

# Department of English

Approved: June 13, 2001

Amended: October 7, 2003

## I. DEPARTMENT MEMBERSHIP AND FUNCTIONS

### A. MEMBERSHIP

#### 1. **Faculty Ranks and Definitions--Fully Affiliated Faculty**

The English department will include full-time faculty at some or all of the following ranks: Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor.

#### 2. **Voting Membership**

The voting membership of the department comprises the fully affiliated faculty along with full-time staff with significant teaching and supervisory responsibilities. Each full-time staff member, instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor is entitled to one vote.

#### 3. **Adjunct Faculty**

The English department may include part-time faculty teaching a variety of courses. Among the part-time faculty may be some hired for only a class or two, some hired to teach on a regular basis, and some retired faculty who return to teach on occasion. The Writing Programs Committee or another subject-area committee will evaluate all new applicants for part-time positions and will recommend qualified applicants to the Chair.

Adjunct faculty are not voting members of the department. However, in specified cases, adjunct faculty may serve and vote on department committees. They are invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings.

#### 4. **Emeritus Faculty**

Retired faculty who have been granted emeritus status continue to be affiliated with the department and may teach on occasion. Emeritus faculty may also attend all official department functions and open meetings. They are not voting members of the department.

#### 5. **Graduate Assistants**

The English department may include a number of graduate assistants. The Graduate Committee will evaluate all applicants for graduate assistantships.

Graduate assistants are not voting members of the department. However, as specified in these bylaws, they may serve and vote on several department committees. They are also invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings.

#### 6. **Support Staff**

The English department may include a number of support staff, among them unclassified staff responsible for directing particular programs and classified staff responsible for managing the department office.

Support staff are not voting members of the department. However, in specified cases, staff may serve on and vote in department committees and may attend department meetings. They are also invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings.

## **B. GOVERNANCE**

### **1. Faculty Involvement in Governance**

As requested by appropriate administrators, faculty will provide recommendations on an array of issues affecting the department and the college. Some of the means by which faculty will provide recommendations on governance follow:

- The faculty will elect a member of the faculty to serve on the College Senate; the department will provide faculty to serve in the appropriate constituency slots in college and university committees
- At the request of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, the faculty will participate in the review of the department Chair and of other department administrators
- At the request of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, the faculty will make recommendations in the selection of a new department Chair; a majority of members of any Chair search committee will be faculty elected by faculty in the department

### **2. Department Committees**

Department committees fall into three categories: Administrative Committees, Subject Area Committees, and Special Committees with particular responsibilities. Unless otherwise indicated, each committee below is a standing committee to be elected at the beginning of each year. Standing committees may form ad hoc subcommittees.

#### **a. Administrative Committees**

The administrative committees of the English department are responsible for reviewing and evaluating the programs and procedures of the department and for preparing materials for college and university committees.

##### **i. Advisory Committee**

Members:

- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- Six non-administrative faculty, including, when possible:
  - One Lecturer
  - One Instructor
  - One Assistant Professor
  - One Associate Professor
  - One Professor
  - One more tenured at-large faculty member

Duties:

- Advise the Chair on policy decisions
- Advise the Chair on matters relating to the annual evaluation of faculty
- Review committee recommendations relating to Lecturer contract renewal; forward these to the Chair with recommendation

ii. **Undergraduate Committee** (Curriculum Committee)

Members:

- A chair (appointed from the full-time faculty by the department Chair)
- The Director of Writing Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex-officio voting member)
- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- Four members elected by the department's voting membership
- Two upper-level undergraduates chosen from among students in the English major, when possible

Duties:

- Recommend and review undergraduate English major requirements
- Recommend and review General Education requirements
- Administer undergraduate major assessment procedures
- Consult with subject-area committees to develop and improve curriculum
- Recommend course changes to the department
- Oversee the department's support of the English Club, the Fogdog Review and any other undergraduate student activity

iii. **Graduate Committee**

Members:

- The Director of Graduate Studies (chair)
- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- The Director of Writing Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- Four other members elected by and from the department's graduate faculty
- One graduate student elected by students in the program. The student member may participate in all discussions and votes except those relating to himself or herself (candidacy for an award, petition, etc.)

