Supplemental Materials: Providing Effective Policies

1. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Productivity Indicators, Department of Human Development

The Human Development Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (T&P) Committee of 1999-2000 developed these guidelines. Periodically, the T&P Committee will update these guidelines in consultation with the department head. The guidelines serve several purposes. First, they represent a general framework that should help new faculty develop their plan of work and prepare them for success when they are evaluated for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Second, this information should provide an equally helpful roadmap for more established faculty as they prepare for promotion to professor and continued scholarly productivity.

While we recognize that professional competence can take several forms, we agree that faculty must show both productivity and quality in core areas. All faculty should have an observable program of research (i.e., a body of work that is integrated and shows progressive development with regard to sophisticated use of research methods, theory, and plans for dissemination). Because Virginia Tech is a land-grant, Carnegie Foundation Research Extensive institution, instruction, research and outreach are the domains in which faculty are to work. All three domains apply to all faculty in the department.

The "numbers vs. quality" dialectic can be troublesome in our promotion system. The table below contains numbers throughout. However, implicit throughout these guidelines is the principle that faculty must demonstrate quality in their work. For example, supervising a large number of graduate student committees does not speak to how well the faculty member supervised the students. Consequently, faculty must provide evidence of quality performance in addition to the breadth and intensity of participation in activities of the profession. One important indication of quality, for example, is publication in first-tier journals. Another is awards received. Still another is the faculty member's ability to secure funding and to publish from funded work. The quality issue is also addressed in the Virginia Tech T&P guidelines, which state, "Original achievements in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods should be regarded more highly than work making minor variations in or repeating familiar themes in the literature or the candidate's previous work." (See the *Faculty Handbook* at www.provost.vt.edu.)

The guidelines below are not intended to be markers for "checking squares." Although certain performance numbers might be achieved, in the absence of quality these numbers would not insure a successful reappointment, tenure, or promotion decision. A reasonable interpretation of these indicators is to view them as minimum expectations. Faculty members should have a solid combination of indicators at each stage to increase their success at that stage. Questions one should consider in assessing the quality of one's work include:

- Does the work advance the field?
- Does the work reflect increasing professional competence?

- Does the work reflect standards of excellence in research, theory, teaching, and practice?
- Does one's profession, through its periodicals and other information outlets, recognize the merits of the work?
- Is the work valued by other reputable professionals, as evidenced by peer review, application and/or citation of the work, awards, or other recognitions?

If faculty members are not sure about how to assess the quality or the quantity of their work they should discuss this issue with the department head and senior faculty.

Questions often arise how "outstanding" one must be across the domains of instruction, research, and service/outreach. For tenure/promotion to associate professor, candidates must demonstrate **outstanding** accomplishment **in at least one** of the three domains, preferably that pertaining to research productivity. For promotion to professor, candidates must demonstrate **outstanding** accomplishment **in at least two** of the three domains, one of which must be research, scholarship or creative achievement broadly defined as appropriate to one's disciplines, and reflecting the faculty member's assignment.

Because our university places a high value on scholarly publications, it is worth elaborating how different types of publications are viewed. "Articles" means publications in refereed scientific journals, at least some of which should have high standing in the field (based, for example, on low acceptance rate and high SSCI rankings). Articles in lower-ranked journals and non-refereed book chapters are still valued, but are not equal to those in the top tier. Evaluation of the contribution of textbooks and scholarly books is based on adoptions, reviews, and other evidence of reputation; these do not substitute, however, for refereed articles in high-ranked journals.

Faculty in Human Development are expected to have an ongoing program of research that results in ongoing contributions to refereed periodicals. While we value multiple-authored published articles, in that they indicate one's ability to collaborate with others, it is important that faculty are sole author or senior author on a sufficient number of articles to indicate the ability to play a leadership role. In multiple authored publications, it is also important that faculty working with others clarify their unique contributions, indicating where their work begins and ends *vis-à-vis* that of their collaborators. This is necessary because the tenure and promotion committee will evaluate each faculty member's unique contributions and scholarly leadership. This expectation is important for all faculty, but is greatest for those moving from associate professor to professor.

The attached table provides multiple productivity criteria that represent reasonable expectations for faculty at each stage of the tenure and promotion ladder. We hope that this narrative and table help Human Development faculty survive and thrive here at Virginia Tech.

