

CODE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
2019 (LAST REVISED MARCH 2021)

Table of Contents

- A. Identity and Scope of the Department of English
 - A.1 Mission Statement of the Department of English
- B. Officers and Standing Committees of the Department
 - B.1 Chair of the Department
 - B.2 Administrative Assistants and Program Directors
 - B.3 Executive Committee
 - B.4 Graduate Committee
 - B.5 Undergraduate Committee
 - B.6 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee
 - B.7 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Hiring Committee
 - B.8 Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Committees
 - B.8.1 Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee
 - B.8.2 Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - B.8.3 Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review (PCPR) Committee
 - B.8.4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee
- C. Program Committees
 - C.1 Creative Writing
 - C.2 Rhetoric and Composition
 - C.3 English Education
 - C.4 Language
 - C.5 Literature
- D. Scheduling Principles
- E. Miscellaneous Procedures
- F. Amendments to the Code
- G. Faculty Appointment Types and Ranks
 - G.1 Faculty Appointment Types
 - G.1.1 Continuing and Contract Appointments
 - G.2 Faculty Ranks by “Track”
 - G.3 Three Tracks Compared
 - G.4 Movement between Tracks
 - G.5 Movement between Ranks
- H. Annual and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty
 - H.1. Annual Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - H.2 Principles for the Evaluation of Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty
 - H.2.1 Annual Evaluation of Tenure-Track (Untenured) Faculty
 - H.2.2 Annual Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
 - H.2.3 Considerations for the Evaluation of Teaching/Advising/Mentoring of Tenured Faculty
 - H.2.4 Considerations for the Evaluation of Scholarship/Creative Activity of Tenured Faculty
 - H.2.5 Considerations for the Evaluation of Service Activity of Tenured Faculty

- H.3 Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review (PCPR) of Tenured Faculty
- I. Faculty Activities and Ratings Defined for the Purposes of Evaluation and Promotion
 - I.1 Teaching/Advising/Mentoring
 - I.1.1 Criteria for Evaluating Teaching/Advising/Mentoring Effectiveness
 - I.1.2 Evidence for Evaluating Teaching/Advising/Mentoring Effectiveness
 - I.2 Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - I.2.1 On the Importance of Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - I.2.2 On the Value of Engaged Scholarship
 - I.2.3 On the Distinctive Profile of and Creative Activity of English Faculty
 - I.2.4 Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - I.2.5 Evidence for Evaluating Scholarship/Creative Activity
 - I.3 Service
 - I.3.1 Criteria for Evaluating Service
 - I.3.2 Evidence for Evaluating Service
 - I.4 Evaluation Ratings Defined
 - I.4.1 Superior
 - I.4.2 Exceeds Expectations
 - I.4.3 Meets Expectations
 - I.4.4 Below Expectations
 - I.4.5 Unsatisfactory
- J. Standards for Appointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - J.1 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Instructor
 - J.2 Standards Regarding Promotion to Senior Instructor
 - J.3 Standards Regarding Promotion to Master Instructor
 - J.4 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Teaching Professor
 - J.5 Standards Regarding Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor
 - J.6 Standards Regarding Promotion to Full Teaching Professor
- K. Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty
 - K.1 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor
 - K.2 Standards Regarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
 - K.3 Standards Regarding Promotion to Full Professor
- L. Transitional-Retirement Faculty
- M. Faculty Search Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty
- N. Faculty Mentoring
- O. Student Appeals of Grading Decisions
- P. Statement on Academic Freedom

Appendices:

- Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty
- Appendix B: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion Procedures

A. Identity and Scope of the Department of English

A.1 Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of English is to advance the study and teaching of literature, language, and writing. To accomplish this mission, the Department will provide the basis for a strong liberal arts education focused on critical literacy, critical thinking, and culturally informed interpretive skills. The Department is committed to maintaining comprehensive and interdisciplinary English studies curricula for undergraduate majors and graduate students. To this end, we offer the following degrees:

- Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Creative Writing with specializations in Fiction, Creative Nonfiction, and Poetry
- Master of Arts in English with specializations in Literature; Writing, Rhetoric and Social Change; and Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL/TEFL)
- Master of Arts in English with area of study in English Education
- Bachelor of Arts in English with concentrations in Creative Writing; English Education; Language; Literature; and Writing, Rhetoric, and Literacy

The Department seeks to foster community within the Department and between the Department and other communities within and beyond the University. The Department encourages the continuing professional development of its faculty members, who are dedicated to excellence in teaching and mentoring, scholarship and creative activities, and program administration, service, and outreach.

B. Officers and Standing Committees of the Department

B.1. Chair of the Department *(rev. approved March 2021)*

On matters of changes in courses, programs, policies, personnel, and objectives, the Chair shall consult with and seek the approval of the Executive Committee.

The Chair shall evaluate the professional work of the members of the Department (tenuretrack faculty, tenured, contract, continuing, and adjunct faculty, staff, and GTAs). The Chair shall be responsible for merit evaluations; appointment, reappointment, and promotion recommendations; and terminations (after having been advised by committees designated in this code). For all evaluations, the Chair shall proceed according to the procedures in Section H. All peer review committees will be constituted within the framework of University Manual specifications.

The Chair shall direct the search for, and hiring of, new faculty members in accordance with procedures described in Section N below.

The Chair shall direct the search for, and hiring of, GTAs with the assistance of the Graduate Director, the Composition Director and other appropriate Departmental committees.

The Chair shall call general Department meetings as needed but at least once each academic year for the purpose of discussing objectives and problems pertaining to the work of the Department and the welfare of its members.

Every faculty member who has completed at least one year of service at the University and holds one of the following appointments is eligible to vote in department meetings: tenure-track full-time, tenure-track part-time, and tenure-track transitional. Non-tenure track faculty who have completed one year in a continuing or contract appointment shall have a vote on all matters, except with regard to personnel matters involving tenure-track and tenured faculty, including the Department Chair.

The Chair shall undergo annual evaluations according to the method prescribed in the College of Liberal Arts Annual Procedures Manual. The Chair Evaluation Committee shall be the Executive Committee, not including the Chair. It shall be chaired by an Assistant Department Chair.

B.2 Administrative Assistants and Program Directors

The Chair shall appoint the following administrative assistants from among the tenured members of the Department:

- The Assistant Chair(s), who shall perform duties delegated by the Chair
- The Director of Composition, who shall be responsible for administering the University Writing Program and for calling meetings as necessary to conduct business related to the University Writing Program.
- The Coordinator of Graduate Programs, who shall be responsible for administering the Department's graduate programs, for chairing the Graduate Committee, and for calling meetings as necessary to conduct business related to the Department's graduate programs
- The Coordinator of Undergraduate Programs, who shall be responsible for administering the Department's undergraduate programs, for chairing the Undergraduate Committee, and for calling meetings as necessary to conduct business related to the Department's undergraduate programs

In consultation with program faculty, the Chair shall appoint the following Directors. Program Directors will be chosen from among the tenured or tenure-track members of the Department:

- The Director of Creative Writing
- The Director of the Language Programs
- The Director of English Education
- The Director of the Literature Program
- The Director of Creative Nonfiction

- The Director of the Writing, Rhetoric and Social Change graduate specialization and the Writing, Rhetoric and Literacy Concentration
- The Director of the University Composition Program

B.3 Executive Committee

The voting members of the Executive Committee shall consist of:

- Department Chair
- An Assistant Chair
- Graduate Coordinator
- Undergraduate Coordinator
- Director of the University Composition Program
- Five members elected from the tenured and tenure-track faculty. One of the elected members must be tenure track (untenured).
- An elected representative of the Non-Tenure Track faculty. Non-Tenure Track faculty members who have completed one year of at least half-time service at the University are eligible for election and to vote. NTTF representatives to the Executive and Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committees are elected in a single ballot.

