

# Department of English

## Standards for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Date effective for use in Annual Evaluations: January 2012

Date effective for use in Pre-Tenure Review: March 2012

Date effective for use in the Tenure and Promotion process: July 2013

### Introduction

This document incorporates all of the rules and procedures detailed in the tenure and promotion policies for the College of Letters and Sciences, whether or not they are specifically cited or directly quoted below. However, it also contains policies that may be unique to the Department of English, including criteria that may exceed the minimal standards described in the college-wide document.

### Promotion and Tenure

#### Promotion and Tenure Procedures

- The Dean will provide to all faculty of the College a list of faculty members in the College eligible by Board of Regents policies for consideration for promotion and for tenure. The policies of the Board of Regents require that all members of the faculty in their final probationary year undergo a tenure review. Members of the faculty who have met the minimum time requirements for tenure, but who are not in the final probationary year, should consult with the department chair prior to reaching a decision on applying for tenure.
- Each eligible faculty member must notify the dean in writing of his/her intent to apply or withdraw from consideration for promotion or tenure by the deadline published in the Academic Affairs calendar.
- Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must submit to the Department Chair and to the Dean all materials to be considered in the review. (The specific materials required from the candidate are listed below.) The candidate is solely responsible for providing ample supporting evidence in the materials submitted for review by the published deadline. The application is sent forward to the Dean by the applicant with accompanying cover sheet.
- The Dean is responsible for maintaining the application file and for making it available to the department head, and to the departmental and College personnel committees.
- The applicant may withdraw his/her application from consideration at each subsequent step in the review by written notification to the appropriate administrator at the level of withdrawal. Withdrawal by a candidate in the final

probationary year will result in a notice of non-renewal of contract for the following academic year.

- Probationary credit awarded toward tenure at the time of hire may be used at the discretion of the candidate to meet length of service eligibility requirements. Candidates granted probationary credit toward tenure may use their actual service dates, and are therefore not required to accelerate their tenure applications due to the probationary credit.

Departmental Procedure:

- Academic departments should form personnel committees provided there are at least three tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve. Faculty members who are related to any candidate by blood or marriage, who are romantically involved, or have other major conflicts of interest are ineligible to serve.
- The department chair may not serve on the committee.
- Formation of department and College personnel committees occurs during Fall planning week each year.
- Departmental committee recommendations must be submitted to the candidate, department chairperson, and the Dean. In the absence of a departmental personnel committee, the chairperson has options of (a) appointing an ad hoc committee of tenured faculty to advise him or her with respect to the merits of the application, and (b) requesting individual recommendations in writing from faculty. All committee and administrative recommendations will be in writing and made available to the applicant.
- The department chairperson must submit to the Dean his or her recommendation including support or non-support of departmental committee action (when such a committee exists) and all materials concerning the departmental review of the application. The applicant will be informed in writing of the recommendation of the department chairperson at the time of transmittal of the recommendation to the College committee. All materials from the departmental review will be returned to the office of the Dean for review by the College committee.

College Level Procedure:

- The College Personnel Committee (CPC) is composed of the following membership: one faculty member from each department elected by the faculty of that department; two at-large faculty members appointed by the Dean to ensure a balance of professional viewpoints and expertise within the Review Committee. Faculty standing for election or appointment to this Committee must be tenured and may neither be under consideration for promotion nor related by blood or

marriage to any candidate under consideration for promotion or tenure. Individuals who may be dating, but not married, to any candidate under consideration, and same-sex partners of candidates are also prohibited from service on the CPC.

- Department chairs may not serve as a member of the CPC.
- The Dean will appoint the chair of this committee from its elected membership.
- The CPC will review all applications for promotion and tenure and be responsible for the following:
  1. Review of Board of Regents' criteria for tenure and promotion as recorded in Board policy and in correspondence from the Chancellor;
  2. Consideration of the College of Letters and Sciences tenure and promotion policies and *Standards of Excellence* as defined in this document;
  3. Consideration of appropriate departmental *Standards of Excellence*;
  4. Consideration of department chair and departmental faculty or committee recommendations; and
  5. Development of a formal recommendation to the Dean of support or non-support for the application.
- The recommendation of the CPC will include:
  1. The numerical vote of the committee, since the recommendation need not be unanimous (submission of a minority report is allowable).
  2. The rationale for the recommendation.
  3. Each committee member's signature.

