



College of Humanities
Criteria for Continuing Faculty Status and Advancement in Rank
Adopted January 2018

1. The following guidelines are supplemental to the “University Policy on Faculty Rank and Status” (2008) in accordance with paragraph 4.2 of that document. The criteria are designed for professorial faculty but can be applied to professional faculty with appropriate adaptation to the particular professional assignment.

2. Areas to be evaluated

2.1. Continuing faculty status is intended to provide the university with a faculty who are effective teachers, productive scholars, and dedicated academic citizens who support the mission of Brigham Young University. Advancement in rank is designed to recognize and reward solid performance in the three faculty responsibilities of citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work.

The college expects all faculty members to be thoughtfully engaged in teaching, service and disciplinary learning. Professorial-track faculty are expected to publish in the fields of expertise as outlined in the appointment letter. Further, it is understood that the amount of faculty time dedicated to any one area may vary according to the stage of a career. For example, one would predict that a senior faculty member might spend more time in administrative service than one recently hired. However, colleagues are expected to maintain at least some activity in all areas throughout their career. Please see “College Guidelines on Faculty Load,” posted in the Faculty Commons (humanities.byu.edu/forms/), for more information on faculty assignments, adjustments and accommodations.

2.2. Citizenship (“University Policy” 3.1).

2.2.1. Citizenship represents the degree to which a faculty member both participates in all aspects of service to the university and to his or her chosen discipline and also exemplifies in that service the academic and spiritual values that Brigham Young University embraces.

2.2.2. To qualify for continuing faculty status and advancement in rank, faculty members should exemplify personal honor and integrity and should contribute

constructively to the university community. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are expected to meet the standards of conduct consistent with qualifying for temple privileges.

2.2.3. Good citizens are civil and respectful in dealing with students, colleagues, and supervisors. They do not engage in actions injurious to the work of others but instead actively promote collegiality and harmony in their departments and in the college. While vigorous disagreement is expected in the course of academic work, good citizens model practices of civil disagreement. They should not denigrate other faculty or students for any reason, either in person or in reference to those not present, or engage in disruption, manipulation, dishonesty, or contention.

2.2.4 Good citizens willingly carry their fair share of such academic tasks as faculty self-governance in section and department meetings, committee work, program-level and course-level assessment of student learning, advisement, lab supervision, supervising graduate students, and administration.

2.2.5. Good citizenship is also manifest through service to the profession such as working in professional organizations, arranging and participating in conferences, and serving as a referee or reviewer for or on the editorial board of academic journals or newsletters or for candidates for promotion at other universities.

2.2.6. Faculty members who do not have Continuing Faculty Status are expected to meet the same standards of honor, commitment, and civility that are expected of senior faculty. It is also important that these new faculty be given opportunities to demonstrate a capacity for service to the department, university, and profession, without being heavily burdened with administrative or committee assignments. New faculty and their department chair should plan carefully so that adequate time is available to develop teaching and scholarly skills.

2.3. **Teaching** (“University Policy” 3.3-3.5).

2.3.1. Faculty in the College of Humanities are expected to give careful and consistent effort to providing their students with an education that is of the highest quality in the classroom and in mentoring situations. In their design of curricula, assignments, and in all interactions with students, faculty should try to instill in students the disposition to life-long learning articulated in “The AIMS of a BYU Education.” As the “University Policy on Faculty Rank and Status” indicates, each faculty member should be “well-read, well-prepared, concerned about their students, and enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge in the classroom.” Indeed, faculty should make continuous improvement of their teaching a fundamental dimension of their careers at the university. As necessary or desirable, faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the many resources the university provides to help them improve their teaching, e.g., The Center for Teaching and Learning, The Faculty Center. Although the specifics of what student-centered research looks like or means vary from field to field and are therefore best determined by the candidate, faculty are expected to demonstrate how their research has brought benefits to their students in mentoring relationships, to the classroom experience, and to the quality of experience students have in internships or in other experiential learning opportunities.

2.3.2. Effective faculty understand that quality teaching includes valid and reliable evaluation of student learning in their courses. They also understand that they are responsible for the health and vitality of the program (major/minor). Consequently, faculty should develop and publish course-level expected learning outcomes that articulate with program-level learning outcomes, and should join with their colleagues in program level assessment of student learning.