The Assistant Chair charged with overseeing elections in consultation with the Department Chair will ensure that the elected and the appointed faculty members together represent each of the department's undergraduate and graduate concentrations, areas of study, and specializations. The election shall be by Hare ballot. The election of tenure-track or tenured faculty members to the Executive Committee shall be conducted no later than the second week of the fall semester.

In the event that there are no faculty who meet the criteria for election or appointment to the Executive Committee, or if no individuals are willing to serve, their seats will not be filled.

Ordinarily, the term of office for appointed members of the Executive Committee shall be at the pleasure of the Chair. The terms of the elected representatives shall be two years and staggered.

Minutes shall be kept of all meetings of the Executive Committee and shall include voting results.

The duties of the Executive Committee shall be to advise and to deliberate with the Chair on planning and executing the curriculum; on making appointments, reappointments, and terminating contracts; on maintaining standards of instruction; on matters on which the Chair wishes to consult the Committee; and on interpreting, enforcing, and reviewing this code, and correlating it with the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*. In cases involving the evaluation, promotion, or tenure of the Chair, the Committee shall assume the duties of the Chair. On all matters that it initiates, the Executive Committee shall consult with all relevant Department committees.

The Chair may request an electronic vote on matters requiring action outside of the EC meetings. The results of an electronic vote will be confirmed at the next available EC meeting and results will be entered into the minutes.

Any member of the Executive Committee, upon receiving written suggestions from a member of the Department concerning any aspect of the Department's work, shall submit these suggestions to the Chair for possible inclusion on the agenda of the Executive Committee.

B.4 Graduate Committee

The Graduate Committee shall consist of the Graduate Coordinator, who acts as chair, six tenure-track or tenured faculty members appointed on a staggered basis for three-year terms, one full-time graduate student appointed for a one- year term, and the Internship Coordinator. The Chair of the Department will make appointments only after consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and will ensure that the faculty members appointed to the Committee represent the graduate programs in the Department.

The Graduate Committee is responsible for overseeing the Department's graduate curricula. These include but are not limited to:

- New graduate programs
- Revisions of existing graduate programs
- Approval of new courses and substantive revisions of existing courses
- Approval of proposals for variable topics courses
- Graduate advising

The Committee also oversees the University-mandated assessment of graduate programs by articulating the achievement goals that our students should attain, setting up appropriate assessment methods, gathering and synthesizing the evidence produced by these methods, and reporting the results to the University.

B.5 Undergraduate Committee

The Undergraduate Committee shall consist of the Undergraduate Coordinator, who acts as chair, six tenure-track or tenured faculty appointed on a staggered basis for three-year terms, one NTTF member appointed for a three-year term, and a full-time undergraduate English major appointed for a one-year term. The Chair of the Department will make appointments only after consultation with the Undergraduate Coordinator and will ensure that the faculty members appointed to the Committee represent each of the five areas of concentration open to English majors.

The Undergraduate Committee is responsible for overseeing all facets of the Department's undergraduate curricula. These include, but are not limited to:

- New concentrations or revisions of existing concentrations
- New courses or substantive revisions of existing courses
- Revisions of the requirements for the major and the minor

- Integration of the University and/or College of Liberal Arts general education requirements into the concentrations
- Topics for umbrella courses
- Prior-credit placement policies
- Review and recommendations of personnel and curricula for Semester at Sea
- Advising issues

The Committee also oversees the University-mandated assessment of major programs by articulating the achievement goals that our majors should attain, setting up appropriate assessment methods, gathering and synthesizing the evidence produced by these methods, and reporting the results to the University.

B.6 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee

The English department Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee shall consist of the NTTF representative to the Executive Committee, the English Department representative to the College of Liberal Arts NTTF Advisory Committee, if there is one, and three other members of the Non-Tenure Track faculty in the Department of English. NTT members who have completed one year of at least half-time service at the University are eligible for election and to vote. The NTTF representative to the College of Liberal Arts NTTF Advisory Committee is elected from the at-large CLA election ballot. The representatives to the Executive, Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Creative Writing, Literature, and Rhetoric and Composition Committees are elected from a single English department ballot, which is the responsibility of the NTTF Committee. The committee shall also include an ex-officio tenure-track or tenured faculty member invited by the committee to serve. All members of this committee may vote.

The terms of the NTTF members elected on the single English department ballot, including the Executive Committee representative, shall be two years and staggered. The term of the representative to the CLA NTTF Advisory Committee shall be determined by the rules of that group.

The NTTF Committee is responsible for representing the interests of NTTF members and working toward their equitable treatment and professionalization in the Department, the College, and the University; to advance the mission of the Department of English; and to enhance undergraduate education. Its duties include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying issues that concern NTTF members
- Communicating NTTF faculty concerns to Departmental, College, and University administration and governance bodies
- Communicating Departmental, College, and University policy and procedures, and other matters of interest to NTTF members;
- Bringing matters of concern to NTTF members to the Executive Committee as needed

B.7 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Hiring Committee

The membership of this committee shall consist of an assistant department chair, who will act as chair; a representative from the University Composition Program; one NTTF member and one tenure-track or tenured faculty member, each appointed for two-year terms by the department chair, in consultation with the chair of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee. The Chair will ensure membership of two NTTF instructors.

The duties of this committee shall include reading and ranking applications for NTTF positions. When the NTTF member on the committee is being considered, they will be excused from the meeting.

B.8 Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Committees

Although it remains the duty of the Chair, as the Code provides, to “evaluate the professional work of members of the Department,” three committees will advise the Chair on the evaluation of faculty: the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee; the Non-Tenure Track Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee; and the Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee. The INTO CSU Academic Director shall advise the Chair on the evaluation of Non-Tenure Track faculty with appointments at INTO CSU.

The composition and duties of these committees are described below in Sections B.8.1, B.8.2 and B.8.4. The system followed by these committees must include formal evaluations of all responsibilities relevant to the position: teaching/advising/mentoring, scholarship or creative activity, and service and engagement. These categories will be weighted or omitted based on the faculty member’s workload distribution. The labels for performance are “Superior,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” and “Unsatisfactory.” See Section I.4, Definitions of Evaluation Ratings.

The Chair will annually review the work of these committees to ensure that the standards articulated in these guidelines are applied uniformly to all faculty. The evaluative procedures and criteria and definitions of labels for performance are given below.

The Chair, members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and senior members of each program in the Department are responsible for encouraging tenure-track faculty members in identifying and pursuing a trajectory of inquiry, research, and creative activity leading to publication as defined in Section I.2, linking scholarship or creative activity to innovative teaching practices; and engaging with academic, intellectual, and/or creative communities both within and outside the Department.

B.8.1 Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee

Tenured faculty (those already tenured and those whose tenure is approved for the year in which they will vote or take office) shall elect a committee of five tenured faculty members, at least three of whom must be full professors. Election shall be by Hare ballot.

Terms of office shall be three years and staggered.

The Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee shall choose a chair from among its members.

The Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee's duties shall be to:

- Lead the departmental process of making recommendations for tenure and promotion as outlined in Appendix A.
- Report on the vote. If the vote is unanimous in favor of granting tenure and/or promotion or unanimous in favor of denying it, then the committee shall so report and provide documentation supporting the vote. If, however, the vote is split, the committee shall report the vote and provide a statement of reasons for both the minority and majority points of view.
- Forward the Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to the Department Chair, who shall write his or her recommendation and commentary before transmitting these materials to the Dean of the College.
- Annually advise the Chair on the performance of tenure-track faculty members based on evidence concerning the professional performance of all tenure-track faculty except those in their first year. They will do so by submitting suggested ratings in each category and evidence in defense of those ratings, and by submitting narratives of performance of tenure-track faculty members, together with suggested ratings, at the third or midpoint year.
- Fulfill any additional duties agreed upon by Committee members and the Department chair.