The committee chairperson will forward a copy of this recommendation to the applicant.

- The CPC recommendation will be submitted to the Dean with all supporting materials.
- Candidates may elect to write a response to any decision and include any additional materials after a recommendation has been made at one level that will be considered by the next level of review. Previous decisions will not be reconsidered by the prior level of review.
- The Dean shall make his or her recommendation on the basis of the evaluation by the committee(s), by the department chairperson, and his or her own evaluation. The applicant will be informed in writing by the Dean of his or her recommendation, including the rationale for the recommendation. The Dean must submit in writing his or her recommendation to the Provost along with all

supporting materials. No materials may be added once the documents leave the College.

### **Promotion Eligibility**

1. University policy permits assistant professors to apply for promotion as early as their fifth year in rank. However, no special consideration will be given to candidates based on their overall time in rank, and candidates applying for promotion in the fifth year will be held to the same standards of accomplishment as those who have served in rank for six or seven years. Department chairs are responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an assistant professor should seek promotion. The assistant professor, while not required to follow that chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.
2. Faculty holding the rank of associate professor may stand for promotion to professor during their fifth year in rank, or later. Department chairs are responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an associate professor should seek promotion. The associate professor, while not required to follow that chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.

### **Areas of Review**

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly, or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

### **Criteria for Promotion**

Faculty must exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two of three areas (one must be teaching) as determined by departmental *Standards of Excellence*, consistent with the guidelines that follow. The necessary quantity and quality of such publication will be determined by departmental tenure and promotion standards, as well as the judgment of those faculty and administrators reviewing the promotion file. While members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee are expected to exercise their own independent judgment, they should also give due deference to departmental Standards of Excellence, and to the recommendations of the chair and members of the department in question.

The following general guidelines shall apply to appointment or promotion to academic ranks:

*Assistant Professor* – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor should be based upon demonstrated academic ability and potential for professional growth

*Associate Professor* – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon actual performance as well as demonstrated potential for further development while in residence at Columbus State University. There must be evidence that the individual is developing professionally and is contributing to his/her field, generally documented by peer-reviewed publication. Although not a sufficient condition for promotion, success in securing external research funding will also be considered as positive evidence of professional growth and development. In addition, a successful candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must document satisfactory service to his or her campus, community and/or profession. Associate Professor is a high academic rank and should carry no presumption of future promotion. Promotion to associate professor without a terminal degree will only be considered in exceptional cases such as having gained high distinction as a publishing scholar or creative artist, as defined by departmental Standards of Excellence.

*Professor* – As the highest academic rank, the title of Professor implies recognition of the individual by peers and associates as an outstanding teacher and an accomplished, productive and respected scholar or creative artist, both within and outside the university. The candidate must also have demonstrated, through a sustained record of scholarly publication, the ability to communicate to professional peers the knowledge and insights gained from the exploration of his/her area of specialization while in residence at Columbus State University. It is generally expected that he or she will have made important contributions in research or creative activity and/or success in securing external funding; university, public or professional service; and/or administrative service to professional societies. Peer review is critical, but the mode of the scholarly or creative production will be determined by the nature of the candidate's discipline, as defined by the department's Standards of Excellence.

### **Initial Appointment at Associate Professor or Professor**

Candidates may be offered initial appointment above the rank of Assistant Professor provided they meet the requirements (other than years of service) for promotion to the desired rank and the appointment is approved by the President, after considering the recommendations of the department, department chair, Dean, and Provost.

### **Tenure Eligibility**

1. University policy permits assistant professors to apply for tenure as early as their fifth year in rank (with the understanding that University rules limit them to only two attempts—see #5 below). However, no special consideration will be given to candidates based on their overall time in rank, and candidates applying for tenure in the fifth year will be held to the same standards of accomplishment as those who have served in rank for six or seven years. Department chairs are responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an assistant professor should seek tenure. The faculty member, while not required to follow the chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.