2.3.3. Teaching at the university level may include course development, classroom instruction, supervision of theses, student advising and consultation, and other directed research or mentoring environments, and the design and preparation of instructional support materials.

2.3.4. In addition to teaching in their areas of specialization, faculty should be prepared and willing to serve the department and the students through effective teaching in introductory, general education, and service courses.

2.3.5. An individual teaching plan should be part of the ongoing faculty development plan (“University Policy” 3.1.4). The teaching plan should include a self-evaluation of teaching strengths and weaknesses, a description of short- and long-term teaching goals, and a report of initiatives undertaken or planned to improve teaching.

2.3.6. Note: “Guidelines on Faculty Load” (in Faculty Commons) specifies course accommodations during the first two years.

2.4. **Scholarly and Creative Work** (“University Policy” 3.6-3.7).

2.4.1. Humanities scholars at BYU are expected to be active contributors to peer-reviewed, published conversations on topics in the humanistic disciplines in ways that capitalize on their academic training and expertise and that typically address current issues and problems with which their disciplines and the larger academic community wrestle. Each discipline and sub-discipline has its own standards and models for consequential scholarship; the evaluation of scholarly projects, products, and publication venues is best left to the discriminating judgment of qualified peers in the field. The quality of the work (as measured by such factors as its substance, originality, soundness of methodology, and demonstrated impact on the field as provided by the candidate under review for promotion) is more important than the quantity or type. At the same time, the type of work should be appropriate to the scholar’s faculty development plan and to the needs of the department, and the quantity should be sufficient to “demonstrate consistent productivity” over the course of a career (“University Policy” 3.4.3). As a general rule, “consistent productivity” is understood in the College of Humanities to approximate the equivalent of one scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal of national or international reach per year.

2.4.2. There are dozens of disciplines within the Humanities that can be grouped generally into three main areas:

- 1) Literary, philosophical, and cultural specialties
- 2) Linguistics, language, and translation studies and
- 3) Language and literature pedagogy and assessment.

Each of these areas often provides unique challenges and opportunities. Some scholarship is motivated by enduring questions while others by addressing more immediate and timely concerns facing the discipline. Some work is solitary and other work is more collaborative, and some work is evaluated by its effectiveness in addressing scientific or historical questions and other work by the quality of its philosophical or theoretical questions. The expected mix of the various types of scholarship varies for each of these three areas and for each faculty. Candidates for promotion and their respective evaluation committees and chairs should provide sufficient guidelines and norms for proper evaluation of the kinds of scholarship produced by the candidate. In all cases, we seek a fair, comparative assessment of quantity while placing a special priority on the quality and impact of the work produced.

1. In the literary, philosophical, and cultural specialties, publishing substantive articles in well-respected journals is an important way for scholars to take part in current conversations on particular issues and problems in a faculty member's area of expertise. The publication of a well-received book, while not requisite for retention or promotion, is often the best way for scholars to solidify their reputations as valued and trusted voices in their disciplines. A book-length study typically demands from its author a level of sophistication and maturity that makes it more than the sum of several individual articles. Edited books and co-authored books can also make significant contributions to scholarship and can represent more than the sum of its parts. Historically, the disciplinary norm has been the single-authored publication even though collaborative work has grown as a respected tradition within these specialties. Typically, an edited volume is not considered to be equal to the achievement that a co-authored book represents, and a co-authored book does not equal the level of attainment represented by a single-authored book. See also the summary matrix at the end of this section and 3.3.4 for additional comments on books.
2. In linguistics, language, and translation studies, the discipline is diverse and timeliness is important, so the standard vehicle for making an academic contribution is an article in a specialty journal or a chapter in an edited book or volume. These contributions will often have an empirical or statistical component. Joint authorship where the authors combine their complementary knowledge to present new theories or to conduct large studies is fully acceptable.
3. In language pedagogy and assessment, research focuses on the burgeoning fields of teaching, learning, and assessment of language and literacy skills in world languages (including English) and cultures. The discipline is expanding rapidly and timeliness is important, so the standard vehicle for making an academic contribution is an article in a specialty journal or a chapter in an edited book or volume. Even in major universities where scholarly research is expected to consume most of a faculty member's time, the standard vehicle for making academic contributions in this area is a journal article in a specialty journal or for historical or theoretical overviews a chapter in an edited volume. These

focused contributions will likely have theoretical, experimental, experiential underpinnings and an empirical research design. Both practitioner-oriented and more theoretically oriented scholarship in pedagogy are valued. Joint authorship is the norm and is fully acceptable.