B.8.2 Tenure and Promotion Committee

All tenured faculty constitute the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee. All tenured faculty are eligible to vote on cases of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Only Full Professors are eligible to vote on promotions to Full Professor.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee's duties shall be to

- Consider and make recommendations to the Department Chair for tenure and promotion by applying the procedures in Appendix A and the department's evaluative criteria in Sections K.2-K.3. In cases involving the Chair, the Executive Committee will receive the recommendation for promotion and make its own recommendation based on the vote of the full professors of the Executive Committee.

All eligible faculty are expected to vote.

B.8.3 Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review (PCPR) Committee

The membership of the Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee shall consist of four faculty members chosen by and from the tenured faculty. The election shall be by Hare ballot. Terms of office shall be two years and staggered.

The Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee's duties shall be to conduct Phase 1 reviews of tenured faculty.

Responsibilities regarding tenured faculty:

- Consult the evidence assembled by tenured faculty up for Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review regarding their teaching/advising/mentoring, scholarship or creative activity, and service in the past five-year period, and coordinate peer observations of classes taught by those faculty in the fall semester of the review.
- Compose brief narratives that correspond to the university form for Phase I of this periodic review. These narratives will constitute, in most cases, the committee's advice to the Chair regarding Phase I. The Chair will then report on the continuing performance of faculty members under review in accordance with the requirements of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*.
- Advise the Chair on suggested ratings in teaching/advising/mentoring and service based on the faculty member's performance in those areas for the five-year period. These suggested ratings may become benchmarks for the Chair to use in the evaluation process during the next five-year period.
- Advise the Chair on suggested ratings in teaching/advising/mentoring and service for the annual review completed in the same year as PCPR.

Should it be necessary to conduct a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review for a member of the faculty, the Department Chair shall appoint a three-member review committee drawn from a pool of tenured Department faculty at the same or higher rank as the faculty member under review. The pool shall be created through recommendations of the Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee and the faculty member under review. The pool shall not include members of the Phase I committee. The duties of the Phase II committee shall include:

- Working with the faculty member under review to suggest strategies for addressing concerns raised by the Phase I review
- Collecting additional information concerning the teaching/advising/mentoring, scholarship or creative activity, and service of the faculty member under review
- Soliciting a narrative from the faculty member under review. The narrative should address concerns raised by the Phase I review and outline a plan for improving performance.
- Evaluating the performance of the faculty member on the basis of the materials collected

At the end of the review process, the members of the Phase II committee shall report one of the following outcomes to the Chair:

- The faculty member under review has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance.
- The deficiencies identified by the Periodic Comprehensive Review Committee are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.
- There are substantial and chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied.
- The conditions set forth in Section E.14.3.2 Time Limit for Action by the Provost/Academic Vice President of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* appear to be present.

In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the Phase II review committee, must be remedied, the Chair and the faculty member under review will design a professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and set a schedule for accomplishing each element of the plan. This plan must be approved by the Dean of the College.

In the event that conditions set forth in Section E.15.4.1 are present, the Phase II committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation.

For each outcome, the Phase II committee shall provide the faculty member under review with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have 30 days to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the Chair and, at successive steps, to the Dean and the Provost. Recommendations of the Chair and Dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost shall make the final decision regarding action.

B.8.4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee

The committee will oversee annual evaluations for English department NTTF and promotions for NTT faculty in English. The INTO CSU Academic Director shall advise the Chair on the evaluation and promotion of Non-Tenure Track faculty with appointments at INTO CSU following established criteria.

The membership of this committee shall consist of seven members elected from the eligible faculty in the English department: two tenure-track or tenured faculty members and five non-tenure track faculty members, all of whom must hold the rank of Senior Instructor, Assistant Teaching Professor or higher. The members will be elected by Hare ballot. All faculty with one or more years of service at 50% of full-time equivalency or higher are eligible to vote on the composition of the committee.

The duties of the committee with regard to evaluation shall be to:

- Arrange for or conduct peer observations of NTTF members.
- Draft annual evaluations for all NTTF (excluding INTO CSU NTTF).

- Fulfill any additional duties agreed upon by committee members and the Department Chair.

The duties of this committee with regard to promotion shall be to serve as a steering committee to:

- Lead the departmental process of making recommendations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty as defined in Appendix B.
- Report on the vote of all non-tenure track faculty at or above the aspirational rank of the candidate. If the vote is unanimous in favor of granting promotion or unanimous in favor of denying it, then the committee shall so report and provide documentation supporting the vote. If, however, the vote is split, the committee shall report the vote and provide a statement of reasons for both the minority and majority points of view.
- Forward the committee's written recommendation to the Department Chair, who shall write the chair's recommendation and commentary before transmitting these materials to the Dean of the College.
- Fulfill any additional duties agreed upon by Committee members and the Department chair.

Promotion cases shall be reviewed by faculty at or above the aspirational rank of the candidate. In the event that fewer than three non-tenure track faculty committee members hold the necessary rank, tenure-track faculty from English or non-tenure track faculty from the College of Liberal Arts will be asked to review promotion cases. Whenever possible, the ratio of two tenure-track and five non-tenure track faculty members will be maintained.

When NTTTF members on this committee are being evaluated or considered for promotion, they will be excused from the relevant meetings.

C. Program Committees

Each program in the Department may form a committee to discuss its curriculum, policies, and hiring needs and to make recommendations to Undergraduate Committee, Graduate Committee, Executive Committee, and Chair. Non-tenure track faculty members of the program committees shall have a vote on all matters, except with regard to personnel matters involving tenure-track faculty, including the Department Chair. Typically, NTTTF on program committees will serve the same term of office as TTF. Current program committees, their make-up, and their leadership consist of the following:

C.1 Creative Writing

The Creative Writing Committee consists of all tenure-track and tenured members of the Creative Writing faculty, one elected NTTTF representative, any other NTTTF members deemed essential to the functions of the Program, and one student representative from the MFA Program.

The Director of Creative Writing will be selected according to a rotation among tenured members of the Creative Writing faculty and serves a two- year term at the discretion of the Department Chair. Sabbaticals, leaves, and other commitments may affect the order of rotation or length of term, at which time an acting chair may be approved by the Department Chair to complete the term, or the order of rotation may change.

C.2 Rhetoric and Composition

The Rhetoric and Composition Committee consists of all tenure-track and tenured members of the Rhetoric and Composition faculty, one elected NTTF member and any other NTTF members deemed essential to the functions of the Program.

The Director of the University Composition Program will be selected according to a rotation among tenured members of the Rhetoric and Composition faculty and normally serves a two-year term at the discretion of the Department Chair. Sabbaticals, leaves, and other commitments may affect the order of rotation or length of term, at which time an acting director may be approved by the Department Chair to complete the term, or the order of rotation may change.

C.3 English Education

The English Education Committee consists of all tenure-track and tenured members of the English Education faculty and other faculty who teach courses required in English Education, as needed.

The Director of English Education will be selected according to a rotation among tenure-track and tenured members of the English Education faculty, and serves a renewable two-year term at the discretion of the Department Chair. Sabbaticals, leaves, and other commitments may affect the order of rotation or length of term, at which time an acting chair may be approved by the Department Chair to complete the term, or the order of rotation may change.

C.4 Language

The Language Committee consists of all tenure-track and tenured members of the faculty who teach linguistics and/or English as a Second Language courses and those non-tenure track faculty deemed essential to the functions of the Program.

The Chair of the Language Committee will be selected according to a rotation among tenure-track and tenured members of the Language faculty and serves a renewable two-year term at the discretion of the Department Chair. Sabbaticals, leaves, and other commitments may affect the order of rotation or length of term, at which time an acting chair may be approved by the Department Chair to complete the term, or the order of rotation may change.