2. Probationary faculty members who do not receive a positive tenure decision by the end of their seventh year in rank will normally receive a terminal appointment, unless their tenure clock has been extended by prior written agreement of the Dean and Provost, with approval of the President.
3. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are employed full-time and who are appointed in tenure-track positions are eligible for tenure. The initial evaluation of a faculty member and recommendation for the award of tenure shall be the responsibility of the faculty member's department. Each department shall devise appropriate standards for such evaluation.
4. Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, or experience, may be considered for tenure. Terminal degrees must come from a university that is fully accredited or, in the absence of a system of accreditation, internationally recognized.
5. Candidates who are not successful in their first tenure application are limited to one additional application for tenure within the seven year probationary period. For this purpose, a review at the first level (department) is considered an application for tenure.

### **Areas of Review**

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly, or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

### **Criteria for Tenure**

Faculty must exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two areas (one must be teaching) as determined by departmental and College Standards of Excellence. The candidate's achievements must demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the university. The necessary quantity and quality of such publication will be determined by departmental tenure and promotion standards, as well as the judgment of those faculty and administrators reviewing the tenure file.

Possession of the foregoing qualifications does not entitle an individual to be awarded tenure. In tenure decisions, present and anticipated staffing needs of the department, College, and University are fully considered. Since the tenure decision involves factors which extend beyond determination of the competence, performance and promise of the faculty member under review, the failure to award tenure does not necessarily imply an unfavorable evaluation of the faculty member.

## **Tenure upon Appointment**

In exceptional cases, the president may approve an outstanding candidate for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment provided that:

- Tenure has been earned at another institution
- Candidate meets CSU's standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor
- Candidate brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution
- Due consideration has been given to the recommendations of the committees and administrators normally involved in the tenure approval process.

## **Pre-Tenure Review Policy**

### **Purpose**

The pre-tenure review is designed to assist a faculty member in preparing for the tenure process in a timely manner. The pre-tenure review should be more than merely an assessment of previous performance. It should include a professional development plan (PDP) prepared by the faculty member that defines his/her long range plans that will allow him/her to reasonably expect to earn tenure. The past performance of the faculty member and the PDP will be reviewed by a committee of the faculty member's peers and his/her annual evaluator for the purpose of identifying strengths and weaknesses and making suggestions for enhancement of those strengths and remediation of any weaknesses. This process is intended to develop and nurture eligible individuals and educate them about the tenure process and criteria early in their employment at Columbus State University. Participation in this process does not assure that tenure will be awarded.

### **Procedure:**

1. All probationary faculty (tenure-track faculty not yet awarded tenure) will undergo a pre-tenure review no later than the end of the spring term of the third year of employment at CSU. Faculty who have been awarded probationary credit toward tenure must undergo pre-tenure review at the end of the second year of employment with CSU.
2. During the first semester at CSU the faculty member, in consultation with his/her department chair will prepare a one-year PDP covering the first full calendar year designed to enhance the faculty member's eligibility for tenure as well as support the objectives of the department, the goals of the College, and the mission of the University.
3. This plan will provide the basis for the annual evaluation of the faculty member the following spring. The PDP will specify goals with a time frame for each,

- activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an ongoing evaluation plan. A copy of the PDP will be sent by the annual evaluator to the Dean for review and budgetary considerations. This process is repeated in years two and three.
4. In the third year (or second for those with probationary credit) pre-tenure review will follow the faculty member's annual evaluation for that year.
  5. The faculty member will prepare a portfolio in the same format required in the formal tenure process. This portfolio will include a description of accomplishments with appropriate documentation in the same format as the formal tenure process described in the Columbus State University Faculty Handbook and in this document.
  6. A Pre-Tenure Committee will be formed for each faculty member undergoing pre-tenure review. Each Pre-Tenure Review Committee shall be composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty from the department/College. One member of the committee should be selected from a department within the College to which the faculty member is not assigned. The committee and the committee chair will be selected by the faculty member and the department chair, and approved by the Dean.
  7. Materials submitted by the faculty member will be evaluated by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee. Using the Pre-Tenure Review Evaluation Form (<http://faculty.columbusstate.edu/handbooks/ftfac/forms/pre-tenure.pdf>), the committee will provide feedback in the form of recommendations to assist the candidate in preparation for tenure review. In addition, the committee will grade the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service using the following evaluations: *Satisfactory Progress* or *Unsatisfactory Progress*.
  8. The department chair will review materials and make a recommendation which provides an analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
  9. The assessment and review recommendations of the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be forwarded to the Dean with a copy of the Evaluation Form being sent to the faculty member and department chair.
  10. Following review of the portfolio and evaluation form, the Dean will indicate that he/she concurs or does not concur with the committee (*Satisfactory Progress* or *Unsatisfactory Progress*).
  11. If the Dean is aware of any proposed program/department changes that might prevent the granting of tenure to an otherwise qualified faculty member, it is incumbent upon him or her to notify the faculty member of that possibility.