Duties:

- Recommend and review graduate program requirements
- Administer graduate program assessment procedures
- Consult with content-area committees to develop and improve curriculum
- Recommend course changes to the department
- Recommend students for graduate assistantships and fellowships, and recommend English graduate students for university awards
- Oversee the department's support of graduate student organizations and any other graduate student activity

iv. **Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Committee**

Members:

- A committee chair, elected by and from the tenured members of the department (the department Chair is not eligible for this position)
- All the tenured bargaining unit faculty members of the department, except those serving primarily in administration outside the department 1
- The department Chair (non-voting member)

Duties:

- Prepare an annual statement for each probationary faculty member on his or her progress toward promotion and tenure
- Where required, prepare an annual statement for each Associate Professor on his or her progress toward promotion
- Vote on all faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure and provide any required statements explaining that vote

The department Chair will forward the committee's vote and statement(s) to the Liberal Arts Promotion and Tenure Committee.

v. **Technology Committee**

Members:

- A chair elected by the department's voting membership
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of Writing Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- Four department members elected by and from the department's voting membership, with at least one member familiar with classroom technology issues

Duties:

- Recommend the department's use of technology, particularly computers, software, and peripherals, in all aspects of teaching, service and research
- Recommend and implement the department's technology plans
- Forward all requests for technology to the department Chair
- Oversee and facilitate technological training and support of faculty

vi. **Awards Nominating Committee**

Members:

- A chair elected by the department's voting membership
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex officio voting member)
- The department Chair (ex officio voting member)

- Four department members elected by and from the department's voting membership

Duties:

- Identify potential recipients for faculty, staff, student, and alumni awards and scholarships
- Initiate, process, and coordinate nominations for award and scholarship recipients

vii. **Search Committee (ad hoc)**

In any search for a new faculty member, a majority of the search committee will be faculty members elected by the department faculty.

viii. **Chair Review Committee Representatives (ad hoc)**

As requested by the College of Liberal Arts, the faculty will elect representatives to serve on the chair review committee.

b. **Subject Area Committees**

i. **Writing Programs Committee**

Members:

- The Director of Writing Programs (chair)
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of the Writing Center (ex-officio voting member)
- Four faculty elected by the department's voting membership, all of whom should be active in one or more of the department writing programs
- A teaching assistant elected by the teaching assistants in the graduate program

Duties:

- Develop policy, program and course recommendations related to writing courses (except those in creative writing)
- Oversee writing program curricula
- Send undergraduate and general-education related curricular recommendations to the Undergraduate Committee
- Send recommendations involving graduate courses to the Graduate Committee
- Periodically evaluate the performance of Lecturers in composition, and send recommendations regarding the renewal of Lecturers' contracts to the Advisory Committee
- Review all applications for part-time writing positions

ii. **Language Programs Committee**

Members:

- The Director of TESOL Programs (chair)
- The Director of ESL Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of the LEAP Intensive English Program (ex-officio voting member)
- Four members elected by the voting membership of the Department, at least two of whom must be active in the language programs
- A TESOL student selected from among the current students in the program

Duties:

- Develop policy, program and course recommendations relating to the linguistics, TESOL, and ESL programs
- Oversee language program curricula
- Periodically evaluate the performance of Lecturers in linguistics and/or ESL, and send recommendations regarding the renewal of Lecturers' contracts to the Advisory Committee
- Send undergraduate curricular recommendations to the Undergraduate Committee
- Send recommendations involving graduate courses to the Graduate Committee

iii. Literature Programs Committee

Members:

- A chair elected by the department's voting membership
- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- The Director of Graduate Studies (ex-officio voting member)
- Four members elected by the department, all of whom should be active in various of the department's literature programs (which include women's studies, creative writing, African and African-American literature, and literary theory)
- A literature student selected from among the graduate or undergraduate literature students

Duties:

- Develop policy, program and course recommendations related to literature and creative writing courses
- Oversee literature program curricula
- Send undergraduate and general education-related curricular recommendations to the Undergraduate Committee
- Send recommendations involving graduate courses to the Graduate Committee

iv. **Integrated Language Arts Program Committee**

Members:

- A chair elected by the department's voting membership
- The department Chair (ex-officio non-voting member)
- The Director of Writing Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- The Director of TESOL Programs (ex-officio voting member)
- Four members elected by the department
- An Integrated Language Arts student selected from among the current students in the program