2.4.2.1. While some humanities scholars develop highly specialized areas of research, others might work in interdisciplinary or comparative fields or examine more theoretical questions that allow them to address a variety of topics. Some scholars dig more deeply into a specialty as they move into the advanced stages of their career; others range more widely. We see no reason to prefer one kind of scholar over another as both have their place in the humanities. In the case of the latter, we would still expect to see a common theme or set of questions that motivates the scholarship and that can assist in the identification of appropriate reviewers. Because it helps a scholar to gain traction and impact and it facilitates the review process, we encourage younger faculty to establish their reputations in a certain field before they begin to develop other areas of interest.

2.4.2.2 Peer review is the fundamental criterion to be used to determine whether or not published faculty research meets the scholarship expectations that come with a professorial faculty appointment. Although the ways in which peer review occurs and is administered may vary somewhat from discipline to discipline, the objectivity of the peer review process is most evident when it is “double blind.” There are instances, however, especially as a scholar’s reputation grows, when invited or solicited publications may themselves be markers of quality and academic standing. Those evaluating such work should consider the reputation of the colleague who extends the invitation, the prestige of the journal or press, and the standing of other authors whose work accompanies the piece in question.

2.4.2.3 Faculty are expected to publish their work with organizations and presses that are respected by peers in their particular disciplines and that observe high editorial and professional standards. In most Humanities disciplines, numerical measures such as impact factors do not exist, nor are journals typically categorized in tiers. Faculty should thoughtfully determine the appropriate venues for their scholarship using criteria such as the audience to be reached, the prestige of the editorial board, the objectivity of peer review, and the reputations of authors published in the journal’s pages. Other factors such as selectivity and circulation may be important indicators of quality, but are not always so: sometimes a less circulated journal that is targeted at a specific scholarly community may more effectively reach the intended audience than more general venues. Candidates for status and promotion should discuss the rationale for the choice of venue and the impact of their scholarship in terms provided in the “Article Summary Table” (found in the Faculty Commons, humanities.byu.edu/forms). A failure to properly contextualize and describe the significance of one’s publications jeopardizes a candidate’s prospects for a successful review process. Mere assertions or assumptions of quality will not suffice.

2.4.2.4 Humanities faculty frequently publish chapters in edited volumes. As

long as these chapters are published by reputable academic presses and submitted to the same careful review as articles in journals, including, ideally, external peer review beyond review by a press or book editor, they can be considered an important publication on par with or, in some cases, superior to a journal article. Their quality may be determined by such things as the quality of the press, the members of its editorial board, the editor(s) of the collection, the objectivity of the peer review, and the reputations of the other authors included in the book. Candidates under review for promotion should provide a description of these and other aspects of the publication, including the press's review process, any reviews of the collection and/or chapter, and documentation of the current status of the chapter. A chapter is not considered accepted for publication until it has undergone peer review and the collection has received final board approval.

2.4.2.5 Papers and presentations delivered at reputable professional meetings are meaningful scholarly activities. They permit faculty to participate in productive scholarly dialogue while becoming personally acquainted with other peer-scholars who also contribute to that dialogue. But most important of all, conference participation gives faculty an occasion to receive feedback from these peers on work that will be turned into published pieces. Conference presentations "count" toward CFS in the review process only indirectly - in the preparation for the published version.

2.4.2.6 As is commonly the judgment of reputable research programs in the humanities throughout the country, the doctoral dissertation represents independent scholarship that provides material appropriate for revision and expansion into a book or articles after successful completion of a PhD. In such cases, candidates should still provide the required evidence of quality as described above, including any evidence of added work and substance involved in revising and/or expanding the dissertation into published form. The work should be judged on its own merits and should not be discounted for having its origins in a dissertation.

2.4.2.7 As a general rule, work that has been formally accepted for publication following peer review should be considered as though it were published. As indicated earlier, for edited books, the editor AND the press must accept the project before an author may count a chapter as accepted. Recognizing that there is sometimes a lag of many months between the submission and acceptance (or rejection) of an article or book, it may be necessary at the Initial Review to include unpublished work among the three required samples, but it will only be counted as published if it has been formally accepted.