At the conclusion of this process, all materials will be returned to the faculty member. The original evaluation by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be placed in the candidate's personnel file so that it is available to be used in the tenure process.

### **Post-Tenure Review Policy**

Each tenured faculty member will have a post-tenure review in the spring of every fifth year. That is, post-tenure review will occur five years after the last promotion or personnel action. To assure a meaningful and fair process, each evaluation should include review by the College Post Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) and a long-range professional development plan (typically five years). This process fosters each faculty member's professional growth, while making each faculty member accountable to his/her colleagues and the university's mission.

The results of post-tenure reviews must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements.

Administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. At such time as an administrator may return full-time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five year intervals. For the purposes of this rule, department chairs and interim department chairs who have served at least one year in that position will be considered administrators. No chair or interim chair will undergo post-tenure review while serving in that capacity.

### **Areas of Evaluation**

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly, or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

### **Criteria**

Faculty must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three areas as determined by departmental/College *Standards of Excellence*.

### **Procedure:**

1. The Dean will inform, in writing, twelve (12) months in advance, the faculty members scheduled the next spring for post-tenure review.

2. The faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, will create a five-year Professional Development Plan (PDP) specifying goals with a reasonable time frame for each; activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an on-going evaluation. This PDP will be evaluated annually by the faculty member's chair for monitoring of progress and/or for possible modification. Neutral party arbitration, by a mutually acceptable party, will be employed in those cases where a faculty member and a department chair cannot agree on a PDP.
3. The tenured faculty member shall submit a PDP and appropriate documentation of performance for review of both by the department chair and the CPTRC. Documentation for each faculty member should include a portfolio comprised of a current curriculum vitae, annual performance reviews for the years under consideration, a statement prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments, student and peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
4. The department chair will submit to the CPTRC an assessment of the faculty member which indicates whether his or her performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past five years. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
5. The CPTRC will review the materials and render a recommendation of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC may elect to include comments about the faculty member's, identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development. In the case of an unsatisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC will make recommendations about the faculty member's future professional development. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
6. The CPTRC recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department chair and the Dean.
7. The Dean will review the evaluations prepared by the department chair and the CPTRC and provide his or her own written assessment of candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations for merit pay and/or professional development costs. This written evaluation will be sent to the candidate, department chair and provost, and will be maintained in the candidate's permanent personnel files in the College and Academic Affairs.

**Outcome:**

Faculty will be given a satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating in each of the three primary areas of responsibility: teaching; research, scholarly or creative achievements; and service by the department chair and CPTRC. A satisfactory rating must be earned in all three areas to receive an overall satisfactory recommendation. In the event of a split recommendation by the department chair and CPTRC, the Dean will assign the overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating.

**Satisfactory Outcome:**

A satisfactory outcome will result in a post-tenure merit salary review. The satisfactory outcome and qualitative comments included in the post-tenure evaluation will serve as the basis for recommendations on merit pay increases, equity adjustments and professional development funding.

**Unsatisfactory Outcome:**

An unsatisfactory outcome in any of the three areas will require the creation of a revised PDP (RPDP). Working with the department chair, the faculty member will develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.

The RPDP must be approved by the department chair and submitted to the Dean for review and budgetary consideration. Faculty development funds should be allocated, as available, to address the areas in need of improvement. The candidate's progress on the RPDP must be noted at each annual review. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory outcome may not be recommended for merit pay increases or equity adjustments until performance has returned to satisfactory. The faculty member will resubmit documentation for Post-tenure Review until a satisfactory outcome is achieved.

**Retirement Exemption**

Faculty who submit a formal letter of intent to retire are exempted from Post-tenure Review if the official date of retirement is within three (3) years after the semester of scheduled review.