Duties:

- Develop policy, program and course recommendations relating to the Integrated Language Arts program
- Oversee language arts program curricula
- Send undergraduate curricular recommendations to the Undergraduate Committee
- Collaborate on language arts issues with College of Education faculty and staff

**c. Special Committees**

**i. Library Committee**

Members:

- A Library Representative appointed by the Chair
- Three other department faculty members, appointed as needed
- A graduate student elected by students in the graduate program, when possible

Duties:

- Oversee University Library acquisitions to reflect the mission of the department
- Provide liaison between the department and the University Library

**ii. Visiting Writer Committee**

Members:

- A chair appointed from among the creative writing faculty
- Three other elected department faculty
- A graduate student elected by students in the graduate program, when possible

Duties:

- Organize visits and readings of writers, critics and scholars
- Publicize visiting writers

iii. **Colloquium Committee**

Members:

- A chair appointed from among the faculty
- Three other elected department faculty
- A graduate student elected by students in the graduate program, when possible

Duties:

- Organize colloquia, papers, and presentations by department faculty and students
- Publicize these colloquia

**C. SUMMER TEACHING POLICY**

The department Chair will follow the existing rotation and the language of the Contract in assigning summer teaching.

The department's summer teaching rotation is based on rank and history. Faculty members' original positions on the summer teaching rotation list when it was established were determined by rank, time in rank, and length of service at Wright State. Faculty who either are denied a summer teaching opportunity or do not choose to teach in summer go to the top of the list the following summer, with relative positions again based on rank, time in rank, and length of service at Wright State. All newly hired faculty are placed at the bottom of the rotation, with relative positions based on differences in rank (if any).

The Chair will give preference in summer teaching to faculty who notify the chair in writing that they intend to retire within three years. Any faculty member who returns to the summer rotation from a fiscal-year contract in which he or she was ineligible for summer teaching will go to the middle of the rotation.

**II. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF BARGAINING-UNIT FACULTY**

The department Chair will annually evaluate the performance of Bargaining-Unit Faculty following the procedure outlined in the contract.

The Contract specifies the process by which Bargaining-Unit members will submit a report to the Chair and the Chair will evaluate their professional activities. The purpose of this by-law is to establish (1) the means by which the Chair will weigh the different areas of activity, and (2) the criteria the Chair will use in evaluation.

Annual evaluations should recognize faculty for their successes in diverse areas of their professional lives. Thus, in some years, teaching, scholarship, or service may be weighted more highly than in others. The English Department adopts the following standard range of percentages for weighting each of the three professional areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.



Teaching: weights may range from 40% to 60%  
Scholarship: weights may range from 5% to 50%  
Service: weights may range from 5% to 50%

The three percentages assigned must add up to 100%.

The Department Chair will evaluate each area of each faculty member's professional activity and assign an integer to that area, guided by the criteria stated below. The Chair will then assign to each area a percentage from the range above that gives the faculty member the maximum possible overall average.

The Chair may assign a different weighting from that defined above in any of the following situations:

- The faculty member has work assignments that differ from those of other faculty
- The Chair is imposing discipline pursuant to the contract
- The Chair is acting to correct a pattern of substandard performance extending for more than one year

## A. THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING 2

### 1. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching**

In the following description, the phrase "course load" refers to the load assigned to each individual faculty member by the university. Depending upon other responsibilities, the actual number of courses taught may differ from one faculty member to another. In describing teaching, advising, and related activities, the adverb "effectively" refers on the one hand to demonstrable overall success in conveying appropriate information and building appropriate skills, and on the other hand to demonstrable effort in attaining such success. Thus, a faculty member may demonstrate the effectiveness of his or her teaching with evidence showing classroom success (e.g. positive student comments on evaluations, peer reviews of teaching by colleagues, recognition given to work completed by students in class), and (if needed) with evidence showing the kind and quality of effort he or she has made in meeting students' needs (e.g. a teaching journal or log, a portfolio of teaching materials, a discussion of special problems faced in a particular class).

