

# ENGLISH DEPARTMENT TIMELINE AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Approved by the English faculty on Sept. 17, 2003

AMENDED ON JANUARY 27, 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I. TIMELINE .....  | 1 |
| II. GUIDELINES FOR SOLICITING AND WRITING INDIVIDUAL REPORTS ..... | 2 |
| A. TEACHING .....  | 2 |
| 1. Process .....   | 2 |
| 2. Demeanor During Classroom Visits .....                          | 2 |
| 3. Organization of Written Reports .....                           | 2 |
| 4. Timing of Reports .....   | 2 |
| B. VALUE TO DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY .....              | 3 |
| 1. Process .....   | 3 |
| 2. Organization Of Written Reports .....                           | 3 |
| C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY .....  | 3 |
| 1. Process .....   | 3 |
| 2. Timely Submission Of Scholarship .....                          | 3 |
| 3. Organization of Written Reports .....                           | 3 |
| III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE .....                       | 4 |
| A. TEACHING .....  | 4 |
| 1. Assistant Professor II .....                                    | 4 |
| 2. Associate Professor With Tenure .....                           | 4 |
| 3. Full Professor .....  | 4 |
| B. VALUE TO THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY .....          | 5 |
| 1. Assistant Professor II .....                                    | 5 |
| 2. Associate Professor with Tenure .....                           | 5 |
| 3. Full Professor .....  | 5 |
| C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY .....  | 5 |
| 1. Evidence Criteria .....   | 6 |
| 2. Promotion Criteria .....  | 6 |
| 3. Categories of Evidence .....                                    | 7 |
| D. PROMOTION TO ADJUNCT ASSISTANT PROFESSOR .....                  | 8 |

## I. TIMELINE

The following deadlines are mandated by the Agreement 2002-2007 Between Rider University and the Rider University Chapter of The American Association of University Professors (Article VIII):

A candidate shall provide notice to the Department **by October 1** of his/her intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure; however, when possible, a candidate should inform the Department during the preceding academic year of his or her intent. The Personnel Committee is responsible for coordinating the appointment of classroom observers and encouraging prospective applicants to make scholarship available for review well before October of the application year and preferably during the preceding academic year. Because we support a review process that is ongoing and collaborative, prospective applicants for promotion are encouraged to share works in progress.

**By October 15** the candidate shall have submitted documented credentials (commonly called the "dossier") to the Department. [Note: In order to provide ample time for review, candidates are encouraged to submit dossiers well before the contractual October 15 deadline, preferably by September 15.] Everyone in the Department is responsible for reviewing the candidate's dossier with sufficient thoroughness to make an informed judgment of the candidate's qualifications based on the criteria specified in the Department guidelines. In the interests of fairness, openness, and collegiality, a Department member who, in the course of the review process, develops questions or desires clarification of some aspect of the dossier is encouraged to discuss these matters informally with the candidate at a mutually agreeable time and place.

**By November 15** the Department members shall have met to discuss the candidate's credentials. The candidate may choose to appear at this meeting (e.g., to make a brief statement or answer questions), but is not required to do so. Prior to this meeting, all teaching observations shall have been completed and all Department members shall have reviewed the candidate's dossier. Following discussion of the candidate's qualifications, each member of the Department shall state in writing his or her intention to support or not support the candidate. No member shall be permitted to reverse his or her stated position of support or non-support after this meeting. At the close of this meeting the Department shall elect the department representative to the Promotion and Tenure committee.

**Within three working days** those members of the Department who have voted with the majority and who have volunteered or been designated to provide substantive documentation of the candidate's credentials in one or more areas shall submit their written reports to the Department Representative. The Department Representative shall use these reports as source material to generate the Department majority report, which shall be approved at a meeting of those voting with the majority. Those not voting with the majority shall prepare their written reports.

**By November 15** those voting with the majority shall sign the Department report and a copy shall be given to the candidate. Those not voting with the majority shall give a signed minority report or reports to the candidate and to the other tenured and tenure-track members of the Department.

Subsequently, the candidate and the Department shall follow the procedures and timeline specified in the Agreement (Article VIII).

## II. GUIDELINES FOR SOLICITING AND WRITING INDIVIDUAL REPORTS

### A. TEACHING

#### 1. Process

Any full-time member of the Department is welcome to submit a teaching observation report on the candidate, but not everyone is required to do so. In order to ensure a properly documented case, the teaching of each candidate will be observed by at least three Department members; two of these observers will be selected by the Chair and one by the candidate. In addition to the required designee, the candidate may ask others to observe and submit reports. Each observer who has agreed to provide documentation in the teaching category will write a detailed report, focusing (as appropriate) on specific class observations(s) and/or other matters specified in the criteria for evaluating teaching (e.g., syllabi, assignments, course development).