**Appeals:**

A faculty member who disagrees with an unsatisfactory post-tenure review may appeal:

- First, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the notification by the dean, to the University Post-Tenure Appeals Committee (UPTAC) that is composed of five faculty members drawn from a pool of tenured associate or full professors. Annually, the faculty of every college shall elect the

members of this pool with every college having the same number of representatives as their number of faculty senators. The Senate Executive Officer and the Provost shall randomly draw a seven-member panel from this pool with at least one faculty member from each college. The faculty member who is appealing will select any five (5) of the seven. Faculty members may not be a member of the UPTAC in the same year that they are scheduled to receive post-tenure review. Members of the UPTAC cannot have served on the CPTRC for the faculty member making the appeal. The UPTAC recommendation may concur with the recommendation or reverse it.

- Then, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the UPTAC notification, to the university president through the provost.

### **Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

As required by Board of Regents policies, the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated annually. The evaluation will take place by March 31 and will cover the performance of responsibilities from the previous calendar year.

It will be the responsibility of each faculty member to document his or her specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments, in a portfolio submitted to the department chair by February 15 of each year. Accomplishments will be reviewed by the department chair against the objectives established and approved by the faculty member and the department chair in the previous year's annual review meeting. Following review of the previous year's performance, goals should be established to serve as the basis for the following year's annual review.

In the annual review process, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member's performance as *satisfactory performance*, *unsatisfactory performance* and *excellent performance*.

The evaluation process will be as follows:

- The department chair will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will sign a statement indicating that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member may elect to respond in writing to the content of the evaluation. The response must be submitted within ten working days to the department chair and will be attached to the evaluation.
- The department chair will acknowledge in writing his/her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either

the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the records.

- The results of the evaluation will be reflected in recommendations by the evaluator for merit pay increases. Only faculty receiving ratings of satisfactory performance and excellent performance will be considered for merit pay increases.

### **Areas of Review**

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly, or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

### **Annual Evaluation Criteria**

All faculty in all disciplines will be evaluated in each of these components annually.

The criteria laid out in the College and departmental Standards of Excellence will be the predominant basis for evaluation of all faculty. Each department will establish Standards of Excellence, consistent with University and College criteria, to be used by its faculty as a guide to department-specific expectations related to annual, promotion, pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure evaluations.

### **Teaching**

As noted in the University tenure and promotion policy, Columbus State University remains committed to the pursuit of excellence in teaching. As such, particular attention is paid to faculty teaching performance, and excellent performance in research and service cannot compensate for less-than-satisfactory performance in teaching. Faculty members who have been granted a reduced teaching load for any authorized reason (e.g., administrative responsibilities) will not have that fact used against them in evaluations of their teaching performance, although they will still have to demonstrate teaching excellence to qualify for tenure and/or promotion.

At a minimum, the evaluation of teaching must include the following components: student evaluation of all courses taught, peer or administrative evaluation (as determined at departmental level), and faculty self-assessment. To allow full consideration of quality, creativity, differences in disciplines, delivery methods and workload, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of any of the following, if applicable:

Student Evaluations: Student evaluations in all courses taught; student comments and other student feedback; (courses with response rates less than 30% and with fewer than six students may be excluded from the evaluation of teaching). Department chairs may make appropriate comparisons to departmental and historical evaluations and consider

the relationship of student evaluations to grade distributions, and differences based on course level, e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate, required and elective courses.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include student evaluations which are judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance will include student evaluations which are judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

Peer Evaluations: Peer evaluations conducted by colleagues inside or outside the department, as specified by departmental policy. Peer evaluations are solicited by the candidate him/herself.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include peer evaluations which are judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance will include peer evaluations which are judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

For pre-tenure review, faculty must have a minimum of one peer evaluation of their teaching and one official evaluation by the assistant chairperson. These evaluations must be included in the portfolio.

For tenure and promotion, faculty must have a minimum of two peer evaluations of their teaching. These evaluations must be included in the portfolio. The evaluation by the assistant chairperson that was completed prior to pre-tenure review should be included as well.