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and advise students effectively.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively, and perform all three of the following, or any two of the following with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show significant evidence of success in teaching and advising
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g. advise honors students, supervise master's theses, serve on thesis and portfolio committees, work with independent-study students, etc.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and perform all four of the following well or three of the four with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising, or the equivalent

- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g. advise honors students and thesis candidates, serve on thesis committees, work with independent-study students, or the equivalent
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and perform all five of the following well or four of the five with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising, or the equivalent
- Perform other teaching-related functions as requested; e.g. advise honors students and thesis candidates, serve on thesis committees, work with independent-study students, or the equivalent, all with outstanding success
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in the development and support of the teaching of other department faculty (especially of bargaining-unit faculty), e.g. by giving classes on pedagogical issues, by leading the way and helping others with classroom technology, by mentoring faculty who may be struggling with their teaching, by developing on-line courses that meet department needs and standards, or the equivalent

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in teaching will be given to any faculty member who does not satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation or who does not provide the Chair the evidence required for the Chair's evaluation. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory teaching performance may include (but are not limited to)

- missed classes (without informing the department or without adequate explanation)
- missed advising appointments
- persistent and justified student complaints  
erratic classroom behavior
- failure to keep appropriate office hours and otherwise be available to students and advisees
- failure or refusal to provide the Chair contract-required information, materials, or notification that are teaching related
- failure to communicate effectively with students
- refusal to teach assigned courses in the faculty member's field
- refusal to teach standard assigned writing and general-education courses for which department faculty are normally responsible
- failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints  
irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with or in the presence of students in a university setting

Behaviors like those described may result in an evaluation of Unsatisfactory (if they are frequent and characteristic) or a lowered evaluation (from Meritorious to Adequate, for example).

## 2. Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching are required of all bargaining-unit faculty. In addition, peer evaluations are required of all probationary bargaining-unit faculty.

**Student Evaluations** The contract specifies what part of the student evaluations will be sent to the faculty member only and what information will be sent to the Chair. If they wish, faculty may provide additional evaluation material or may provide information explaining or responding to the student evaluations.

**Peer Evaluations:** The Chair and the department Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Committee will arrange for the peer evaluation of non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty. At least one peer evaluation visit will be conducted for each non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty member per full calendar year. The PTR Committee and the Chair will both have access to the reports of all peer evaluation visits. The Chair will use them in his or her Annual Evaluation, while the PTR Committee will use them in its statement of progress toward promotion and tenure.

Faculty who wish to present additional evidence of their teaching effectiveness may arrange on their own for peer evaluation visits. Reports of any peer evaluation activities are due to the Chair by the date on which the activity reports are due.

**Other Evidence:** Faculty may submit additional evidence to the department Chair. Supporting evidence may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- Selected syllabuses or other class materials (to demonstrate a particular classroom innovation, for example)
- A peer evaluation of teaching (for example, a colleague's report of a classroom visit)
- A written response to any peer evaluation
- A description of a particular section or a response to the student evaluations for a particular section (if the faculty member believes the evaluations for that section need to be contextualized, for example)
- Additional student evaluation materials, including (but not limited to) a self-administered evaluation instrument, a mid-term evaluation, the numerical evaluations from the official university instrument, signed letter(s) from students in a particular course, etc. 3
- Evidence showing student learning success, for example the results of a pre- and post-evaluation

The Chair may also gather evidence to be used as part of the evaluation of teaching. In such cases, the Chair will make all written records and/or summaries of evidence available to the faculty member.

## **B. THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP**

### **1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarship 4**

The English department values research and scholarship, and fully understands that real scholarship often bears fruit only after a researcher spends a considerable time preparing the ground. Thus, in determining merit in scholarship, the Chair should not only weigh publications but the time and effort of preparation. (Collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as single-author scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly.) In particular, the department encourages the Chair to look beyond the work of the single year to get a sense of the faculty member's overall performance as a scholar. Similarly, we encourage all faculty to give the Chair materials which will help him/her accurately judge merit using a

broader perspective than that of a single year. However, higher levels of merit in scholarship, particularly the rankings of Outstanding and Extraordinary, will normally require publication of the kind described below.