2.4.2.8 By virtue of their training and assignment, language and literature pedagogues in the humanities focus their efforts on the development of textbooks and other instructional materials, including materials designed to introduce students to a discipline, author, or text. Such scholarship should not be discounted merely because it also enhances teaching. The assessment of teaching materials as scholarship should involve a discriminating judgment by qualified peers of such factors as whether the materials are based on sound theoretical and pedagogical principles, whether they address a real need in the field, and whether they have

had a demonstrable impact beyond the author's own classroom and institution. Those qualified peers should include any qualified colleagues in the home department, peer reviewers, and external reviewers. As with other publications, candidates under review for promotion should justify the choice of venue, describe the review process, document its current status and any reviews of the book.

2.4.2.9 Translating or editing may be a substantial scholarly achievement. For instance, a translation or a critical edition of a literary work or of an author's diaries or correspondence may demand highly developed scholarly skills and have a lasting impact in the field. In order for evaluators to determine the quality and importance of translations or critical editions, candidates under review for promotion should justify the choice of the text and explain its contribution to scholarship as such and the degree of scholarly expertise required to do the translation or edition. The translation should also be subjected to the same discriminating peer evaluation as other scholarly products and should be assessed with similar rigor by evaluators in the department and college.

2.4.2.10 Electronic publications, including videos, compact disks, and web sites, are not discounted simply because they appear in electronic form. Such work, when presented as scholarship, should be judged by the same principles as apply to the evaluation of printed scholarship, including peer review, intellectual substance, originality, soundness of methodology, contribution to the field, and the identity and reputation of the publisher. Work that is developed for use only within the university counts as a contribution to teaching rather than scholarship. The burden is on the candidate under review for promotion to provide the necessary documentation of rigorous peer evaluation and impact. See also the University Rank and Status Policy, 3.4.4.1H.

2.4.2.11 Jointly authored articles, books, and other artifacts are considered a normal way of publishing scholarship within some disciplines in the humanities. Candidates should include in the file for each jointly authored work a brief explanation describing precisely the extent of his or her role in its preparation and an explanation as to when and if the order of authorship matters according to disciplinary norms. College evaluators expect department and external reviews to corroborate these standards. To assist in the review process across the college, they also require an explanation for how to judge quantitatively what the equivalent is in the candidate's field for a successful CFS (tenure) file according to disciplinary norms.

2.4.2.12 In some fields, such as Art History and Curatorial Studies, working as the editor of or making significant contributions to an Exhibition Catalog can be considered as a prestigious scholarly achievement. Contributing entries to a catalog can also be considered as evidence of scholarly productivity. The quality and significance of catalog work vary. Publication of exhibition catalog research will be evaluated according to the amount of research involved, the catalog's

source of production and dissemination, the quality of the collaborators, and the quality, reach, and importance of the scholarship the candidate has contributed.

2.4.2.13 As indicated in the University Rank and Status Policy, application for grants for research and creative work and work conducted during the term of an awarded grant can count as evidence of scholarly achievement when resulting from a competitive process of peer review. Because standard peer-reviewed publications normally provide the most effective method for demonstrating scholarly achievement, the candidate and department and college committees should provide sufficient critical evaluation of the significance of the grants applied for, criteria suggested for interpreting the significance of a successful or unsuccessful award, and any other information that will contextualize and verify the quality and quality of the work done. As in other co-authored work, the candidate should provide evidence of the ratio of the work contributed. Normally a successful candidate will provide other evidence, beyond grant writing, of scholarly achievement.

2.4.2.14 Book reviews and encyclopedia entries, although valued activities and evidence of scholarly service and promise, do not count as peer-review scholarly products.