Teaching Load: Number of preparations; new preparations; new course developments; new delivery methods.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include documentation of multiple course preparations in a given year, the occasional preparation or development of new courses, the adoption of new delivery methods, or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance will include a consistent record of multiple course preparations, regular preparation or development of new courses, the adoption of multiple new delivery methods, or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

Pedagogy: Evidence of innovative course or updated content development, teaching materials, and instructional techniques; experiential learning opportunities; international education activities; direction of student research.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include a documented commitment to updating courses as necessary, regular review of teaching materials and instructional techniques, efforts to assess and document student learning in courses, provision of experiential learning opportunities, direction of student research, or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance will include innovation in course delivery or development of course content, documented evidence of student learning in courses, direction or development of international education initiatives, frequent direction of student research, or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

Advising, Mentoring, Recruitment of Students: Advising logs; recruitment activity/success; orientation and visitation; mentorships, job referrals and internships; undergraduate or graduate research.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include participation in student advising as directed by the department chair, assisting with job referrals and internships, or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance will include taking on an unusually high advising load relative to other members of the department; participation in orientation and visitation activities; multiple mentorships, job referrals, or internships; frequent direction of student research; or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

Faculty Development Activities in Teaching: Teaching seminars and workshops; training or research related to alternative delivery methods; pedagogical enhancements; and maintaining currency in teaching field.

Evidence of satisfactory performance will include activities in this area judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellence performance will include activities in this area judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

Department chairs should also consider unusual grade distributions, high attrition rates, class cancellations and faculty availability to students and colleagues.

Faculty members may provide other measures of teaching effectiveness such as teaching awards, evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments, and securing grants for curriculum development. Materials presented as evidence of teaching effectiveness will be most informative if they demonstrate professional growth and improvement over time. The department chair will evaluate the above areas of teaching

effectiveness allowing for varying emphases on the components to reflect differences in load, discipline and circumstances. The areas are not necessarily equally weighted.

For the purposes of evaluations regarding tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (as opposed to annual evaluations), those colleagues and administrators involved in the evaluation process will consider the totality of the candidate's performance during the relevant time period when making their assessments. Using their best professional judgment, they will determine the appropriate weight to be given to each of the criteria above, and to all other documentation provided by the candidate.

### **Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity**

Productivity standards may vary by workload and area of primary teaching responsibility. At a minimum, departmental standards must require evidence that a faculty member's work includes some externally validated research, scholarly, and/or creative work. Faculty should provide evidence of all scholarly, research, and creative activities in the annual portfolio. All scholarly activities may be included and will be considered within the context of the university's mission. Greater weight will be placed on peer-reviewed publications (or the equivalent—see below).

Evidence of satisfactory performance in this area for the annual review will include all efforts to remain active in the area of research and creative activity, including papers presented at conferences, manuscripts submitted for review, invited research presentations delivered, or performance otherwise judged by the chair and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance in this area for the annual review will include the publication of peer-reviewed scholarship (or the equivalent—see below); the receipt of a significant competitive external grant related to the faculty member's academic discipline; manuscripts submitted for review; or performance otherwise judged by the chair and/or Dean to be excellent.

Evidence of satisfactory performance in this area for tenure and promotion will typically include single- or co-authored articles in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent—see appendix).

Evidence of excellent performance in this area for tenure and promotion will typically include 3 single- or co-authored articles published or forthcoming in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent—see appendix).

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to demonstrate the value and validity of scholarly work.

Candidates for tenure and promotion must also include a minimum of one outside letter of support from a colleague in his or her field from another institution who can attest to

the scholarly contributions of the candidate. Candidates will solicit these letters themselves.

The guidelines presented here represent the minimum professional development expectations. Faculty should be aware that meeting the minimum expectations may not be sufficient for the award of tenure.

### **Evaluation of Service**

Faculty are expected to be available to students and colleagues, accept appropriate committee assignments, and actively participate in departmental, college, university and university system activities.

Service activities are designed to contribute to the professional development of the faculty member and to the enhancement of the department, college, university, and academic and local communities. In the annual portfolio, service should be identified as service to the institution (college, university, and university system), profession or community. Each entry should include how the faculty member contributed to the advancement of the college/university mission.

#### Institutional Service

Faculty members are expected to participate in the internal affairs and governance of the department, college, university, and university system. Such activities include committee work, assigned administrative duties, special departmental projects and activities, and consultation with, and assistance to, college-related outreach units.

