

Pre-Promotion review: Associate Professors [adopted January 2000, revised March 2006]

Preamble

As the English Department has no formal “mentoring” process for Associate Professors and the university has no mandatory review structure beyond the point of tenure, the policy adopted in 2000 and revised in this document is intended to encourage Associate Professors to make progress toward promotion to Professor and to support them with more regular and useful feedback about their professional advancement.

Period of the Pre-Promotion Review

Between March first and May first of their third and fifth years in rank, Associate Professors should undergo a pre-promotion review. Associate Professors who do not stand for promotion to Full Professor during or before their sixth year in rank, but who intend to seek promotion should undergo periodic pre-promotion reviews, at least once in every three years, and must undergo a pre-promotion review in the spring semester prior to the year in which they stand for promotion.

Composition of the Review Committee

The pre-promotion review is conducted by a committee composed of at least two Full Professors, one named by the Associate Professor under review and one named by the Chair. The review committee may have more than two members, but it should have no more than five people.

Information Offered for Review

Associate Professors write a statement of no more than three pages summarizing their work in research/publication, teaching, and service for the period under review. The statement should project a probable trajectory of achievement to the year in which the colleague will stand for promotion. A current vita plus other relevant materials, such as copies of publications, indications of work in progress, other materials related to research or creative work; and appropriate materials that speak to the colleague’s teaching, such as syllabi, teaching observations, and student evaluations, should also be included.

Substance of the Review

The committee reviews the materials submitted, visits classes and observes the colleague’s teaching, and each committee member writes an evaluation addressed to the Department Chair. These evaluations are shared with the colleague in a meeting with all committee members and the colleague present, after which the Chair writes a summary evaluation. The colleague reviews the written summary evaluation and either accepts it as written or challenges the review in writing with a memo to the Chair, citing, with specific references, the deficiencies of the review.

Administrative Use of the Review

Promotion Reviews become part of an Associate Professor’s professional files kept by the Department. When the Associate Professor stands for promotion, these reviews will be included with the internal materials evaluated by the Full Professors and forwarded to the College as the promotion process goes forward.