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or creative reading(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or creative reading(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, or the equivalent
- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering one to three papers or presentations at academic conferences, publishing one or more reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, publishing one or more short creative works, editing an academic series, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by any two of the following, for example attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or creative reading(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, publishing one or more reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, or the equivalent
- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering a significant paper or a presentation at a significant academic conference, publishing one or more reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, publishing one or more short creative works, editing an academic series, or the equivalent
- Demonstrate professional originality and independence, for example by publishing an article (or several articles) in a peer-reviewed academic journal<sup>5</sup>, publishing a chapter (or chapters) in a peer-reviewed academic book, publishing a longer creative work or a collection of short creative works in a recognized creative-writing journal or in chapbook form with a recognized creative writing press, editing or coediting an academic book with a recognized university or academic press, revising and republishing a previously published book or textbook, revising and collecting previously published work in a single volume, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in scholarship, a faculty member must do at least one of the following fully or some partial combination of at least two of the following, or the equivalent, in addition to otherwise keeping at least an Adequate or Meritorious level of scholarly activity:

- Publish an academic book with a recognized university or academic press
- Publish a professional textbook with a recognized publisher of texts in the appropriate field
- Publish four or more professional articles in peer-reviewed academic journals

- Publish four or more chapters in peer-reviewed academic books
- Publish a novel or collection of short stories with a recognized publisher of creative writing
- Publish a book of poetry with a recognized publisher of poetry
- Publish four or more stories in recognized and significant journals publishing short fiction

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in scholarship will be given to any faculty member who cannot satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory scholarly performance include (but are not limited to) demonstrations of incompetence in matters of professional expertise, periods of four or more years without a professional publication of any kind, refusal to respond to mentoring or to develop a research plan (if requested), and so on.

## 2. Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship

Faculty may claim a work for the purposes of merit (above the level of Adequate) in one year only. For example, an article may be reported in year one as being "in preparation" or "under consideration"; in year two it may be reported as having been "accepted"; in year three it may be reported as being "published." While it is useful for faculty to list all three in order to establish their ongoing commitment to keeping current with their professional fields, the article will count for Meritorious or higher consideration either in year two or year three. That is, an article, chapter, or book may count when it is accepted for publication or when it appears.

In support of all claims of merit in scholarship at the Meritorious level and above, the faculty member must submit the following:

- For all published works: a copy of the publication
- For all works listed as accepted but not yet published: a printed copy of the accepted manuscript or galley proofs of the printed publication
- For all conference papers: a printed copy of the manuscript

In addition, all faculty may (if they wish) submit a statement describing their research program and publication plans, as a way of placing in context the performance for a given year.

## C. THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE

### 1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Faculty service that is most valued should contribute to the overall mission of the department, college or university. Service includes but is not limited to committee service, leadership in existing university programs, development of new programs and initiatives, and professional or community service.

Activity like the following will be typical of an Adequate level of service and will receive a score of 1:

- Serve on one or two committees at the department level and/or at the college or university level
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise

Activity like the following will be typical of a Meritorious level of service and will receive a score of 2:

- Chair an important department committee or serve on two or more important department committees or committees at the college or university level or the equivalent
- Serve on two or more other department committees and/or committees at the college or university level or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in developing a new course, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise

In addition to an otherwise Meritorious level of service, activity like the following will be typical of an Outstanding level of service and will receive a score of 3:

- Lead a major aspect of the department's academic life beyond the regular activities of teaching, advising, and service; for example, lead a student organization, direct a departmental program, lead a search, chair an important and productive committee, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chair a committee that rewrites and implements changes in general education, take a faculty leadership role, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in a state or national professional organization, or function in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in community or professional service related to professional expertise

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in service, a faculty member must perform some combination of Outstanding activities in multiple areas of service or one Extraordinary accomplishment in service; for example take a major leadership role in the university while heading a state professional organization.

## 2. Evidence for the Evaluation of Service

Faculty should submit to the Chair

- A list of all service activities performed during the year, arranged in order from the most important to the least important
- A description of all service activities performed that represent special commitment or effort beyond the norm
- Any testimonial letters received that describe a particular act of service and its effects
- Any other material that may support a claim to merit in service above that of Meritorious

# III. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The following paragraphs describe the criteria for promotion and tenure in the English department. Normally, candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure only at the Associate Professor rank should be able to show that their activities in each area have been ongoing from the time of hiring to the date of the evaluation for promotion. Candidates for promotion and tenure may present accomplishments dating from before their hiring at Wright State University if the accomplishments are relevant to their case (for example, a scholarly article in English published while the faculty member was a graduate student or employed outside academe) or if the position previously occupied was an academic position at another university. Candidates for tenure already at the Associate Professor or Professor rank may present evidence from Wright State and/or from the previous place of employment.