Evidence of satisfactory performance in this area will include regular and meritorious participation on department, College, or University committees; successful completion of administrative duties; or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance in this area will generally include leadership roles on important department, College, and/or University committees; successful completion of work-intensive administrative duties (such as department chair); assistance in outreach efforts at the College or University level; or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

#### Professional Service

Academic service activities may include serving as a reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; serving as a member of an editorial review board; and editing conference proceedings. Holding key leadership roles in national, regional, or local organizations is evidence of professional service activity. Departments should identify appropriate, discipline-specific organizations that are consistent with the faculty member's performance objectives.

Evidence of satisfactory performance in this area could include service as a reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; reviewing a manuscript for a journal or book publisher; or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance in this area could generally include holding leadership roles in national, regional, or local professional organizations; editing conference proceedings; serving as a member of an editorial board; or performance otherwise judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

### Community Service

Service to the local community forges and enhances partnerships between the community and Columbus State University. The application of faculty professional expertise to enhance the local community is encouraged. Community service includes active contributing memberships in area organizations, committee membership/chairperson, board of directors or equivalent, professional services such as speeches, continuing education programs presented, and consulting (both with and without remuneration). Community service consistent with the University's mission. The primary motivation for community service should be the enhancement of the Columbus State University community.

Evidence of satisfactory performance in this area will include performance judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be generally satisfactory.

Evidence of excellent performance in this area will include performance judged by the department committee, chair, and/or Dean to be exemplary.

For the purposes of evaluations regarding tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (as opposed to annual evaluations), those colleagues and administrators involved in the evaluation process will consider the totality of the candidate's performance during the relevant time period when making their assessments. Using their best professional judgment, they will determine the appropriate weight to be given to each of the criteria above, and to all other documentation provided by the candidate.

### **Guidelines for Submitting the Candidate's Dossier for Pre-Tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**

Beginning at the point of pre-tenure review (or at the point of promotion or post-tenure review, for those who are hired with tenure), each faculty member should prepare and maintain a portfolio to be presented to the appropriate committees and administrators at the appropriate time. Assistant Professors, Associate Professors seeking promotion, and untenured faculty members on the tenure track should include labeled tabs for each of the items below, even if some of those tabs will be empty at various times (e.g., candidates for pre-tenure review will not have an entry for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter).

*The faculty member's portfolio will only be accepted by the Dean's office if it includes each of the relevant categories in the order provided below.*

1. **Table of Contents** with page numbers accurately conveying the location of each piece of information listed below.
  2. **Cover Sheet** with signature of candidate and department chair.
  3. **Letter of Application** for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. This is an opportunity for the candidate to summarize the case in his/her favor.
  4. **Departmental Standards of Excellence**
  5. **Department Committee's Recommendation** (where relevant).
  6. **Department Chair's Recommendation.**
  7. **College T&P Committee's Recommendation** including the necessary signature pages (where relevant).
  8. **Dean's Recommendation.**
  9. **Curriculum Vitae** (current).
- The format for the CV can be found at:  
<http://faculty.columbusstate.edu/handbooks/ftfac/appendixia.php>
10. **Candidate's Offer Letter or Most Recent Letter Granting Promotion and/or Tenure** (for untenured faculty, the offer letter is needed to verify eligibility for and/or credit toward tenure).
  11. **Annual Evaluations** (complete set since appointment, tenure, promotion, or last post-tenure review, where relevant).
  12. **Letters of Recommendation** from colleagues in or out of the unit. As noted above, candidates for tenure and promotion must also include a minimum of one outside letter of support from a colleague in his or her field from another institution who can attest to the scholarly contributions of the candidate. Candidates will solicit these letters themselves.
  13. **Evidence Regarding Teaching Performance**  
All evidence regarding teaching performance (except student evaluations and learning assessments) should be included here, including self-statement (optional), peer evaluations, representative syllabi, etc.

As noted above, the pre-tenure review portfolio must include a minimum of one peer evaluation and one official evaluation by the assistant chairperson.

The tenure and promotion portfolio must include a minimum of two peer evaluations. The evaluation by the assistant chairperson that was completed prior to pre-tenure review should be included as well.

14. **Summaries of Course Evaluations** including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action. Regardless of when the last successful personnel action occurred, this section should include no less than three years' worth of data.