2.4.2.15 The College of Humanities recognizes the value of the emerging field of Digital Humanities and believes that work done in this field can be a valuable contribution to our college and the academic community. Digital Humanities pertains both to the tools and techniques of digital media as they bear on traditional humanistic questions as well as bringing humanistic modes of inquiry to bear on digital media. Due to DH's status as an emerging field, the onus is on DH scholars to expound and contextualize the novel components of their scholarship for reviewers and colleagues so that they can effectively assess both the quality and quantity of the work done. BYU's Office of Digital Humanities is staffed by professional faculty members whose formal scholarly expectations include the development of digital resources (analysis tools, digital archives, etc.) or techniques. Professorial faculty normally receive credit only for the published research that employs those resources and techniques, not for the development itself. In other words, the development of DH resources by professorial faculty will be considered a contribution to citizenship, unless the terms of scholarly expectations are otherwise defined and mutually agreed upon with the chair's consent.

2.5 Principles for the Quantitative Evaluation of Scholarly Products

2.5.1 The types of publications and scholarship outlined above can sometimes vary widely even within the overall record of a single candidate, and they can also vary among candidates from across the college. Historically individual departments in the college have preferred not to have their own department

expectations for the simple reason that all but one of our departments are multi-disciplinary. This means that disciplinary norms vary within departments and, depending on the sub-discipline of a candidate, that our faculty often have affinities with the scholarly practices of colleagues in other departments that are sometimes as strong or stronger than in their own department. We do not believe that candidates should protect themselves from criticism with claims of disciplinary exceptionalism; indeed, we affirm that despite differences among our various humanistic disciplines there are still common standards by which we measure quality especially with regard to peer review, quality of venue, and other indicators of quality and influence. In order to protect against misguided judgments of either quality or quantity, however, we expect, of course, that evaluators respect the variety of disciplinary norms in the college and protect against disciplinary bias that might punish or undervalue a candidate who has ranged outside of the norms of an evaluator's discipline. We refer to the grid below in 2.4.3 as a reference to the three main disciplinary cultures within our college and to assist evaluators in understanding the reasons why scholarship of candidates from the College of Humanities might vary in terms of quantity and type.

Even assuming equal and an acceptably high level of quality across all scholarly products, not all products within the same type or genre are of equal quantitative value. Some products are much more significant than others for their impact on the field and for the work and expertise that each required. It is incumbent on the candidate and evaluators at each stage of review within the college to provide sufficient context and justifications for how a particular scholarly product should be compared to the college standard of "one scholarly article published in a peer-reviewed journal of national or international reach." Such context includes a general outline of disciplinary norms regarding quantitative output as well as documentation of the level of expertise brought to bear on each product. This is especially important when evaluating scholarly products that are markedly different in type. A book chapter, for example, can be a close equivalent to a journal article, but an edited book, a critical edition, a creative work or translation might require further explanation, not to defend its legitimacy which is not in question but to assist evaluators in understanding its equivalency in terms of journal articles. An edited book could be the equivalent, for example, of at least 2-4 articles as could a critical edition, but it could also equal more depending on the influence and quantity of the work done. A solo-authored book is the equivalent of multiple articles; it is incumbent on the candidate and internal evaluators to provide an explanation of its relative significance in terms of quantity.

2.5.2 Valuing Scholarly Products, based on national academic practices and publications norms

| Type of Publication | Expectations by Discipline Area | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Literary, philosophical, and artistic specialties | Linguistics, language, and translation specialties | Language and literature pedagogy; and assessment specialties |
| Sole or co-authored book or textbook | Often expected; sometimes one of these options may be required | Occasionally expected; not required | Not expected; not required |
| Edited or co-edited book; annotated scholarly edition of a book; novel-length literary translation; textbook with multiple authors; peer-reviewed grant | | | |
| Journal article; chapter in a book or volume; supplementary materials for a textbook publisher; shorter literary or technical translation; peer-reviewed technical or summary report; review essay | Frequently expected; often required | Frequently expected; sometimes required | Always expected and required |

3. Expectations for Continuing Faculty Status and Advancement to the Rank of Associate Professor (“University Policy” 4, 5.2).

3.1. The first seven years of service in a professorial rank constitute a probationary period during which the university determines whether a candidate’s citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work are of a substance and quality to justify the awarding of continuing faculty status. The department chair evaluates each candidate’s performance annually. In addition, there are two formal reviews: an initial review that occurs in the winter semester of a candidate’s third year of service, and the final continuing faculty status review in the seventh year. In the case of faculty initially appointed to the rank of assistant professor, the final continuing faculty status review normally also considers advancement to the rank of associate professor.