Latest revision by HD Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Committee with non-substantive edits by the Department Head, 5/7/04.

Area of Productivity	Level of Review			
	2-Year	**4-Year**	**Tenure/Associate**	**Professor**
Instruction	1. Clear, up to date syllabi 2. Satisfactory student evaluations 3. Advisor to undergraduate students (or graduate students in Northern Virginia) 4. Participation in teaching enhancement workshops (e.g., CEUT) 5. Satisfactory peer review of several courses each year	1. Items 1-5 (under 2-yr column) 2. Co-chaired MS/PhD committees 3. Taught a variety of courses (both undergraduate and graduate levels where possible)	1. Items 1-3 (under 4-yr column) 2. Directed theses/ dissertations 3. Satisfactory reviews by external scholars	1. All items previously mentioned 2. Evidence of mentorship role 3. Leadership in course/ curriculum development 4. Accomplishments of former students and advisees (with clear statement about your specific contribution)

Research	1. Specific plan for a focused research agenda 2. 2 empirical articles under review (including from dissertation) 3. 1 national presentation (given or scheduled) 4. Appropriate use of any start-up funds, with evidence of the results (e.g., professional development activities, research activities)	1. Evidence of movement toward a focused research agenda (e.g., interconnected presentations and publications, presentations and publications related to dimensions of an underlying construct or area of study) 2. 5 articles published/in press 3. 2-4 articles under review 4. 4 national presentations (given or scheduled) 5. State/Regional presentations 6. Internal grant submitted	1. Evidence of a focused research agenda 2. 10-15 articles published/in press 3. 3-5 additional articles under review 4. 6 national presentations (given or scheduled) 5. State/Regional presentations 6. External grant submitted 7. Satisfactory reviews by external scholars 8. Indication of your leadership role in multiple authored publications	1. Evidence of a focused research agenda 2. National and international reputation 3. 12-15 additional articles published/in press 4. Scholarly book 5. 6 additional national presentations 6. State/Regional presentations 7. Record of consistency in submitting external grant proposals 8. PI status on externally funded research grant(s) 9. Excellent reviews by external scholars

Service/Outreach	1. Active service on at least 2 department or college governance committees	1. Active service on at least 2 department committees 2. Active service on at least 1 college or university committee 3. Presentations to community groups 4. Participation in professional organizations (e.g., review abstracts & journal articles; committee membership) 5. Delivery of Extension program(s)	1. Items 1-5 (under 4-yr column) 2. Satisfactory reviews by external scholars	1. All items previously mentioned 2. Provides guidance for junior faculty 3. Leadership in professional organizations (e.g., chaired committee, held office) 4. Continued activity in university service (departmental, college, and university)

*   *The indicators do not provide a minimal list which, if satisfied, ensures tenure or promotion.*
** *For tenure/promotion to associate professor, candidates must demonstrate **outstanding** accomplishment in at least **one** of the three domains.*
*** *For promotion to professor, candidates must demonstrate **outstanding** accomplishment in at least **two** of the three domains.*

2. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures, Department of English

Principles

Tenure protects academic freedom by discouraging faculty evaluations based on arbitrary or political criteria. It therefore encourages ambitious inquiry, creative scholarship, and innovative teaching that may challenge current paradigms of thought. Universities and society as a whole benefit from innovative and boundary-breaking inquiry and teaching.

Because of the job security that tenure offers as a condition of academic freedom, universities have a responsibility to evaluate candidates for tenure according to their potential for significant future inquiry or creative scholarship, teaching, service, outreach, and contributions to diversity. By granting tenure, the university promises that the candidate will not have to avoid important but controversial work for fear of consequences. In granting tenure, protection, and job security, the university hopes to benefit from the kinds of inquiry and creative scholarship that provide new knowledge as well as the teaching, service, outreach, and contributions to diversity that improve the discipline and society as a whole.

The awarding of tenure is based on an interpretive act: a prediction that the candidate is likely to continue to do the kind of intellectual work that may require the protection of tenure. The best evidence for this claim of future promise is work completed, especially as this work points to continuing, comparable work. Work completed includes research and publication, teaching, service, outreach, and contributions to diversity.

