair of the Department shall notify the Area Committee on Promotion and Tenure of his or her recommendations no later than the time prescribed in the College Manual, and shall forward each candidate's dossiers and supporting materials to that committee.

INFORMATIONAL APPENDIX

THIRD YEAR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

The Department of English reviews all faculty during their third year of employment. The purpose of this review, which assesses the faculty member's effectiveness in professional development, instruction, and service, is to ensure that junior faculty have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

While the faculty member under review should be familiar with the Department's promotion and tenure manual, and use the manual as a general guide for what to include in the dossier, it is important to remember that the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. While extremely important, the third-year review is more informal: it is meant to encourage an honest assessment of, and dialogue about, the faculty member's achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, he or she will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure.

PROCESS

1. By January 1 the Chair will ask third-year faculty in writing to prepare and submit, by the sixth week of Spring semester, a dossier for third-year promotion and tenure review.
2. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas

of professional development, instruction, and service, including such materials as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications/creative achievements, and evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. After due deliberations, Departmental Advisory Committee members shall prepare an objective summary report on the dossier and shall vote on a positive or negative recommendation.

4. The Chair shall hold a conference to inform the faculty member of how well he or she is progressing toward a positive promotion and tenure decision. The Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of the committee's written evaluation and a copy of his or her own independent report.

5. The Chair shall forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.