C.5 Literature

The Literature Committee consists of all tenure-track and tenured members of the Literature faculty and one member of the non-tenure track faculty who regularly teaches literature courses. This member will be elected by the non-tenure track faculty.

The Literature Committee Chair, who also serves as Chair of the Literature Program, will be appointed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the Literature Committee, for a renewable two-year term. Sabbaticals, leaves, and other commitments may affect the length of term, at which time an acting chair may be appointed by the Department Chair to complete the term.

D. Scheduling Principles

Department scheduling obligations:

- To provide a full range of courses in support of the Department's common core, program curricula, and AUCC.
- To spread classes evenly across the day and week.
- To minimize competition among courses.
- To distribute advanced courses among faculty as evenly as possible.

Principles and practices:

- An environment conducive to high quality instruction and learning must be fostered for teachers and students.
- Teaching workload reductions from the current norm are intended to support research and creative activity or in recognition of Departmental administrative assignments.
- Teaching schedules are organized by the Assistant Chair responsible for staffing and scheduling in consultation with the graduate and undergraduate coordinators and in light of the requirements of the AUCC and University Composition Program.
- Faculty will have an opportunity to express their teaching preferences for both regular and special topics courses.
- Faculty will have an opportunity to express their scheduling preferences vis-à-vis morning/afternoon/evening, contiguity, days, and class sessions per week for assigned courses.

E. Miscellaneous Procedures (*rev. March 2021*)

With regard to the resolution of grievances between Department Chair and individual faculty members, parties should consult the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, section K.

This Code shall be reviewed at least once every five years, ordinarily in the fourth year of a Chair's term of office.

Department Program Review will be initiated and coordinated by the Chair according to the schedule set by the University. The Chair will be assisted in this task by the Executive Committee and by other standing committees and Departmental officers as needed. Reviews must include a survey of all faculty members.

Every faculty member who has completed at least one year of service at the University and holds one of the following appointments is eligible to vote in department meetings: tenure-track full-time, tenure-track part-time, and tenure-track transitional. Non-tenure track faculty who have completed one year in a continuing or contract appointment shall have a vote on all matters, except with regard to personnel matters involving tenure-track and tenured faculty, including the Department Chair.

All non-tenure track faculty who have completed at least one year of service in the English department are encouraged to stand for election and/or appointment to department committees, and may vote on those committees, except with regard to personnel matters involving tenure-track faculty, including the Department Chair.

A quorum is defined as a simple majority of the faculty who are eligible to vote. Eligibility is based on years of service in the department, faculty appointment, and the matters to be voted on. For all matters, faculty on transitional retirement and faculty on sabbatical or other approved leave at the time of the voting shall not be included in the total number of faculty on which the quorum is calculated.

F. Amendments to the Code (*rev. March 2021*)

Any faculty member eligible to vote may offer an amendment to this code at one of the Department's faculty meetings.

The proposed amendment shall be presented to the Chair in writing at least two calendar weeks before the Department meeting at which its adoption will be moved. The Chair will circulate the amendment and that portion of the code to be amended to all faculty members eligible to vote on the amendment at least one calendar week prior to the meeting.

Voting shall be by written ballot. There are two requirements for passing an amendment to the code. First, a two-thirds majority of those voting, a quorum being present, is required to carry the motion. Second, that approving two-thirds majority must include simple majorities of both the tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty who are voting at the meeting.

Amendments thus passed by the Department will be referred to the Dean's and Provost's Offices for approval before becoming an operational part of this code.

G. Faculty Appointment Types and Ranks

G.1 Faculty Appointment Types

Definition of faculty. Persons who hold any faculty appointment type in the Department of English are considered faculty. The Department of English is the academic home for faculty

at in the English Language Programs at INTO CSU and faculty appointed in the English department.

Faculty in the department of English fall into six categories or appointment types. Appointment types differ from ranks or titles. Adjunct, Continuing, and Contract are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are defined in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, sections E.2.1 – E.2.6.

- Adjunct appointments
- Continuing appointments
- Contract appointments
- Tenure-track appointments
- Tenured appointments
- Transitional appointments

G.1.1 Expectations for Contract Appointments

Continuing faculty are eligible for conversion to Contract appointment as outlined in the Faculty Manual E.2.1.4. Contract appointments will primarily be offered to faculty at the ranks of Senior Instructors or Assistant Teaching Professors or higher. To meet instructional and service needs, the department will offer contracts to faculty at the rank of Senior Instructor or Assistant Teaching Professor or above, with priority based on teaching performance, years of service, or skills to meet departmental service commitments in addition to teaching. Contracts may also be offered for continuing faculty with specific non-teaching duties. Instructional contracts will typically have an effort distribution of 90% teaching and 10% service, which will be compensated. Non-contracted committee service shall be compensated per the CLA policy.

Contracted faculty should expect to renew or renegotiate their contracts upon expiration, with a conversion to Continuing as job performance or decreased sections warrant. The number of contracts available will be calculated based on the three-year average of total sections, as well as university enrollment trends and enrollment forecasts, to be monitored and adjusted annually. Faculty with Continuing appointments interested in contracts should consult the Chair.

G.2 Faculty Ranks by “Track”

Appointment types differ from ranks. A faculty member’s ability to hold a given rank will be determined by the type of appointment they hold (listed in the preceding subsection) and, in the case of non-tenure track faculty, which “track” they are on (Instructor or Professorial). In most cases, non-tenure track faculty on the Instructor Track have primarily teaching responsibilities. Non-tenure track faculty on the Professorial Teaching Track typically have additional responsibilities in the areas of service and/or scholarship/creative activity.

- Non-tenure track faculty on the Instructor Track may hold the ranks of Instructor, Senior Instructor, or Master Instructor. Those with adjunct appointments hold the rank of Instructor.

- Non-tenure track faculty on the Professorial Teaching Track may hold the ranks of Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor or Full Teaching Professor.
- Tenure-track and tenured faculty may hold the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor.
- Transitional faculty may hold the ranks Associate Professor or Full Professor.

G.3 Three Tracks Compared

The following table compares all three tracks and will determine who may vote on non-tenure track promotion cases. For example, Master Instructors, Associate Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, Full Teaching Professors, and Full Professors could all vote on the promotion of a Senior Instructor to Master Instructor because they are all at or above that candidate's aspirational rank. Non-tenure track faculty may not vote on tenure/promotion cases for faculty on the Tenure Track.

Instructor Track	Professorial Teaching Track	Tenure Track
Instructor		
Senior Instructor	Assistant Teaching Professor	Assistant Professor
Master Instructor	Associate Teaching Professor	Associate Professor
	Full Teaching Professor	Full Professor

G.4 Movement between Tracks

Promotion leads through the ranks of a single track, that is, through the Tenure Track or, in the case of non-tenure track faculty, the Professorial Teaching Track and the Instructor Track. Lateral shifting of an appointment from one track to another does not constitute promotion and requires a revision of the faculty member's position description and assigned duties.

G.5 Movement between Ranks

Individuals on contract or continuing appointments are eligible to be considered for advancement in rank. All candidates for advancement in rank will be reviewed according to their distribution of effort in teaching and service for faculty in the Instructor rank and teaching, service and research in the professorial ranks. Normally, candidates should demonstrate the same level of effectiveness as is required for a tenure track faculty member in any and all categories of their job duties. (Appendix B. CLA Code)

See section J. for promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

H. Annual and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

H.1. Annual Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated each calendar year by the Chair with assistance from the Executive Committee and the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee. Faculty will be evaluated using categories and ratings described in Sections I.1-I.3. Specific categories (e.g. service or scholarship/creative activity) will be omitted and/or weighted based on the individual faculty member's effort distribution. Annual evaluation files for non-tenure track faculty should include, at minimum, the following:

- Confidential Annual Activities Report (including job description)
- *Curriculum Vitae* (any format);
- Goals statement with previous year's statement attached (if in second year or beyond)
- Additional required materials will be communicated by a staff member

New faculty are encouraged to work with their mentor in preparing material, and all faculty receive more specific guidelines about the length and content of the material in workshops held in October or November.