The department PTR committee expects all faculty to show that they have been productive in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Normally, teaching and scholarship will be valued most highly; service is important but should not be pursued to the detriment of teaching and scholarship.

#### **A. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (WITH TENURE)**

Before becoming eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, an Assistant Professor will ordinarily accumulate at least five years of full-time college teaching and will ordinarily serve as Assistant Professor at Wright State University for at least two years.

##### **1. Teaching:**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has advised and taught students successfully. Among other things, a successful teacher will do both of the following, or the equivalent:

- Establish and maintain high and appropriate standards of achievement in all classes
- Help students acquire the knowledge and strategies for meeting those standards

In addition, a successful teacher will do some or all of the following, or the equivalent:

- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly, including formal and informal advising, serving on thesis committees, working with independent-study students
- Develop new courses and/or significantly revise existing courses
- Integrate appropriate technologies into classes in a meaningful and useful way

##### **Evidence of Successful Teaching**

1. Each candidate for promotion and tenure must produce a summary of his or her student evaluation numbers as part of the formal promotion and tenure document.
2. Each candidate for promotion and tenure will produce a portfolio of teaching which will be an appendix to the promotion and tenure document. The portfolio of teaching will include a selection of evidence showing how the candidate has performed actions like those itemized above.
3. The department Chair and the tenured members of the Bargaining Unit Faculty will arrange for the peer evaluation of teaching for all non-tenured faculty. Such peer-written letters will be placed in the candidate's portfolio of teaching.

4. The candidate may place additional testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, responses to peer-written letters, student evaluation comments, or other documents relating to his or her teaching in the portfolio of teaching

## 2. **Scholarship**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has pursued a successful and effective program of ongoing scholarship. Scholarship can include traditional forms of research and publication as well as creative writing. 6 Scholarship may be collaborative. 7 At a minimum, success in scholarship sufficient for promotion and tenure will include the following, or a clear equivalent 8:

- Four substantial articles, chapters or other publications in or accepted by reputable peer-reviewed academic journals or books 9

Although scholarly publication is a goal, we recognize that not all significant faculty scholarship eventuates in publication. Candidates for promotion with tenure may further demonstrate their "successful and effective program of ongoing scholarship" by listing activity like the following, or the equivalent:

- Conference papers
- Research-related grant proposals
- Published reviews, notes, and other short articles
- Entries in reference works
- Editorial work
- Preparation of unpublished drafts
- Conference attendance
- Scholarly consulting

### **Evidence of Successful Scholarship:**

1. The candidate must provide copies of all publications.

2. Works accepted but not yet published, works not yet accepted for publication, conference papers, and works in progress (if they are claimed) must be provided to the PTR committee in typescript form.

3. The candidate will provide a list of five to seven potential outside reviewers qualified to evaluate the quality of his or her work. The PTR committee will solicit letters from three of these reviewers. If the PTR committee cannot find three appropriate and available reviewers from the candidate's initial list, the candidate will provide additional names, as requested, until the committee can find enough appropriate and available reviewers. Reviewers should be scholars qualified in the candidate's field(s). The PTR committee will use the reviewers' letters to help gauge the candidate's contributions and potential contributions to his or her field.

## 3. **Service**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has performed appropriate service successfully and effectively. Success in service should include at a minimum the following, or their clear equivalents:



- Responding to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Participating regularly in department faculty meetings
- Attending and participating in commencement ceremonies regularly as required by the contract
- Serving on two or more active department committees
- Serving on two or more other department committees
- Serving on one or more college or university committees or otherwise demonstrating involvement in university governance outside the department

As part of the service itemized above or in addition to it, the department will recognize and especially welcome service activities that advance the department, college, university, or academic discipline, such as the following, or the equivalent:

- Chairing an important department committee
- Taking a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in developing a new course, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Performing service for professional organization(s) locally, regionally, or nationally
- Performing community service related to professional expertise

**Evidence of Successful Service:**

Each candidate for promotion and tenure will list service accomplishments on the CV, which is a required part of the promotion and tenure document. The candidate may include any testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, relating to service as part of an appendix to the promotion and tenure document.