At the point of hiring, the department makes a preliminary judgment that the candidate will likely succeed in a future application for tenure and promotion. The department commits to providing opportunities and support for all pre-tenure faculty, including feedback on annual evaluations and at contract renewal in the second and fourth years of the pre-tenure period, a mentoring program, travel support when the budget permits, and appropriate teaching assignments. The department makes an investment in the success of its pre-tenure faculty. Pre-tenure faculty members bear responsibility for understanding departmental expectations for promotion and tenure and for meeting those expectations.

Consistent with the principles of academic freedom, the department respects minority opinions, dissent from professional orthodoxies, and honest and civil disagreement with administrative actions.

Virginia Tech's Perspectives on Tenure: 2006–2007

Information on tenure eligibility, terms of the probationary period, stopping the tenure clock, guidelines for calculation of prior service, evaluation procedures, guidelines for tenure dossiers, and appeal procedures appear in the *Faculty Handbook,* section 2.8 (available at www.provost.vt.edu).

The Commission on Faculty Affairs passed a resolution in spring 2007, "Annual and Pre-tenure Faculty Evaluations," that modifies parts of section 2.8. Among other modifications, it requires departments to define the bases for evaluation and merit salary adjustments as well as pre-tenure review procedures.

In September 2006, Provost Mark McNamee hosted a university-wide workshop in which he made these points, among others:

- The university values research, teaching, service, outreach, and contributions to diversity. The university expects effectiveness in all areas.

- Expectations increase every year. The university aspires to be a better university.
- It is simplistic to quantify expectations for tenure. Rather, departments should define the "initially plausible case" for tenure.

A podcast of the presentations by the provost and others is available at www.provost.vt.edu.
The *Faculty Handbook* describes expectations for tenure as follows (section 2.8.4):

> The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in an area of learning and the prediction of eminence throughout the individual's professional career. The documentation and evaluation should recognize some significant impact of the candidate's contributions beyond the borders of the university. If the primary strength is in instruction, there should be recognition that the candidate's pedagogical contributions have influence beyond the immediate classroom; if in research, that there is significant impression on colleagues nationally; if in outreach that the influence of the contributions reaches beyond the immediate clientele.

Expectations in the Department of English

The department considers the university and college guidelines and norms, standards set by faculty within the department, expectations at peer institutions, and guidelines of professional associations, such as the Modern Language Association, for defining expectations for tenure in English. Each candidate must demonstrate effectiveness in all the areas of evaluation: research or creative scholarship, teaching, service, outreach, and contributions to diversity. Each case will vary somewhat in the proportional strength of the areas. The descriptions of expectations that follow are guidelines more than rules; each tenure case is unique and must be interpreted on its own merits. The guidelines should help candidates understand how their dossiers will be interpreted and evaluated both within the university and by external reviewers.

In addition to these demonstrations of effectiveness in the various areas of the university's mission, faculty are expected to adhere to the standards of conduct and ethical behavior as stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.7.1) and in the "Principles of Community," *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.7.2).

Research or Creative Scholarship

Evidence of effectiveness in research or creative scholarship consists primarily of publication. Evidence should include conference presentations or readings of creative work and grant applications. Although quantifying the expectations would be misleading, the expectation is that the publication record will be substantial. The two-course teaching load per semester should allow substantial time for research, and publication should be commensurate. (The university defines full-time teaching as four courses per semester; the two-course assignment reflects a reduction for research.) In addition, the trajectory of publication should indicate future productivity. Both the candidate who peaks in the first year or two and then produces little and the candidate who offers a pre-tenure spurt will have a harder time making their case for tenure than the candidate with the same amount of published work who seems to work steadily. There can be good reasons for variations in publication patterns, but the evidence overall should point to ongoing research or creative scholarship after tenure is awarded.

Because external reviewers of the tenure and promotion application will receive and review only research or creative scholarship, pre-tenure faculty should be especially diligent to demonstrate effectiveness in this area of evaluation.