3.2 Faculty advanced to candidacy for continuing faculty status as a result of a positive third-year review shall have their final review in the fall of the seventh year.

Faculty with unusually strong records may elect to be reviewed in the fall of their sixth year. Faculty are encouraged to consult with colleagues, the department chair and dean (or associate dean) prior to making this decision. In all cases faculty are to declare in writing to their chair and dean no later than Oct 31 of the year preceding the continuing faculty status review so that proper teaching reviews can be conducted during winter term. Whether the review is conducted in the sixth or seventh year, it is the final review. For most candidates it is expected that the review will take place in the seventh year. Whether the review takes place in the sixth or seventh year, candidates will be expected to meet the same department, college and university standards.

3.3. By the time of the initial (third year) continuing faculty status review candidates are expected to demonstrate clear promise as effective teachers and loyal and contributing academic citizens and to have established a promising record in scholarly and creative work, and be progressing satisfactorily according to the guidelines given above and in the “University Policy on Faculty Rank and Status. (2008, 5.2)”

3.3.1. A faculty development plan should be initiated by the candidate in consultation with the department chair, revised and refined as necessary, and approved by the department chair no later than the end of fall semester in the first year of service (“University Policy” 3.1.4). The development plan should outline the candidate’s professional goals and plans to accomplish the goals in teaching, scholarly and creative work, and citizenship. It should present the logic and aspirations of an individual scholarly career in relation to the mission of the department and the university, and might identify the resources, in budget, equipment, and time, necessary for the successful accomplishment of the goals. The professional development plan should be reviewed at least annually and revised as necessary to reflect changes in goals or assignments.

3.3.2. In the first semester of service, the candidate should begin to develop a professional relationship with a mentor or advisor, selected in consultation with the chair from among the seasoned faculty. Among other things, this mentor should assist the candidate in designing a faculty development plan to meet department, college, and university expectations for citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work.

3.3.3. In view of the relatively short period given candidates to demonstrate a capacity for productive scholarship, it is especially important that a research and publication program be implemented during the first year. Teaching and service assignments should allow adequate time for scholarly and creative work, and candidates should budget their time carefully in accordance with their assignments. (For example, a reasonable service load and a teaching assignment of two courses in a semester mean that approximately one-half of a faculty member’s time should be devoted to scholarly and creative work.)

3.3.4. New faculty should consider reworking their doctoral dissertations and other existing work for material that can be shaped into publishable articles in keeping with their career plans. When the dissertation or other existing work has promise as a book, often it is prudent to develop the material from at least some potential chapters into independent articles. It is difficult to write (or revise) a book-length work and get it reviewed, accepted, and published within seven years. Strategies of if, when, and how to

publish the dissertation should be developed with the assistance of experienced mentors and should be part of the approved faculty development plan. A book will not count as “published” even if it is under contract unless it has undergone peer review and has been revised accordingly and received final approval.

3.3.5. The initial (third year) review will evaluate a candidate’s progress in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship.

3.3.5.1 Citizenship should be evaluated on the evidence of good personal character, collegiality, commitment to the mission of the university, and promise for solid service contributions (bearing in mind that service assignments should be kept at a modest level while a candidate is qualifying for continuing faculty status).

3.3.5.2 Teaching performance should be evaluated on the evidence of: (A) ongoing implementation and measurement of, and reflection on, course and program learning outcomes; (B) online student ratings and faculty peer reviews (please see “Peer Review Teaching Packet” in Faculty Commons, humanities.byu.edu/forms); (C) the candidate’s capacity and commitment to meet the department’s needs.

3.3.5.3 Performance in scholarly and creative work should be evaluated on the evidence of the quality of the work the candidate has published thus far and the evidence provided by work the candidate is pursuing for publication at the time of the review, and on an assessment of how well that work expresses and fits into the candidate’s faculty development plan.

3.4. By the time of the final continuing faculty status review a candidate should demonstrate a solid foundation for a productive career in the three areas of citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work.

3.4.1. Type, venue, and quantity of scholarship at the continuing faculty status review will vary according to the candidate’s particular discipline and development plan. It must be borne in mind that some types of research require more time to complete than others. In the end, the criteria for judging scholarship are quality and significance to the discipline, rather than sheer quantity.