#### 2. Demeanor During Classroom Visits

- a. The evaluator will notify the instructor 48 hours in advance of a forthcoming visit, unless the instructor has previously extended an open invitation to the faculty to make unannounced evaluation visits. If possible, the evaluator will notify the instructor 5 working days in advance of a forthcoming visit.
- b. The evaluator will be unobtrusive, arriving before the beginning of the class period and remaining until the class is dismissed.
- c. The evaluator will take notes recording observed behavior, together with comments on the significance of what is observed, and will give the instructor an opportunity to answer questions subsequent to the class.

#### 3. Organization of Written Reports

The report must describe the standards used in judging the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The report may take the form of a narrative account of the class, followed or accompanied by an evaluation referring specifically to Department criteria (defined in these guidelines) as appropriate to rank.

#### 4. Timing of Reports

The candidate should receive a draft of an observer's evaluation no later than 14 days after the observation occurs, but in no case later than October 10. In the event that the candidate wishes to discuss any details or questions in the evaluation he/she will have the right to schedule a conference with the observer at a mutually agreeable time. Copies of the final report shall be due 28 days after the observation occurs and shall be submitted to the candidate and the Personnel Committee at that time.

## B. VALUE TO DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY

### 1. Process

In order to ensure sufficient documentation in the value category, the following guidelines are established:

- a. Department members who are familiar with the quality and importance of the candidate's contributions in a particular area or areas and who are willing to contribute to the Department report shall inform the Personnel Committee of their intentions as soon as possible, preferably by the start of summer preceding the candidate's formal application.
- b. The candidate may request letters documenting his or her contributions from individuals inside and outside the Department.

### 2. Organization of Written Reports

Evaluators should refer specifically to Department criteria appropriate to rank.

## C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

### 1. Process

So that everyone will have ample time to review the scholarship portion of the dossier, the candidate is strongly encouraged to make his or her scholarship available (to the extent that this is possible) by the end of the spring semester prior to the application year. Any full-time member of the Department may submit a written evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. The Personnel Committee shall ensure that sufficient documentation is developed for purposes of compiling the Department report.

### 2. Timely Submission of Scholarship

- a. Individuals who plan to write substantive evaluations of some or all of the scholarship shall inform the Personnel Committee of their intentions as soon as possible, preferably by the start of the summer preceding the candidate's formal application.
- b. The candidate may request evaluations from individual members of the Department.
- c. The candidate may solicit letters from qualified readers outside the Department or University; such letters may become part of the candidate's record and may be used as source material for the Department report.

### 3. Organization of Written Reports

Written evaluations of scholarship are usually best organized so that all relevant comments on a particular piece are kept together. Evaluators should refer specifically to Department criteria appropriate to rank.

### III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

#### A. TEACHING

The English Department establishes the following standards for evaluating the teaching, value to the Department, College, and University, and scholarly activity of candidates for promotion to Assistant Professor II, Associate Professor with Tenure, and Full Professor.

##### 1. Assistant Professor II

A candidate for Assistant Professor II must demonstrate "satisfactory" teaching. By "satisfactory," the Department means that the instructor:

- a. shows command of the subject matter.
- b. conveys course material in ways students can understand.
- c. demonstrates respect and sensitivity when interacting with students.

##### 2. Associate Professor With Tenure

A candidate for Associate Professor with Tenure must demonstrate "effective" teaching. By "effective," the Department means that the candidate:

- a. shows a strong command of subject matter.
- b. conceives and organizes course material/assignments thoughtfully.
- c. shows effort to make class sessions and assignments stimulating.
- d. uses depth appropriate to class level.
- e. encourages students to take appropriate responsibility for their own learning.
- f. shows respect and sensitivity while interacting with students.

##### 3. Full Professor

A candidate for Full Professor must demonstrate "distinguished" teaching which is consistently "exemplary." By "distinguished" teaching the Department means that the candidate:

- a. shows a strong command of subject matter.
- b. conceives and organizes course material/assignments thoughtfully.
- c. shows effort to make class sessions and assignments stimulating.
- d. uses depth appropriate to class level.
- e. encourages students to take appropriate responsibility for their own learning.
- f. shows respect and sensitivity while interacting with students.
- g. shows serious effort to keep courses current, i.e., shows evidence of ongoing reflection on content and methods.

- h. actively engages in academic mentoring in response to perceived student needs at all levels.
- i. may contribute to the pedagogical life of the University. (optional)

## B. VALUE TO THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY

### 1. Assistant Professor II

- a. Willingness to teach courses the Department considers appropriate to the candidate's expertise
- b. Willingness to assist students outside the classroom
- c. Appropriate contributions to the life of the Department, Program, School, College, and/or University beyond the classroom and scholarly activities
- d. The ability to work well with colleagues

### 2. Associate Professor with Tenure

- a. Appropriate match between the candidate's abilities and interests and the goals of the Department, College and University
- b. Ability to teach a variety of courses
- c. Promise of continued devotion to strengthening and updating courses, curriculum, or University programs
- d. Demonstrated performance in assisting students outside the formal classroom
- e. Substantial service in student advising, student recruitment, and student retention activities
- f. Documented Department, AAUP, Program, or College or University committee service
- g. Helpfulness in the development of colleagues' scholarship and/or the improvement of their teaching

### 3. Full Professor

A candidate may document significant activity in appropriate professional organizations and must distinguish himself or herself by demonstrating "sustained and varied value" to the Department, College, and University through the following:

- a. meaningful service on Department committees
- b. active participation in Department projects
- c. meaningful service to the AAUP, in Programs, on College or University committees, or on special projects
- d. consistent willingness to share scholarship and pedagogical insights with colleagues.