Principles for evaluating publication

- Published work must have some impact beyond this particular university and be recognized as having merit by others in the field. It should appear in national or international peer-reviewed journals and be offered by publishers with good reputations. Peer review during manuscript selection is a significant measure of the merit of the work.
- Published work should present a coherent and sustainable research or creative scholarship agenda. The pre-tenure candidate begins to establish his or her research or creative identity and area of expertise. Coherence might be established by a group of articles on a related topic and/or by the sustained inquiry of a book. The body of published work does not need to be limited by a single topic or genre, but it should enable colleagues and external reviewers to define the candidate's specialization within a field.
- The publications should include work by the candidate as primary author.

What "counts" as publication?

No one type of publication guarantees tenure, nor does tenure depend exclusively on the single-authored book, the traditional standard for tenure and promotion in English departments. The following comments about different types of publication are meant to suggest how these publications might be evaluated. The department avoids absolute claims, such as "textbooks don't count," but rather encourages candidates to think of the implications of any choice about publication.

Every candidate's package will be unique. In addition to individual differences, the specializations within English have their own priorities and forums. A candidate in professional writing, for example, may be more likely to publish with a commercial press with academic titles, such as Erlbaum, Baywood, Hampton, Heinemann, or Wiley, than with a university press. The examples that follow are some of the publications that might be part of a package making a case for tenure and promotion.

- *Single-authored book.* The English Department at Virginia Tech continues to value single-authored books from university or other presses respected in the academic world, even as it recognizes, with the Modern Language Association, that university presses are publishing fewer books in the humanities and that other forms of inquiry and publication have merit. The scholarly book makes a substantial case for the candidate's ability to frame a significant research question and sustain an inquiry and for recognition of merit beyond the university. Likewise, fiction, poetry, nonfiction, or drama from a major press demonstrates a high level of achievement and recognition. Department and external reviewers will assess the quality and significance of the work, including published reviews. Especially if the book is a minimal revision of the dissertation, the tenure and promotion dossier will be stronger if it also includes some evidence of the next major research project, such as articles establishing a continuing inquiry or evidence of progress toward a second book. Successful candidates for tenure in the English Department at Virginia Tech over the past decade have not all had single-authored books, but the strongest cases for candidates in the academic and creative areas have included them.

- *Chapbooks, selections in literary magazines, books.* These types of publications are expected for faculty in creative writing. As in the academic areas of English, the reputation of the press or magazine and reviews of the work will help to establish the merit of the work.
- *Journal articles.* Peer-reviewed research articles provide excellent evidence of the candidate's ability to conduct research and of recognition beyond the university. As the 2006 report of the MLA task force on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion observes, "Scholarly journals … provide a forum for new ideas and research and for a timely exchange of argument" (p. 40). The ranking of the journal helps to establish the value of the article. The tenure dossier requires candidates to provide acceptance rates for the journal, with lower rates generally establishing greater selectivity and reputation. Candidates should consult with the experts in their specialization to help evaluate the quality of the journals in the field. Candidates who build their cases primarily on journal articles should offer approximately the equivalent to a book in quantity and quality.
- *Book chapters.* A book chapter may be a credible part of a tenure package especially if it has been peer-reviewed before acceptance and if the book is published by a respected press.
- *Critical editions.* Scholarly editions demonstrate research as the editor examines textual variations, makes choices based on sound bibliographic principles, and provides an introduction and textual apparatus. Depending on the scope and significance of the work and its relationship to probable future work, such a publication could serve as the primary evidence that the candidate meets the department's expectations in research.
- *Collaborative work.* The department recognizes the value of collaboration and even encourages it in some areas. However, the candidate must be able to identify his or her particular contribution to the collaboration and should either be able to demonstrate leadership in some of the collaboration or offer some separate, independent work to establish ability to carry out research projects. The tenure and promotion supplemental materials include a statement from the collaborator(s) about the candidate's contributions.
- *Edited collections.* Edited collections can strengthen a case for tenure and promotion, but a strong case for tenure and promotion will include evidence of the candidate's ability to produce independent research or creative scholarship as well as to define an area for inquiry and to collect the work of others.
- *Articles, chapters, and books on pedagogy.* Virginia Tech values the scholarship of teaching and publication about pedagogy, especially as that publication results from research and if the candidate's research specialization is pedagogy. As with other publication, the reputation of the publisher, peer review, and evidence of impact on the field can enhance the status of such publication.
- *Textbooks.* Textbooks are often considered to compile knowledge developed by others and are usually not the place where a writer first publishes original research. However, the textbook may be considered as contributing to the case for tenure, especially in rhetoric and professional writing, which have strong pedagogical purposes. The reputation of the publisher, evidence of adoptions beyond the university, evidence of research contributing to the contents, and evidence of the textbook defining a new type of subject matter or innovative pedagogy will enhance the value of the textbook.
- *Digital publication.* Online journals, digital archives, and humanities databases are among the ways in which people in English are using digital media for research and publication.