3.4.2. External reviews are vital to a successful file for CFS and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Full Professor. It is important that the process of selecting external reviews follows the guidelines outlined in the University Rank and Status Policy, 7.9.6: *“In final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, the department review committee will obtain external reviews of the body of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three faculty members at well regarded academic institutions who have achieved reputations in the relevant field. The faculty member may recommend reviewers, but the department review committee and the department chair are responsible for selecting the reviewers. Generally, reviewers should hold equal or higher rank to that being sought, and they should be persons whose personal association with the candidate would not be expected to bias the reviews. The committee report will describe how the reviewers were selected, the reasons they were chosen, their stature in the field,*

and any relationship they may have with the faculty member. The committee will send the reviewers the faculty member's curriculum vitae, information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, samples of scholarship from the file, and a summary of the university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Appendix D is a sample letter to external reviewers. For professional faculty, the department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service. Department chairs and department review committees should allow adequate time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters."

3.4.3. Although faculty have different styles and methods of teaching, the teaching record at the Final Review, including student ratings and peer reviews (please see "Peer Review Teaching Packet" in Faculty Commons, humanities.byu.edu/forms), should demonstrate the candidate's attention to the learning experience he/she provides to students. In addition to exhibiting the standard practices of good teaching—e.g., current course design and materials, appropriate rigor, clear expectations, treating students respectfully—the candidate should have established good habits of using information gathered from ongoing and appropriate assessments to guide changes or improvements to course design, classroom management, etc.

3.4.4. Successful candidates for continuing faculty status have demonstrated a capacity for supportive collegial relations and a willingness to assist in the routine work of the department.

4. Expectations for Advancement to the Rank of Professor ("University Policy" 5.3)

4.1. Advancement to professor is neither the consequence nor the privilege of seniority; some valued faculty members will complete their careers as associate professors. Candidates for advancement to professor should present "an established record of university citizenship," "an established record of high quality teaching," and "an established record of high quality scholarship [or creative work] since becoming an associate professor" ("University Policy" 5.3). Consequently, candidates for the rank of professor should present a file that is exemplary in its balance of professional responsibilities, and that documents an established professional reputation beyond the university. Such a reputation is established by a body of work that typically includes a monograph (see 2.4.2.3) and demonstrates influence through publication venues, reviews, and citation analysis. Other evidence of influence beyond the university includes leadership appointments in professional organizations, on editorial boards or in editorial positions of professional publications, etc. Candidates for the rank of professor should notify the dean of their candidacy by October 31 of the year preceding the expected review (last sentence in 4.1)?

4.2. In addition to meeting the standards for personal honor, institutional loyalty, and collegiality, candidates for advancement to professor should have made a substantial contribution to the work of the department and the university through committee, advisement, supervisory, and administrative service, and should also have been active contributors to their professional fields.

4.3. Candidates for advancement to professor should present a consistent record of effective

teaching as verified by sustained attention to implementing, measuring, and reflecting on student learning in courses and programs, as well as by student ratings and peer reviews (please see “Peer Review Teaching Packet” in Faculty Commons, humanities.byu.edu/forms). Depending on their individual career plans and the needs of the department, the record of quality teaching should extend across introductory as well as advanced courses, general education and service courses as well as those designed for disciplinary majors, and thesis advisement and other individual direction of students as well as classroom courses.

4.4 Candidates for advancement to professor should demonstrate consistent and ongoing productivity that results in a growing body of scholarly or creative works that have stood the test of exposure to and evaluation by other scholars in the discipline. Please see 3.4.1 for comments on selecting external reviewers, also applicable to applications to the rank of professor.

4.5 Academic leadership is, in itself, an important academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of administrative duties by a department chair or other administrator shall be considered appropriate criteria in evaluating performance for a merit increase in salary or for promotion. Extended periods of time by associate professors in demanding administrative assignments may reduce the opportunity to produce the quantity of scholarly or creative work expected for advancement to professor. However, while adjustments may reasonably be made in quantitative expectations in such cases, there should be no compromise of qualitative expectations. As it states in the University Rank and Status Policy 3.1.3, *“The allocation of time in these three areas may vary among faculty or over a faculty member's career, depending on changes in assignments due to legitimate university and department needs. Reviewers in the rank and status process will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing heavier responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and performance in another.”*