H.2 Principles for the Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

All tenure-track and tenured faculty will be evaluated each calendar year in the areas of teaching/advising/mentoring, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases will be consistent with, and based upon, the effort distribution established for each member of the faculty.

Although it remains the duty of the Chair, as the Code provides, to "evaluate the professional work of members of the Department," two committees will advise the Chair on the evaluation of tenure-track or tenured faculty: the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee. The composition and duties of these committees are described in Section B. The system followed by both committees must include formal evaluations of teaching/advising/mentoring, scholarship or creative activity, and service. The labels for performance are "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," and "Unsatisfactory." See Section I.4 for Definitions of Evaluation Ratings.

The Chair will annually review the work of both committees to ensure that the standards articulated in these guidelines are applied uniformly to tenure-track and tenured faculty. The evaluative procedures and criteria and definitions of labels for performance are given below.

The Chair, members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and senior members of each program in the Department are responsible for encouraging tenure-track assistant professors and tenured associate professors in identifying and pursuing a trajectory of inquiry, research, and creative activity leading to publication as defined in Section I.2; linking scholarship or

creative activity to innovative teaching practices and program administration; and engaging with academic, intellectual, and/or creative communities both within and outside the Department.

Tenure-track faculty are expected to maintain a performance file (see Section H.2.1-H.2.2 for the contents of the file). Tenured faculty up for periodic comprehensive performance review are expected to assemble a performance file (see Section H.3 for the contents of the file).

In the process of evaluation of tenure-track faculty members conducted by the Chair and the evaluation committees, the Department notes the difference between annual evaluation and progress toward tenure. In a given year, for example, a tenure-track faculty member may receive an “Exceeds Expectations” rating for outstanding publications, yet not be on track overall for the achievement of tenure and promotion. Annual evaluation for the last calendar year is a snapshot of one year’s activities, while the annual review for tenure and promotion is a cumulative review of an entire professional career in rank up to the point of the review.

Tenure-track faculty are reviewed for progress toward tenure annually and independently by both the Chair and the tenured faculty. Both reviews yield independent memos summarizing the progress toward tenure that are given to the faculty member and the Dean or Chair, respectively.

H.2.1 Annual Evaluation of Tenure-Track (Nontenured) Faculty

Probationary faculty should be thoroughly familiar with the following:

- “Academic Faculty Tenure Policy” in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*
- Relevant sections of the Department Code on tenure, promotion, and the functions of the Tenure and Promotion Committee
- The University’s Tenure and Promotion Application form.
- In addition, probationary faculty members should keep their performance files up to date.

Performance files should include:

- All Confidential Faculty Annual Activities Reports since arriving at the University
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae
- Teaching materials, including syllabi, course handouts, and other data from classes taught since arriving at the University
- Student and peer evaluations of teaching, advising, and/or mentoring since arriving at the University
- Copies of all scholarly or creative activities, including publications, grant proposals, conference papers, and work in progress completed since arriving at the University

- A full record of service, including the candidate's own statements of specific contributions and any other documents attesting to quality and extent of service since arriving at the University
- A narrative summary of the candidate's activities since arriving at the University and a work plan for the coming year

Candidates in their first year of service should have this file in readiness by ~~the end of the~~ early November; candidates in their second year, in early October; and candidates in their third, fourth, and fifth years of service, in early January.

In a faculty member's first year of service, their teaching evaluation is the responsibility of the Chair. Recommendations for reappointment from first to second year are normally due in the Dean's Office in January, so this evaluation will necessarily be based on only one semester of activity. The Chair will consult with the faculty member and schedule classroom visits to the courses being taught in the first semester of appointment, to be conducted either by the Chair or the Chair's appointee. A letter of evaluation to the faculty member, with a copy to be placed in his/her file, will ordinarily be composed within five days of the visit.

H.2.2 Annual Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Each year, each tenured faculty member who is not undergoing periodic comprehensive performance review will submit a Confidential Faculty Annual Activity Report, an annual goals statement, and an updated curriculum vitae. Faculty may also provide a brief narrative of their work during the previous year.

H.2.3 Considerations for the Evaluation of Teaching/Advising/Mentoring of Tenured Faculty

Assessments assigned in the most recent prior periodic comprehensive performance review or tenure-and- promotion evaluation will be used as baseline evaluations. Each annual evaluation until the next periodic comprehensive performance review will assess the current year's work in reference to that baseline, changing the evaluation as necessary to reflect such elements as student teaching evaluations, whether the faculty member taught what was for him/her a new course or a substantial revision of an old one, and advising and mentoring. Faculty may ask for peer reviews of their teaching.

H.2.4 Considerations for the Evaluation of Scholarship/Creative Activity of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty undergoing annual review will provide a list of scholarly or creative activities taking place over the past three years. The list shall include:

- Multiple- or single-authored publications and works in press, in print or digital form, including scholarly monographs, textbooks, edited collections, technical reports, publications in refereed journals or refereed edited collections, collections of poems, stories, essays, and other texts as outlined in Section I.2.

- Events such as juried or invited exhibitions
- Activities such as presentations or performances
- Professional roles at conferences such as panelist or discussant
- Professional activities such as publishers' reviewer
- Awards received and nominations for awards
- Applications for outside funding (successful or not)
- Reports of miscellaneous items such as citations, acknowledgments, etc.
- Evidence of continuing study and development

The Chair will consider the list of scholarly or creative activities provided annually by each faculty member as a moving three-year window of accomplishment, and will judge the scholarship or creative activity of each tenured faculty member on the basis of the Provost's rating scale and the Department's definitions of that scale. This moving window is considered a means of evaluation separate from the three-year retrospective evaluation conducted by the Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review Committee.

The Chair will take into account such elements as whether a publication is refereed; the prestige of the publisher/journal; the extent of the faculty member's participation, single or shared, in the preparation of the publication, whether as author, editor, or translator; the extent to which the publication is addressed to experts in the field and appears to make an original contribution to this field; the number and nature of reviews, citations, and other forms of recognition the publication receives.

H.2.5 Considerations for the Evaluation of Service Activity of Tenured Faculty

Assessments assigned in the most recent prior periodic comprehensive performance review or tenure and promotion evaluation will be used as baseline evaluations. Each annual evaluation until the next periodic comprehensive performance review will assess the year's work in reference to that baseline, changing the evaluation as necessary to reflect the faculty member's service activities during the year under review.

H.3 Periodic Comprehensive Performance Review (PCPR) of Tenured Faculty

In the year of his/her periodic comprehensive performance review, the faculty member will create a performance file consisting of:

- Faculty Annual Activity Reports and Annual Faculty Evaluation—Summary Reports (Provost's form or "landscape" form) from the last five years or period since the last periodic comprehensive performance review;
- Updated curriculum vitae, with last five years of publications or work in press clearly indicated;
- All student surveys and peer evaluations from last five years;
- Narrative of previous five years and goals for next evaluation period.

Re-evaluation: Faculty members may request a periodic comprehensive performance review even when not scheduled for one.

I. Faculty Activities and Ratings Defined for the Purposes of Evaluation and Promotion

The *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, section C. 2.5., requires that “the evaluation of faculty shall be based on qualitative and quantitative assessments of the faculty member’s fulfillment of responsibilities to the university during the period of the evaluation” in each of the areas of professional responsibility.

As stipulated in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*, section C. 2.5., “assessment of the quality of faculty performance requires careful and critical review, necessarily involving judgments, and should never be reduced to purely quantitative measures.” The Manual also requires that “the criteria for evaluating the original or imaginative nature of research and other creative activities should be the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area” and that “reviews of performance must be based upon the faculty member’s effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility (sections E. 12.2., E. 14.; and see section E. 9).”