The Virginia Tech English Department welcomes scholarship in new media and will evaluate it on the same terms as it evaluates print. For example, peer review and acceptance rates are measures of quality for online as well as for print journals. The introduction and apparatus for an archive or database can provide the same kind of validation as they do for a critical edition or print reference work. Sponsorship by a professional association or other organized group or demonstrated use by others beyond the university also provide ways to establish merit. Reviews of the work and evidence of impact enhance the credibility of the work.

- *Other types of publication.* Annotated translations, conference proceedings, book reviews, abstracts, encyclopedia articles, contributions to the digitization of literary texts, edited issues of scholarly journals, trade books, and essays written for a general audience can all contribute to the case for tenure and promotion. Pre-tenure faculty are advised to consult with their mentors before undertaking time-consuming projects that may not contribute to the tenure case in proportion to the investment of time.

Publication before the Virginia Tech appointment

Some pre-tenure faculty present significant publication before they join the Virginia Tech faculty, particularly if they have begun their careers at other institutions. This publication can appear in the tenure and promotion dossier, especially if the publication is within three years of the Virginia Tech appointment. Candidates should not depend entirely on this pre-appointment publication but rather should be able to demonstrate that an active agenda of research and publication is underway at Virginia Tech. (See also the section on Applications for Early Tenure and Promotion below.)

Conference presentations, posters, and invited lectures or readings

The department and college value the regular presentation of one's work at national conferences. Conference presentations provide excellent opportunities to present research that a faculty member may later develop into a publication. In addition, participation in conferences helps to develop one's national reputation and provides the opportunity to network and to identify potential external reviewers for the tenure and promotion application. National conferences and conferences in which selection is based on blind review have more merit than regional or local conferences or conferences for which all proposals are accepted. Conferences with international participation are particularly valued.

Lectures and readings, especially beyond the university, also demonstrate recognition and reputation and provide opportunities to get audience feedback for developing the work.

Grant applications

The English Department encourages junior faculty to gain experience in the process of seeking funding early in their careers through internal or external funding that supports their work. We advise junior faculty to think strategically about the timing of any efforts to apply to large grants that require a significant investment of time. If a significant publication record is already in place, pursing large external grants is encouraged, but we caution faculty at earlier stages of their work from taking on large externally funded project as principal investigators or project directors. Gaining experience with smaller projects or as a contributor to a larger project is more appropriate when still developing a foundation of scholarly or creative work. Such experience will position you to take on larger degrees of responsibility in pursuing

externally funded projects after tenure. For senior faculty seeking promotion, obtaining external funding for research is looked upon extremely favorably, especially when that work translates into a significant book project or another outcome of comparable impact nationally or internationally.

Teaching

Effective teaching includes course design and selection of materials according to the established objectives of the course; engagement of the students in the learning process; creation of a classroom environment conducive to learning; efforts to develop the students' critical thinking, reading, and writing; delivery of information in ways that are accessible to students; appropriate assignments; showing respect for students and for diverse ideas; and course management (communicating expectations clearly, returning papers and tests in a timely way, organizing the materials and assignments, keeping good records). The university requires faculty members to distribute a syllabus and to accommodate students with disabilities.

According to Virginia Tech policy, all faculty members evaluate each course every semester, using university forms as well as student comment pages. These result in "SPOI" scores (Student Perception of Instruction) as well as comments. The scores and student comments constitute one part of evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Peer reviews of teaching (see the Procedures section of this document) in the second and fourth years of the pre-tenure period constitute an even more significant means of evaluating teaching effectiveness. A tenured faculty member selected by the Associate Chair will conduct the peer review, which includes class visits, review of the syllabus, and review of responses to student writing.