**B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

Before becoming eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor, an Associate Professor will normally complete at least five years as Associate Professor. Time in rank alone will never be sufficient criterion for promotion to Professor, however.

The candidate for promotion to Professor must show that he or she has been productive and successful, at a level significantly beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor, in each of the three areas of faculty activity. The candidate must also show significant evidence of effective leadership in several areas of his or her professional life, leadership that has had positive effect upon the department, college, university, community, and/or profession of English.

**1. Teaching**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of teaching he or she has accomplished the following, or their equivalents:

- Maintained high and appropriate standards in classes
- Advised and taught students with great success overall
- Taken the lead in developing appropriate and effective teaching materials
- Taken the lead in developing and revising courses as needed
- Performed all other teaching-related duties responsibly and successfully
- Taught necessary service and GE courses responsibly and successfully

## 2. **Scholarship**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of scholarship he or she has accomplished the following, or its equivalent:

- Published a scholarly book, scholarly monograph, or at least six substantial articles, chapters, or other publications beyond the number required to achieve Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to Professor may further demonstrate their ongoing scholarship by listing activity like the following, or the equivalent:

- Conference papers
- Research-related grant proposals
- Published reviews, notes, and other short articles
- Entries in reference works
- Editorial work
- Preparation of unpublished drafts
- Conference attendance
- Scholarly consulting

## 3. **Service**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of service he or she has accomplished the following, or their equivalents:

- Chaired several important department, college, and/or university committees with significant responsibilities
- Taken a leadership role in some crucial aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Performed service for professional organization(s) locally, regionally, or nationally
- Performed community service related to professional expertise

## **C. CRITERIA FOR TENURE ONLY**

To be eligible for tenure a faculty member already at the Associate Professor or Professor rank must demonstrate the level of accomplishments defined above for promotion to those respective ranks. The candidate may freely use evidence from Wright State and from previous positions, academic and non-academic where appropriate, to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department may vote to waive the requirement for a teaching portfolio. All candidates must submit at a minimum a full CV describing in detail their teaching, scholarship, service, and other relevant academic experiences.

---

1 - All PTR committee members are eligible to vote on cases of the promotion and tenure of Assistant Professors and on cases of the tenure of Associate Professors. Only Professors may vote on cases of promotion to the rank of Professor and on the annual statement of progress toward promotion for Associate Professors.

2 - In this document, "teaching" refers to all assigned teaching done by department faculty at or on behalf of Wright State University, whether or not it occurred in the English department.

3 - As stated in the Contract, for non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty, the numerical portions of all student teaching evaluations are sent to the department Chair along with the written portions. The Chair will consider these numerical evaluations (along with any numerical evaluations submitted voluntarily by tenured bargaining-unit faculty) as part of the overall evaluation of teaching, keeping in mind the questionable validity of numerical evaluations.

4 - In this document, "scholarship" refers to the publication of original research and scholarship in both print and electronic media. In assessing electronic scholarship, the Chair will be guided by the standards current in the profession for evaluating electronic media.

5 -The department uses "peer review" in a broad sense to mean review of submitted material by people in an appropriate academic/professional discipline.

6 - The term "traditional" here does not in any way exclude scholarship that may appear in on-line journals or other non-print-and-paper formats. Creative writing shall be evaluated as the equivalent of research-based scholarship providing the creative work appears in reputable and selective literary publications with strong regional or national reputation.

7 - The English Department recognizes that collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as single-author scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly. In cases where a faculty member's contribution to a collaborative work was that of substantial coauthor, the work will be counted as the equivalent of a similar single-authored work. In cases where an individual's contribution may have been that of co-researcher or facilitator, or where the individual authored a portion of the scholarly work, the appropriate portion of the work will be counted.

8 - "Equivalent" here refers both to the effort going into a work and the professional importance of the scholarship itself. Thus, an important edited book may well be the equivalent of one or two important and substantial articles; an article widely recognized as groundbreaking in a major field may well be counted as more than one article; an invited article in an important journal or collection, although not technically "peer-reviewed," may be equally important.

9 - "Substantial" here refers to work which (a) meets professional standards for depth and breadth of coverage, and (b) reflects current theory and practices within specific disciplines.