I.1 Teaching/Advising/Mentoring

I.1.1 Criteria for Evaluating Teaching/Advising/Mentoring Effectiveness

Criteria for measuring effectiveness and continued growth in teaching, advising, and mentoring shall be understood to include:

- Command of subject matter
- Creation of an atmosphere that encourages and facilitates learning, lucid reasoning, creativity, and independent thinking
- Skill in presenting material and demonstrating its significance and importance, and skill in presenting interrelationships among fields of knowledge
- Continual efforts to improve the aims and content of courses and academic programs
- Openness to a variety of views and respect for student expression
- Fairness, clarity, reasonableness, timeliness, and discernment in assigning and evaluating student work
- Commitment to teaching and advising responsibilities, including regular, prompt meeting of classes, keeping office hours, providing accurate advice and information, demonstrating excellent knowledge of University services and career services and effectively referring students to appropriate services;
- Willingness to assist students in their academic and professional development, including writing letters of recommendation, and accommodating special circumstances
- Continual assessment and development of effectiveness as a teacher, adviser, and mentor

I.1.2 Evidence for Evaluating Teaching/Advising/Mentoring Effectiveness

The Department Chair, with advice from the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee and Periodic Comprehensive Review Committee where required, will assess the

teaching/advising/mentoring work of faculty members by consulting multiple sources of information, including course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning or community engagement; appropriate course surveys of teaching; faculty self-reports of mentoring activities and evidence of effectiveness; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students or mentees; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments other than those that appear on course survey forms shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor.

On the basis of the evidence so gathered, the committees (or the Chair or appointees) will judge faculty members' teaching to be "Superior," "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Below Expectations," or "Unsatisfactory."

I.2 Scholarship/Creative Activity

I.2.1 On the Importance of Scholarship/Creative Activity

As befits a major research institution, scholarly research and creative activity are central responsibilities of departmental faculty. They include the production of original works that require substantive development, information gathering, processing, and/or analysis that leads to dissemination in a way that will make the work and results of the activity accessible to scholars, professionals across the disciplines of English Studies, and/or other publics. Research refers to the kind of intellectual activity that normally leads to academic or specialized publication. Creative activity refers to the kind of intellectual activity normally engaged in by artists and professional practitioners in the discipline. All research and creative activity that is relevant to the faculty member's professional interests shall be evaluated as part of her/his record. To be considered sufficient for tenure and promotion, the works must represent an original and distinctive theoretical/intellectual/artistic contribution anchored in the candidate's scholarly or creative record, and the record must be judged by external reviewers as making a significant contribution to the field. Applicants can include in their file work other than traditional refereed or juried work. Candidates will be expected to provide relevant and necessary information to the evaluation committee regarding disciplinary standards, publication venues, and the impact of their work.

I.2.2 On the Value of Engaged Scholarship

The Department recognizes the value of engaged scholarship. Taking our cue from the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, we ground our policies in a notion of "multiple scholarships." By engagement, we refer to collaborations between universities and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Engaged scholarship cuts across and enriches university missions of teaching, research and service, and embraces the processes and values of a civil democracy.

I.2.3 On the Distinctive Profile of and Creative Activity of English Faculty

The Department, through its Chair and evaluation committees, acknowledges the distinctive profile of scholarship and creative activity of English Department faculty members, including but not limited to those responsible for teaching and mentoring secondary licensure students and whose scholarship is directed toward the multiple audiences of university-level and K-12 educators; those faculty involved with writing program administration whose scholarship is directed toward multiple audiences including undergraduate educators (GTAs and instructors), as well as state, university, and disciplinary leadership bodies; those faculty involved with the preparation and implementation of ELL instruction in adult, K-12, and higher education systems.

I.2.4 Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship/Creative Activity

Criteria for measuring effectiveness and promise of continued growth in scholarship or creative activity shall be understood to include the consistency, quality, and substances of the scholarship or creative activity. Measures include:

- Publications in the form of scholarly books, monographs, textbooks, edited collections, technical reports, publications in refereed journals or refereed edited collections, collections of poems, stories, essays, and other texts as outlined in Section H, part 2, “Standards Regarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor,” together with judgments of the publications by specialists in the field
- Juried or invited exhibitions, presentations, or performances
- Peers’ judgments of the quality of the venues of such publication, exhibitions, presentations, or performances
- Evidence of continued study and development
- Peers’ judgments of the faculty member’s professional activities demonstrably related to the discipline and directed toward one’s peers
- Estimates by outside experts as to the quality of the work and of the venue(s) in which it appears
- The application for and/or award of funding to support scholarly or creative activities

I.2.5 Evidence for Evaluating Scholarship/Creative Activity

Evidence of scholarly excellence in research and creative activity includes but is not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed monographs and books
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Scholarly articles or chapters in refereed edited volumes published by a reputable academic press
- Publication of creative artistry including essays, stories, poems, novels, drama, and other creative forms
- Textbooks that make original contributions to a specific field
- Edited collections

- Major grants to support research and scholarship including the acceptance of a proposal before the work resulting from the grant appears in print
- Edited anthologies, journals or series of volumes comprising the work of other scholars and artists, including print and online journals
- Translations of creative or scholarly works or important source materials from other languages
- Writing, language, or literacy projects housed within digital platforms that showcase scholarly expertise
- Research reports, white papers, administrative histories, educational materials, chapbooks, policy papers, position statements, expert testimony and/or consulting reports.
- Review articles evaluating scholarship in a specific field
- Substantial book reviews
- Publications designed for technical or non-academic audiences including but not limited to newsletters, encyclopedias, reference books, books and magazine articles
- Dissemination of scholarship through op-ed pieces, interviews, substantial blogs and other commentary as experts in print or digital popular media

Faculty at work on long-term projects should submit finished portions of work in progress. Works in press will ordinarily be evaluated as publications. For consideration for promotion from assistant to associate professor and for annual evaluations a work “in press” will ordinarily be evaluated as published. A work is considered to be “in press” when it has been accepted for publication without further revision or review. Faculty submitting works in press will attach official notices of acceptance and will not resubmit the works in subsequent evaluation periods when these are published. For promotion from associate to full professor actual publication is required. The committees will read the material furnished and, if necessary, ask outside experts to read it as well. The committees will then judge the scholarship or creative activity to be “Superior,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” or “Unsatisfactory.”

I.3 Service

I.3.1 Criteria for Evaluating Service

Criteria for measuring effectiveness in institutional and professional service shall be understood to include:

- Willingness to serve
- Responsible fulfillment of assignments
- Efforts to act in the best interests of the Department, College, and University
- Contributions to the profession and the discipline
- Quality, significance, and impact of professionally-oriented community service and outreach related to one’s teaching, scholarship, or creative activity

The Department understands its polity as one of consensus and participation. Faculty members express their views and conduct much of the business of the Department

through the committee structure. This shared governance can only succeed when faculty members are willing to accept appointments, stand for elections, offer consistent and reliable service, and accept leadership roles in Department committees and working groups.

These activities will likewise receive ratings of “Superior,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” or “Unsatisfactory.”

I.3.2 Evidence for Evaluating Service

Evidence of service shall come primarily from self-reporting documents, including but not limited to annual activities reports, CVs, and narratives. Other evidence can include but is not limited to expressions of appreciation/acknowledgement written by others, certificates, awards, and published lists of editors/editorial boards.

I.4 Evaluation Ratings Defined

Evaluation committees will apply the labels “Superior,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” or “Unsatisfactory,” in the following fashion.