Development of new courses or contributions to curriculum revision appear in the teaching section of the tenure and promotion dossier. Teaching awards, grants for course development, participation in professional development activities related to teaching, serving as appointed advisor to students, and serving on undergraduate honors projects or independent studies or graduate student thesis or dissertation committees are other marks of teaching effectiveness.

Service

Service consists of activities beyond research and teaching for the department, college, university, or one's discipline. Examples are serving on committees, advising student organizations or publications, presenting public lectures, organizing or chairing panels at conferences, reviewing manuscripts and proposals for conferences and journals, and serving as an officer of a professional association. Pre-tenure faculty should become involved in the life of the department, but they should also manage their time to complete research. In general, one or two committees a year should be manageable but also establish a record of service. The Personnel Committee evaluates the quality of service on committees, not just membership.

Outreach

Outreach consists of activities beyond the walls of the university or profession. Outreach is important because of the land grant status of Virginia Tech. All faculty members are expected to be engaged actively in outreach. Examples are working with the public schools or volunteer organizations. Some faculty members help organizations with grant writing, websites, or newsletters. Some service learning projects also have an outreach component.

Contributions to diversity

Contributions to the diversity goals of the university make take many forms, including self-education, committee participation or leadership, advising students, incorporating diversity-related materials in courses, or student and faculty recruitment initiatives. For elaboration of these categories and more possibilities, see www.provost.vt.edu/diversity_accomplishments.php.

Applications for early tenure and promotion

Usually assistant professors apply for tenure and promotion in the sixth year after the appointment begins, with a declaration of intent in the spring of the fifth year. Virginia Tech allows faculty to apply early without prejudice; that is, if an application for early tenure is denied, the candidate may apply again.

Standards for early tenure candidates may be higher than for those in their mandatory year. Candidates are held to a standard of "no questions." Candidates should be exemplary in all areas of consideration. Early applicants cannot appeal a negative decision; the application in a subsequent year constitutes the appeal.

According to the *Faculty Handbook,* 2.8.3, a maximum of three years from another institution may be counted toward the probationary period at Virginia Tech. The department will count years in a tenure-track position at another institution if the candidate wishes to count them but is also willing to start the tenure clock with the Virginia Tech appointment. Candidates should consult with their mentor and department chair about their choice. If the prior position was not tenure-eligible, the tenure clock starts with the Virginia Tech appointment.

Departmental Procedures Regarding Tenure and Promotion

The English Department provides extensive feedback to faculty throughout the pre-tenure period, including annual reviews, comprehensive reviews for contract renewal in the second and fourth years, peer reviews of teaching, and consultations with the mentoring team.

Reviews

Annual reviews

All faculty members, at all ranks, complete Faculty Activity Reports, or FARs, each year. The due date is usually around April 1; the report covers the period from April 1 to March 31. These reports become part of the basis for performance evaluations, awarding merit adjustments, and promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

The department chair provides a written response to the FAR within 90 days of its submission. Faculty members sign an acknowledgement of receipt of the evaluation. The chair will meet face to face with each pre-tenure faculty member to discuss the evaluation.

Reviews in the second and fourth years

The English Department conducts comprehensive, pre-tenure reviews in the Spring Semester of the second and fourth years. The Personnel Committee members review all aspects of the candidate's progress, in teaching, research, service and outreach, and diversity. Satisfactory review results in a contract renewal as well as feedback.
Items reviewed include

- FARs and annual evaluations for years from the appointment to the review year
- A current CV
- Peer review(s) of teaching + course evaluations
- Published work, work in progress (actual documents, not just titles); reviews of the work
- Service, outreach, and diversity contributions

Pre-tenure faculty use the promotion and tenure dossier format (see the Faculty Handbook, section 2.8.4) in organizing and presenting information for review.

Individual committee members are assigned specific aspects to review thoroughly—for example, teaching, or a series of publications; the review is then presented to the committee as a whole. This work is more extensive in the fourth year, as the candidate has generally produced more and accumulated a longer record.