15. **Evidence Regarding Assessments of Student Learning.** Each faculty member will provide a statement regarding their efforts to measure student learning outcomes and/or their participation in departmental efforts to assess program outcomes.

16. **Evidence Regarding Research and Creative Performance**

All evidence regarding scholarship, including self-statement (optional). Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor should include work published prior to appointment and all work published since appointment. Tenured faculty seeking promotion to full professor or those undergoing post-tenure review should include all work published since their last successful personnel action.

17. **Evidence Regarding Campus, Professional, and Community Service** including self-statement (optional). Evidence provided should follow the order above: 1) campus service; 2) professional service; 3) community service.

**Full-time, non-tenure track faculty**

University policy is as follows: Because some non-tenure track faculty holding academic rank teach and some do not, they will be evaluated on the same departmental standards as tenure-track faculty depending on the duties of the non-tenure track position. The criteria for evaluation should be solely determined by individual departmental standards of excellence.

To carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction, universities may appoint instructional staff members to the position of lecturer. Lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure. Reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. The reappointment process must follow procedures outlined by the institution (BOR Minutes, February 2007) and the criteria for annual evaluation should be solely determined by individual departmental standards of excellence.

The title of senior lecturer may be used at the discretion of institutions that employ lecturers. Institutions are discouraged from initial hiring at the senior lecturer level. Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six (6) years at the employing

institution may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer if the institution has adopted this title and has clearly stated promotion criteria at the departmental level.

Promotion to senior lecturer requires approval by the president. Reappointment procedures for senior lecturers follow the same reappointment procedures as those for lecturers. Senior lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure (BOR Minutes, August 2002).<sup>1</sup>

Full-time, non-tenure track faculty who have been hired at the rank of assistant professor are also eligible for promotion. If a faculty member has the terminal degree or the equivalent (see Faculty Handbook §107.1) and has completed the necessary years of service at rank (see Faculty Handbook § 107.2), he or she may stand for promotion.

Non-tenure track assistant professors and lecturers must inform the department chairperson of the intention to stand for promotion by the time of the annual review interview. Candidates will be evaluated based on the criteria for teaching excellence outlined above, and they should also have a strong record of service and faculty development.

### **Collegiality**

Members of the Department of English will be productive, constructive, and professional in their relationships with other faculty members.

---

<sup>1</sup> These policies were approved by the Faculty Senate in 2011.

## Appendix

### Suggested Equivalencies:

(These equivalencies should serve as guidelines and not be considered absolute).

**1 chapter in an edited volume of essays that is peer-reviewed and is published by a respected academic or university press** is equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**1 short story published in a respected journal (either print or online) with an internal screening process** is equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**1 creative nonfiction essay published in a respected journal (either print or online) with an internal screening process** is equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**3-5 poems published in a respected journal (either print or online) with an internal screening process** are equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**1 short play that receives a public performance in an academic or professional venue** is equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**1 short screenplay filmed by a professional filmmaker** is equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**3 or more book reviews in peer-reviewed journals** are equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article. Please note: book reviews, regardless of how many are written above the minimum number, will only ever serve as the equivalent of 1 article. They may not be counted as more than one publication.

**3 articles of substantial length in a peer-reviewed encyclopedia** are equivalent to 1 peer-reviewed journal article.

**1 edited volume of essays that lists the candidate as a lead author, is peer-reviewed, and is published by a respected academic or university press** is equivalent to 2 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 edited volume of essays that lists the candidate as a lead author, includes an essay by the candidate, is peer-reviewed, and is published by a respected academic or university press** is equivalent to 3 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 full-length play that receives a public performance in an academic or professional venue** is equivalent to 3 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 full-length screenplay filmed by a professional filmmaker** is equivalent to 3 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 single- or co-authored pedagogical textbook that is peer-reviewed and is published by a respected academic press** is equivalent to 3 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 single- or co-authored book that is peer-reviewed and is published by a respected academic or university press** is equivalent to 4 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 novel or full-length collection of short stories that is published by a respected press with a detailed screening process** is equivalent to 4 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 full-length book of poetry that is published by a respected press with a detailed screening process** is equivalent to 4 peer-reviewed journal articles.

**1 book-length scholarly edition of a text that includes original material, is peer-reviewed, and is published by a respected academic or university press** is equivalent to 4 peer-reviewed journal articles.