I.4.1 Superior

“Superior” denotes:

- A consistent record of outstanding teaching, including but not limited to innovative teaching methods, constant revision of syllabi, and proposal of new courses, together with a record of exemplary advising and mentoring
- Significant and ongoing scholarly or creative work, including scholarly monographs, textbooks, edited collections, technical reports, publications in refereed journals or refereed edited collections, collections of poems, stories or essays; a significant number of published uncollected works; conference papers, presentations, readings, or other activities and texts as outlined in Section I.2.
- Leadership in service to the Department, demonstrated by making significant contributions to the work of the Department. In addition, leadership on College or University-wide committees, service as officers on national committees, or other service that advances the reputation of the Department, College, or University in the local, regional, national, or international communities.

I.4.2 Exceeds Expectations

“Exceeds Expectations” denotes:

- A high level of teaching and advising/mentoring activities
- A consistent and coherent level of scholarly or creative activity including published work in refereed journals or refereed edited collections, conference papers, presentations, readings, or other activities
- A steady record of service to the Department. Ordinarily in addition, a steady record of service to the College, University, or community that reflects the faculty

member's professional expertise, or service to the profession in some other significant capacity

I.4.3 Meets Expectations

“Meets Expectations” denotes:

- The adequate fulfillment of teaching assignments and advising/mentoring functions
- The adequate maintenance of a scholarly or creative profile through occasional publications, as well as conference papers, presentations, or readings
- Adequate service to the Department and adequate service on institutional or professional committees, boards, or other such activities

I.4.4 Below Expectations

“Below Expectations” denotes:

- Difficulties in fulfilling teaching assignments that may be corrected through mentoring and consultation, and inattention to advising duties such as inaccurate or incorrect advice, missed advising sessions, or inaccurately or inadequately completed graduation contracts
- Some promise of scholarly or creative work, but difficulty in identifying sets of issues, techniques, or questions that constitute a scholarly or creative profile or trajectory, and scholarly or creative work that focuses solely on conference presentations or readings
- Difficulties in fulfilling service obligations, demonstrated by chronic absence from committee meetings, inattention to necessary work, lack of commitment to the obligations of service

I.4.5 Unsatisfactory

“Unsatisfactory” denotes:

- Insufficient or problematic classroom preparation/presentation and advising/mentoring functions
- Slight evidence of continuous scholarly or creative activity
- Unwillingness to serve on institutional or professional committees, boards, or panels, or to participate in other such activities

J. Standards for Appointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Individuals on contract or continuing appointments are eligible to be considered for advancement in rank. Typically, promotions require ten semesters of appointment in rank completed within five or six consecutive years. This does not preclude promotions after shorter periods of time in rank at the University, which can occur when service credit is specified in the offer letter for time spent in rank at another institution or in cases of exceptional records, when one-year-early promotions can be considered.

J.1 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Instructor

Appointment at the rank of instructor shall require a master's degree relevant to the position description and demonstrated teaching effectiveness at the university/college level. Additional requirements will be indicated in the position description.

J.2 Standards Regarding Promotion to Senior Instructor

The Senior Instructor rank is available to non-tenure track faculty in the Instructor Track. Promotion to Senior Instructor requires the following:

- Ten semesters of experience as an Instructor (or equivalent)
- Record of teaching excellence
- Contributions to the department, college, university and/or discipline including but not limited to: service on committees; new course/curriculum development; integration of service learning; peer mentoring or participation in department training programs for GTAs or similar; and/or pedagogical development. Contributions in this area may include scholarship or creative activity that is related to position responsibilities.
- Evidence of professional development

J.3 Standards Regarding Promotion to Master Instructor

The Master Instructor rank is available to non-tenure track faculty in the Instructor Track. Promotion to Master Instructor requires the following:

- Ten semesters of experience as Senior Instructor (or equivalent)
- Record of teaching excellence
- Contributions to the department, college, university and/or discipline including but not limited to: service on committees; new course/curriculum development; integration of service learning; peer mentoring or participation in department training programs for GTAs or similar; and/or pedagogical development. Contributions in this area may include scholarship or creative activity that is related to position responsibilities.
- Evidence of professional development

J.4 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Teaching Professor

Appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor shall require a terminal degree in a discipline relevant to the position offered, evidence of successful teaching at the university/college level, and promise of excellence in scholarly or creative activity relevant to the position. Additional requirements will be indicated by the position description.

J.5 Standards Regarding Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

- Completion of a terminal degree and ten semesters of experience as Assistant Teaching Professor (or equivalent)
- Record of teaching excellence
- Record of excellence in scholarly/creative activity (the amount will vary dependent on teaching load and work distribution) as defined in Section I.2
- A record of service to the department, through activities such as service on committees or boards, on the Department, College, or University level
- Evidence of professional development

J.6 Standards Regarding Promotion to Full Teaching Professor

- Ten semesters of experience as Associate Teaching Professor (or equivalent)
- Record of teaching excellence.
- Record of excellence in scholarly/creative activity (the amount will vary dependent on teaching load and work distribution) as defined in Section I.2
- A record of service to the department, through activities such as service on committees or boards, on the Department, College, or University level
- Evidence of professional development

K. Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty

All faculty members being recommended for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of achievement appropriate to the rank under consideration. Recommendation for tenure shall require clear evidence of capability for significant professional contributions, effectiveness and promise of continued growth in teaching, research, scholarship, and/or creative activity, and of effectiveness in institutional, professional, and public service. We understand that the evidence may not always be identical for standard expectations for individuals requesting tenure and/or promotion. We value the disciplinary differences within the Department of English. We recognize and value engaged teaching, scholarship, service, as well as the administration of large and specialized programs having particular significance to the university. We also recognize and value interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship. In all cases, the decisions for tenure and promotion will consider the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative activity as well as quantity.

K.1 Standards Regarding Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor

Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor will require a terminal degree in English Studies or a closely related field. Additional criteria will be articulated by the department in the position description, in accordance with University procedures and the procedures outlined in Section N.

K.2 Standards Regarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be recommended for tenure, assistant professors ordinarily must meet the requirements for promotion to associate professor. These are:

- Completion of ~~the~~ a terminal degree and tenure-track faculty appointment
- A record of “Superior” or “Exceeds Expectations” teaching that includes the development and revision of course curricula, the effective use of proven and/or innovative teaching methods, and a consistent record of reliable advising and mentoring
- A record of “Meets Expectations” service, through activities such as service on committees or boards, on the Department, College, or University level, or a record of service to the community that reflects the faculty member’s professional expertise
- Evidence of sustained research or creative activity resulting in publications, performances, or exhibitions. Evidence typically consists of a publication record (normally achieved in rank) of some combination of multiple or single authored refereed or juried publications that contribute to new knowledge or perspectives equivalent to five or six substantial refereed articles and/or book chapters. (See Section I.2 for a definition of research and creative activity)

K.3 Standards Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

Recommendation for promotion to professor requires demonstration that the faculty member has achieved recognition among leaders in the profession. This achievement is normally demonstrated by maturation in scholarship or creative activity as well as continued professional development. Promotion to professor also requires a strong record of teaching/advising/mentoring and service.

The requirements for promotion to Full Professor are:

- A record of “Superior” or “Exceeds Expectations” teaching in the period since the promotion to associate professor (including the year of application for promotion) that includes the development and revision of course curricula, the effective use of proven and/or innovative teaching methods, and a consistent record of reliable advising and mentoring
- A consistent record of “Exceeds Expectations” service in the period since the promotion to associate professor (including the year of application for promotion), through activities such as work on committees or boards, on the Department, College, or University level, or a record of service to the community that reflects the faculty member’s professional expertise, or service to the profession in some other significant capacity
- Evidence of sustained research or creative activity resulting in publications, performances, or exhibitions. Evidence typically consists of a publication record (normally achieved in rank) of some combination of multiple or single authored refereed or juried publications that contribute to new knowledge or perspectives equivalent to five or six substantial refereed articles and/or book chapters. (See Section I.2 for a definition of research and creative activity)

L. Transitional-Retirement Faculty

Full-time tenured faculty may request transitional appointment as they move toward full retirement. Transitional appointments are governed by the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* E.2.6 and by the procedures and forms provided in the *College of Liberal Arts Annual Procedures Manual*. Transitional appointments are for a specified term of at least one year and no more than four years, and conclude with full retirement.