After full discussion in the Personnel Committee meetings, the chair of the committee drafts a letter for the candidate. The other committee members review that draft before the final copy is sent to both the department chair and the candidate. The goal of the letter is to provide evaluative feedback in all areas, to commend where appropriate, and to give clear indication of any shortcomings or areas in need of attention. The letter should also communicate expectations and recommendations for the next contract period. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing and returning a copy for the departmental file. He or she is welcome to visit with Personnel Committee for questions and clarification.

The Personnel Committee, through its chair, also makes recommendations to the candidate about such mechanical matters as vita preparation and encourages the candidate, in the fourth-year review, to begin trying to frame a personal statement for the tenure dossier.

Peer reviews

Peer reviews take place in the second and fourth years of the pre-tenure period; the department tries to conduct an additional peer review before the tenure review. Peer reviews are intended to be both developmental and evaluative.

The candidate makes a list of faculty members at the associate professor or professor levels that she/he would not object to serving as peer evaluators; the candidate may also veto faculty who, for whatever reason, he/she would prefer not do an evaluation. The Associate Chair administers this process.

The peer reviewer meets with the candidate prior to classroom visits to discuss the candidate's pedagogical philosophy and style. The candidate furnishes the reviewer with syllabi for the course(s) being reviewed as well as any other teaching materials that seem significant. The peer reviewer and the candidate work out a mutually convenient time for the classroom visits. The peer reviewer visits one week's worth of classes, sometimes in one, and sometimes in every, class. At some point in the process, the candidate gives the reviewer a sampling or a set of graded papers. After further conversation with the candidate, the reviewer writes a peer review letter; this letter is first shared with the candidate before it is turned in to the Associate Chair.

Mentoring team reviews

The English Department assigns every new assistant professor a mentoring team consisting of a "main" mentor and two other faculty members. The mentor stays in close contact with the assistant professor and offers guidance as regards departmental, college, and

university procedures; teaching; and research. The principal mentor does an informal review of the assistant professor's teaching during the first year. This review is strictly for the benefit of the assistant professor; it simulates, to the extent possible, the process of formal peer review which occurs in the second year and once or twice thereafter during the probationary period. Generally the mentor and often the other members of the mentoring team offer to read the work of the assistant professor to provide feedback aimed at helping get the work published. At least once a semester, the mentoring team holds a formal meeting with the assistant professor; at this meeting she or he brings the team up to date with research and teaching and talks with the team about immediate and long-term plans for the future.

Applications for Tenure and Promotion

Beginning the process
In the spring of the candidate's fifth pre-tenure year, the department chair notifies the candidates who are approaching the mandatory year for a tenure and promotion application to update his or her CV according to the template provided by the provost's office, to identify four potential external reviewers, and to collect six copies of all publications (five for external reviewers, one for use in the university). The department reimburses candidates for the purchase of enough books for all the external reviewers.

If some pre-tenure faculty members wish to apply early for tenure and promotion, they should submit a CV to the Personnel Committee for review and advice regarding the early application. This review and approval should take place in the spring before the committee begins to identify external reviewers for tenure and promotion candidates.

By early June, external reviewers should be identified, and copies of the CV and publications should be mailed to them with a letter of instruction.

Candidates also provide copies of the student evaluations, peer reviews, FARs, and annual evaluations for Personnel Committee consideration.

External reviews
We seek five external reviewers for each tenure and promotion case as well as for promotion to full professor. We seek reviewers from peer institutions as identified by SCHEV (see http://www.irpa.vt.edu/vt_peers.htm). Exceptions can be made when reviewers with the best expertise are not faculty members at SCHEV peers.

To select external reviewers, we solicit from the candidate a list of four names of the individuals with the expertise to evaluate his or her work; the candidate also indicates whether and how she or he knows each of these experts. The candidate may also submit names of people who would be unsatisfactory because of possible prejudice.

Simultaneously, the Personnel Committee draws up a list of experts in the candidate's field. Both lists include brief biographical sketches. Drawing from both lists, the Personnel Committee prepares a ranked list of ten to fifteen names and outlines clear instructions about which name the department chair should turn to if one of the first five turns us down. Working with the committee chair, the department chair contacts individuals until he or she has secured affirmative responses from the appropriate number of reviewers. Throughout the process, the department chair and the committee chair work to insure balance—between the candidate's list and the committee's, between male and female reviewers, sometimes even between multiple fields (when the candidate's work is distributed across more than one area of

specialization). No more than two of the five reviewers may be from the candidate's list. The identity of all the reviewers remains confidential as does the content of their letters.

