

TENURE-LINE FACULTY SALARY/WORKLOAD REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL RATINGS

Every spring semester, the Tenure-line Salary/Workload Review Committee reviews and rates the productivity during the previous calendar year of each member of the English Department faculty. The three areas of activity considered are scholarship, teaching, and service. The evaluation is expressed in differing numeric terms for each area. The rank (assistant, associate or full) of the professor under consideration is relevant in the area of service; the expectation for scholarship and teaching are consistent for each rank. The English Department and College criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion provide the framework for these determinations.

In the area of scholarship, the numeric evaluation is formulated on a scale of 1 to 4: 1 = falls below expectation; 2 = minimally meets expectation; 3 = amply meets expectation; 4 = exceeds expectation. The publication of books with reputable presses and articles in refereed periodicals are ranked highest when evaluating scholarship (which includes creative work), although conference presentations, editing professional journals, scholarly reviews, artistic performances, grant-based research, grant applications, work appearing solely in refereed internet publication venues, manuscripts-in-progress and work accepted for print publication are all considered. The quality of the publication venue in terms of its reputation, visibility and importance within the given field will also be considered. "Minimally meeting expectation," for a rating of 2, would mean the publication or acceptance of one article or creative work, in addition to evidence of work in progress, conference presentation activity, or acceptance of work for future publication. Publication of two peer-reviewed articles and evidence of other scholarly engagement, or a comparable body of creative work, would "amply meet expectation," and likely yield a rating of 3. Publication of a book or three or more articles, or a comparable body of creative work, would "exceed expectation" and likely yield a rating of 4. Publication of a book will be considered in the year of publication, and for two subsequent years. Little or no evidence of productivity would be considered as falling below expectations, a rating of 1.

The numeric evaluation for teaching is formulated on a scale of 1 to 3: 1 = below expectation; 2 = meets expectation; 3 = exceeds expectation. Teaching effectiveness is determined by reviewing the teaching responsibilities of a faculty member each semester and by performance relative to the typical English Department means according to numeric student evaluations. A rating of 2 would be accorded to faculty with acceptable teaching evaluations as part of fulfilling one's assigned courses and by earning numeric scores within the typical standard deviation of the Department means. Teaching a quantity of courses beyond the expected load, teaching courses requiring a new preparation, teaching "large lecture" courses or service courses or a substantial number of students, overseeing a number of directed readings or independent studies, chairing multiple thesis or project committees, conducting pedagogically meaningful events, and/or receiving numeric scores well above typical department means could constitute a strong case for exceeding expectation and a rating of 3. Teaching awards and exceptional contributions to program and curriculum development would also be considered. A rating of 1 would likely result if the faculty member falls below expectations in several of these areas, and if student evaluations show that the faculty member has performed significantly below typical English Department means.

The numeric evaluation for service is formulated on a scale of 1 to 3: 1 = falls below expectation; 2 = meets expectation; 3 = exceeds expectation. Each faculty member is expected to contribute, through service, to the governance of the English Department and, as appropriate,

to the College and University, and to the support of the profession. Expectation varies according to rank, with less service expected from untenured faculty. After tenure, faculty are expected to undertake more service and, upon occasion and as appropriate, assume leadership roles in institutional governance and professional service: evidence that they are providing exceptional and substantial service in these capacities exceeds expectations. Meeting expectations by serving on the one or two (depending on his or her rank) department committees assigned and performing other expected service roles as appropriate to one's rank would likely result in a rating of 2. A faculty member who performs extraordinary service to the Department, College, University, community and/or profession would exceed expectation, resulting in a likely 3. A rating of 1 would ensue if a faculty member neglects committee responsibilities, fails to attend required meetings, or is otherwise persistently unwilling to engage in Department governance activity.

The Chair meets with the committee to discuss their ratings and bring any additional information needed to the rating process. The committee submits their final ratings in a cumulative score, which is advisory to the Chair. The committee furthermore advises the Chair on relative priorities for requesting "off-the-top" monies for book publication.