## C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

The Department encourages candidates to pursue excellence rather than quantity in their scholarly activities. Thus, the Department will consider the magnitude and significance of the evidence in its evaluation of the candidate. Publication and/or public presentation as well as

well-developed preparatory drafts, proposals and/or notes and outlines of material may be considered.

1. Evidence Criteria

Recognizing every individual's right to pursue kinds of activity that satisfy his or her own intellectual interests, the Department will evaluate evidence of scholarly activity with respect to the following criteria, applied as appropriate to the work being judged:

- a. originality and/or creative intelligence
- b. soundness and cogency:
  - 1) adequacy of evidence
  - 2) validity of reasoning
  - 3) pertinence to conclusion
- c. depth and significance, revealing thorough knowledge of the context
- d. value to the Department, to Rider University, and to the larger scholarly community

2. Promotion Criteria

a. Assistant Professor II

- 1) The appropriate terminal qualification shall be the Ph.D., except for faculty whose field is creative writing, for whom the appropriate terminal qualification may be the MFA.
- 2) A candidate must show evidence of scholarly activity beyond graduate work, which may include work growing out of his or her dissertation.

b. Associate Professor with Tenure

- 1) The appropriate terminal qualification shall be the Ph.D., except for faculty whose field is creative writing, for whom the appropriate terminal qualification may be the MFA.
- 2) The Department looks for evidence of scholarly achievement in the candidate's field of specialization. Field of specialization will include the field for which the candidate was hired or upper-level major courses which the candidate regularly teaches. It may also include graduate field(s).
- 3) The Department expects an ability and commitment to continue to grow and develop in the future.
- 4) The Department expects that the candidate is in the process of establishing himself or herself as a scholar or writer in his or her field.

c. Full Professor

- 1) The Department looks for scholarship that is:
  - (a) ongoing
  - (b) mature
  - (c) distinguished
- 2) Scholarship should exhibit a pattern of growth with promise of continuing development.
- 3) Scholarship should be recognized beyond the institution as a contribution to the field.

3. Categories of Evidence

The kinds of evidence which a candidate for promotion submits to demonstrate his or her scholarly activity should be relevant and appropriate to his or her scholarly and pedagogical development. The preponderance of evidence must be from categories a and b.

a. Work demonstrating original scholarly or creative thought, such as the following:

- 1) writings or addresses setting forth original investigation or evaluation of facts, ideas, features, or theories associated with the content, form, style, origins, transmissions, cultural relations, historical context, or meaning and significance of "texts"—here understood to include drama and film as well as oral and written literature, whether fictive, theoretical, discursive, or persuasive
- 2) writings or addresses concerned with curriculum development, linguistics, or composition, in which the relevant texts are instances of language and/or writing not necessarily literary
- 3) original analyses of, or speculations about, methods of investigation, topics, problems, or possible results of productions in the candidate's field of study
- 4) historical, biographical, or comparative studies of scholarship in the candidate's field of study
- 5) original fiction, non-fiction prose, poetry, drama, film, and television scripts
- 6) scholarly editions of texts
- 7) essay review articles

b. Work demonstrating sound application of established scholarly thought and methods, such as the following:

- 1) textbooks in area of teaching and/or research
- 2) annotated bibliographies in area of teaching and/or research
- 3) proposals for grants, books, and other major projects containing substantial evidence of research
- 4) empirical studies, theoretical arguments, case studies, or analyses of intellectual principles concerned with teaching and learning in the candidate's field of study
- 5) main or primary editorial responsibilities for a periodical or for a special issue of a periodical
- 6) faculty development projects or special curricular programs relating to the candidate's field of study either at Rider or in the professional community (for example, National Endowment for the Humanities, Fulbright, or New Jersey state grants or fellowships)
- 7) scholarly awards or grants based on demonstrated competence in the candidate's field

c. Work such as the following:

- 1) refereeing materials for a periodical, for a conference panel, or for a publisher
- 2) consultantships relating to area of teaching and/or research
- 3) reviews
- 4) workshops, lectures and/or readings requiring scholarly, creative, or pedagogical competence



D. PROMOTION TO ADJUNCT ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

1. Teaching
  - a. candidate shows command of the subject matter
  - b. candidate conveys course material in ways students can understand
  - c. candidate demonstrates respect and sensitivity when interacting with students
2. Value
  - a. candidate makes contributions to Department, College or University committees or projects
  - b. candidate works well with colleagues
3. Scholarly and/or Professional Activity
  - a. candidate shows evidence of scholarly and/or appropriate professional activity