All of the candidate's eligible work is sent to all external reviewers. Ordinarily, only work that has been accepted or published will be sent. Occasionally, however, a completed manuscript still under review may be included.

Dossier preparation

University requirements for tenure and promotion dossiers, including formatting and structural details for the CV, personal statement, and executive summary, are described at www.provost.vt.edu/tenure.php. Candidates need to follow these requirements very carefully. Candidates need to prepare the CV, personal statement, and executive summary. In addition, they need to provide

- six copies of all published materials (the department will reimburse candidates for the purchase of books)
- copies that can be reproduced of reviews of published work
- teaching evaluations for all courses taught since the appointment or last promotion
- FARs and department evaluations for each year since the appointment or last promotion

The department's office manager will distribute published materials to external reviewers and will assemble the dossiers from the materials provided.

The Personnel Committee's chair, or another member of the committee, works closely with the candidate on the vita, the executive summary, and the personal statement. The whole committee eventually reviews these documents and provides additional feedback. The senior support staff member who actually assembles the dossier also works with the candidate.

Departmental review

In the early fall, following the process for comprehensive reviews described above, the members of the Personnel Committee are assigned to report on various aspects of the tenure and promotion dossier: research, teaching, service, outreach, and diversity. Reading of all the published work is distributed among members of the committee. Each individual reports on the assigned area of evaluation to the entire committee. This usually lasts well into October. The department chair does not participate in the committee's review of tenure and promotion candidates. The chair may attend discussion of the candidate's research by members of the Personnel Committee in order to understand their decision.

Each member of the committee votes on whether to recommend the candidate for tenure or not. The committee chair drafts a detailed letter reporting the vote, explaining the strengths in each of the categories of evaluation, and responding to any questions that have been raised. If there is a mixed vote, a minority letter may be written, or an explanation of the minority vote may be incorporated into the committee's letter.

All members of the committee read and suggest revisions to the letter so that it accurately reflects the discussion of the committee as a whole. All members sign the letter (or the minority letter, if one is written).

The department chair votes independently of the Personnel Committee and prepares a detailed letter according to the guidelines set forth by the provost's office. The department chair verbally informs the candidate of the departmental recommendations, preferably before Thanksgiving, assuming the committee's work is complete by then. In cases of mandatory (sixth

year) tenure decisions, the dossiers of all candidates go forward to the dean. In cases of early applications, the dossier moves forward if either the committee or the chair votes positively. If both the committee and the department chair vote no in an early tenure decision, the dossier does not go forward to the college. In accordance with university policy, the chair informs the candidate in writing of a negative decision and refers the candidate to the *Faculty Handbook* for the protocol of filing an appeal. (See the *Faculty Handbook,* 2.8.4.1.) The dossier and supplementary materials go to the college in early December.

College, university, provost, and BOV reviews

The college committee, which includes a member from every department in the college, meets in early January to review all applications. The department representative presents the cases from the department. The college committee and dean have separate votes and forward their recommendations to a university committee. The dean reports the results of a department's candidates to the department chair, who reports to the candidate.
The department representative to the college committee may attend the meetings of the department's Personnel Committee but cannot be a voting member of both the department and college committees. The university committee meets in April. The provost reports the recommendation of the committee and the president to the candidate. The Board of Visitors meets in June.

The Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee consists of eight members of the professoriate, with at least two members from the associate and full ranks. Seven of the eight members are elected by the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty; the eighth member is appointed by the department chair. All full-time tenured associate and full professors are eligible to be on the committee. Excluded from both the electorate and membership on the committee are faculty who hold administrative positions outside the English Department. The entire Personnel Committee votes on cases of tenure and promotion to associate professor.

In years when there are candidates for promotion to full professor, the fulls who are members of the Professorial Personnel Committee are supplemented by other fulls sufficient to create an Ad Hoc Committee of five full professors. If additional fulls are needed, one full is appointed by the department chair and any additional necessary fulls are elected by the tenured full professors for a term of one year. This Committee alone deliberates on the case or cases of promotion to full.