Transitional faculty will participate in the teaching/advising/mentoring, service, and research activities and expectations of the Department.

Transitional faculty will teach three courses in the semester of their service. This number may be negotiated with the chair and dean.

Transitional faculty are exempt from the periodic comprehensive performance review procedure.

M. Faculty Search Procedures

Hiring new tenure-track faculty members in the Department of English will follow the procedures and schedule mandated by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and certified by the University's Office of Equal Opportunity. The Department Chair, who in conjunction with the Executive Committee has authority for organizing and supervising the hiring procedure, will review with the Executive Committee the most recent procedures at the start of each hiring season, normally toward the end of the spring semester. When adopted by the Executive Committee, these procedures will be in effect for that hiring season and will be on file in the English department office.

Application materials, including letters of recommendation, from semifinalist candidates for tenure-track and tenured positions, will be made available to all tenure-track and tenured members of the department faculty.

The department chair and search committee chair will encourage the attendance at finalist presentations of all Department members, including faculty at any rank or appointment, staff, and students, and will ensure that feedback is actively encouraged and consulted by the Executive/Search Committee as it shapes its recommendations to the department chair.

N. Faculty Mentoring

The Department has established a formal mentoring plan for tenure-track faculty and an optional plan for non-tenure track faculty. The details of these plans may be found in the Department Handbook.

O. Student Appeals of Grading Decisions

The Department has established a procedure for receiving and adjudicating student grade appeals in conformity with the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* I.7.1. The

Appeals Committee shall be formed according to the Manual, observing the timeline specified there. The Department Chair will invite five members to comprise the Appeals Committee: two faculty members and two students from within the department and one faculty member from outside the department who will serve as the committee chair. All five members of the committee shall be voting members.

P. Statement on Academic Freedom

In accordance with the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* E.1, “The faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, master instructor, senior instructor, instructor, and faculty affiliate) and the University President. All faculty members shall have the academic freedom enjoyed by tenured faculty members, regardless of the type of appointment.” Principles and policies are further articulated in E.8 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*.

Appendix A

Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty

PROCEDURES	
Step 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty receive an e-mail announcing that a candidate is going up for tenure and/or promotion. The e-mail would include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ description of the review process the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee has already followed in vetting the file ○ instructions for faculty input as described below ○ date of the formal department meeting where the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee shall present the candidate's case (described in Step 3) ○ reminder of the expectation for casting an informed vote, to be achieved by attending the department meeting and/or reviewing the candidate's file. These files, including a summary of the external letters, would be available for perusal in the department office. ○ ballot with space for comments and the deadline for submission. <i>Note that comments are required for a negative vote.</i>
Step 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee shares their narrative and vote with the candidate prior to the meeting, and the candidate has an opportunity to respond in writing.
Step 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A department meeting shall be convened during which the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee members make a formal presentation to: 1) briefly contextualize the case with information that might help faculty who are not in the candidate's field to understand the field more fully; 2) review the key points of the committee narrative, provide the committee vote and the gist of the candidate's response (if any); and 3) address faculty questions. • Tenured faculty shall attend meetings reviewing cases of untenured candidates. Full Professors shall attend meetings reviewing promotion cases for Associate Professors. Candidates themselves shall not be present at these meetings.
Step 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By a designated deadline, faculty members complete ballots, including any comments, and deposit them in a secure location in the department office. • Ballots shall be signed and submitted in a sealed, signed envelope with an indication of the extent to which the faculty member has reviewed the candidate's files. Objections to the recommendation of the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee shall require review of the file. The PowerPoint presentation made by the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee may be made available, if necessary (e.g., if the faculty member was unable to attend the meeting). • Faculty shall initial a sheet indicating that they have submitted their votes. In order to ensure that everyone votes, an office staff member will remind any faculty member who has not initialed the signature sheet, indicating that s/he must vote by the designated deadline.
Step 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the faculty vote and a summary of comments from the ballot (without attribution) shall be provided to the candidate and the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee by the Chair of the P&T Steering Committee. • The candidate shall have the option to respond in writing. This written statement shall go to the Chair of the T&P and will go forward with the packet. • After reviewing the result of the faculty vote and the summary of comments, the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee may amend their narrative if the content of faculty comments reflects information that was factually inaccurate (e.g., the number of publications, etc.). The committee shall also report the minority vote if there is one and summarize any objections from faculty as a part of their report and recommendation.
Step 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department Chair shall forward her/his final decision to the Dean based on this body of information—the Tenure & Promotion Steering Committee's narrative (with indicated amendments if necessary as described in Step 5), the vote and comments of all tenured faculty, and the candidate's response (if provided).

Appendix B

Promotion Procedures for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

PROCEDURES	
Step 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty receive an e-mail announcing that a candidate is going up for promotion. The e-mail would include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ description of the review process the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee has already followed in vetting the file ○ instructions for faculty input as described below ○ date of the formal department meeting where the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee shall present the candidate's case (described in Step 3) ○ reminder of the expectation for casting an informed vote, to be achieved by attending the department meeting and/or reviewing the candidate's file. These files, including a summary of any external letters, would be available for perusal in the department office or on a secure department website. ○ ballot with space for comments and the deadline for submission. <i>Note that comments are required for a negative vote.</i>
Step 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee shares their narrative and vote with the candidate prior to the meeting, and the candidate has an opportunity to respond in writing.
Step 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A department meeting shall be convened during which the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee members make a formal presentation to: 1) briefly contextualize the case with information that might help faculty who are not in the candidate's field to understand the field more fully; 2) review the key points of the committee narrative, provide the committee vote and the gist of the candidate's response (if any); and 3) address faculty questions. • Faculty at the aspirational rank of the candidate are eligible voters. Faculty at the rank of Senior Instructor, Assistant Teaching Professor or higher shall attend meetings reviewing cases for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor. Master Instructors, Associate Teaching Professors and those of higher rank shall attend meetings reviewing cases for promotion to Master Instructor and Associate Teaching Professor. Only Full Teaching Professors shall attend meetings reviewing cases for promotion to the rank of Full Teaching Professors. Candidates themselves shall not be present at these meetings.
Step 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By a designated deadline, faculty members complete ballots, including any comments, and deposit them in a secure location in the department office. All eligible voters are expected to complete a ballot. • Ballots shall be signed and submitted in a sealed, signed envelope with an indication of the extent to which the faculty member has reviewed the candidate's files. Objections to the recommendation of the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee shall require review of the file. The PowerPoint presentation made by the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee may be made available, if necessary (e.g., if the faculty member was unable to attend the meeting). • Faculty shall initial a sheet indicating that they have submitted their votes. In order to ensure that everyone votes, an office staff member will remind any faculty member who has not initialed the signature sheet, indicating that s/he must vote by the designated deadline.
Step 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the faculty vote and a summary of comments from the ballot (without attribution) shall be provided to the candidate and the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee by the Chair of the Committee. • The candidate shall have the option to respond in writing. This written statement shall go to the Chair of the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee and will go forward with the packet.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After reviewing the result of the faculty vote and the summary of comments, the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee may amend their narrative if the content of faculty comments reflects information that was factually inaccurate (e.g., the number of sections taught, etc.). The committee shall also report the minority vote if there is one and summarize any objections from faculty as a part of their report and recommendation.
Step 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department Chair shall forward her/his final decision to the Dean based on this body of information—the Evaluation and Promotion Steering Committee’s narrative (with indicated amendments if necessary as described in Step 5), the vote and comments of all non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of Senior Instructor or Assistant Teaching Professor or above, and the candidate’s response (if provided).