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DEN 501.1 Regular Faculty Hiring Procedures

See also: DEN 212.1 Policy on Faculty Enrichment Hires and DEN 212.2 Policy on Focused Hires

All faculty participating in recruitment should be familiar with the ASU Office of Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Recruitment Policies. See https://cfo.asu.edu/hr-equityandinclusion.

1. The Personnel Committee, after consultation with faculty, will make recommendations to the Chair on hiring needs. The Chair will request positions from the Dean.

2. The Chair will appoint a Search Committee for each authorized position. Each Search Committee will include faculty from the area of specialization and at least one member trained in Affirmative Action policies and procedures. Each Search Committee will have gender and ethnic representation insofar as possible with faculty available and include a trained affirmative action representative (normally the member of the Personnel Committee). The Chair will meet with each Search Committee when appropriate.

A. The responsibilities of the Chair of a Search Committee normally include the following:

1. Calling and chairing meetings of the Search Committee as needed;
2. Keeping records for Human Resources and Affirmative Action review;
3. Assisting the Hiring Committee in setting up and running the campus visits;
4. Working with the Hiring Committee and the Department Chair to assure that Affirmative Action procedures have been followed.

B. The responsibilities of each member of the Search Committee normally include:

1. Drafting the ad (with required and desired qualifications) and identifying venues for advertising;
2. Identifying potential candidates, including those who have previously expressed interest;
3. Drafting the indicators, linking these to the required and desired qualifications;
4. Reviewing all the applications;
5. Identifying a short list for initial contacts;
6. Consulting with the contact team to identify a short list of candidates for campus interviews;
7. Participating in the campus interviews, in particular attending the presentation and the meeting with the Personnel and Search Committee members;
8. Making a recommendation to the Hiring Committee (usually a memo to the Hiring Committee that includes a ranked list, along with a list of the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate).

3. Each Search Committee will narrow its pool of candidates to a reasonable number for contact at MLA or other appropriate national conference or by phone or by Skype.

4. For each search, “unofficial” (see RH, p. 9) interviews of the candidates selected for contact will be conducted by the search committee if by phone or Skype or by a contact team put together by the Chair if at a conference or other place outside of ASU. If a contact team accompanies the Department Chair, it shall be constituted by the Chair in consultation with the Search Committee and Hiring Committee. The contact team will report their observations of the candidates’ strengths and weaknesses to the Search Committee[s].

5. Upon receiving advice from the contact team or upon reviewing strengths and weaknesses of the interviews the Search Committee conducted, the Search Committee for each search will recommend candidates to be brought to campus for interviews. The Chair of the Search Committee prepares a Hiring Process Report indicating the candidates recommended for interview and all candidates not recommended for interview, each with an explanation. This Report is sent through the Dean’s Office. Resumes of all candidates must be attached. After the Dean's Office approves the interview pool (usually within 24 hours), candidates may be invited to campus.

6. Immediately after the on-campus interviews, responses from all faculty will be solicited for consideration in all further levels of the hiring process. The Search Committee will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the on-campus candidates and make a recommendation for hiring to the Hiring Committee. The Hiring Committee will consider the Search Committee recommendation and will make its own recommendation for hiring and forward both recommendations to the Department Chair.

7. The Provost’s Office has a fund for some interview expenses for candidates brought to campus. Normally, departments can bring the top two candidates for an on-campus interview. A third candidate may also be invited, if that candidate is a member of a protected class or if the Department has the funds to pay.

See DEN 501.2 for Policy on Reimbursements for Meals with Candidates at: http://www.asu.edu/clas/asuenglish/facspace/deptmanual/den501-2.htm All those dining with an interview candidate will be reimbursed as long as there are only three department personnel per meal. Faculty will be reimbursed for meal costs of a maximum of: $10.00 for breakfast, $15.00 for lunch, and $20.00 for dinner. All reimbursements for the candidate are submitted to the Business Operations Manager. (Reimbursements do not cover alcohol.)

All candidates will meet twice with the CLAS Dean of Humanities or another CLAS dean. Other normally scheduled meetings include (1) meetings with area faculty and Search Committee members, (2) open meeting for faculty and students, (3) meeting with the Hiring Committee and Search Committee, and (4) two meetings with the Department Chair. Additionally, each candidate will be scheduled for a presentation to the Department.
DEN 501.2  Policy on Reimbursements for Meals with Candidates
Revised 8/23/12

Effective January, 2006, all those dining with an interviewee will be reimbursed as long as there are only three department personnel per meal. We ask no duplicate meal attendance per candidate visit.

Faculty will be reimbursed for meal costs at a maximum of
  $10.00 (Breakfast)
  $15.00 (Lunch)
  $20.00 (Dinner)

Be reminded that reimbursements do not cover alcohol.

No guests of employees will be reimbursed unless they are members of the search committee.

The interviewee’s meal will be reimbursed to the person paying the bill.

The Business Manager prefers to reimburse one person per meal.

An itemized paid receipt will be required, not just a charge slip, for reimbursement.

Information if you are hosting a meal with a candidate

Normally, you pay the bill for the candidate, yourself and the other faculty members in attendance at the meal. Please fill out the ASU Business Meals Reimbursement Form (PDF); bring it and the meal receipt to the department Financial Specialist or Business Operations Manager.

Return to English Home Page
DEN 502.1  Review of Probationary Faculty  Revised 7/06

Probationary appointments are those that will become appointments with tenure within a specified period of time or terminated.

Determination of Probationary Period: Typically, the probationary period begins with the initial appointment. The duration of the probationary period is six years, beginning with the year of initial appointment. Exceptions to this probationary period are as follows: (1) If an individual with a visiting appointment in one of the regular tenure-eligible ranks (assistant professor or above) is offered a regular appointment for the following year, only one visiting year may be counted as the first year of probation if the appointee so requests and the academic vice president agrees at the time of regular appointment. (2) If an individual receives a probationary appointment commencing at the beginning of the spring semester the academic year in which the appointment began shall count as the first year of the probationary period. At the time of appointment, however, s/he may request in writing that the spring semester not be counted as part of the probationary period. (3) If an individual receives an initial appointment as lecturer because s/he has not completed the terminal degree, the period served as lecturer shall not count as part of the probationary period. The initial letter of appointment shall specify that the probationary period is to begin with the appointment to the rank of assistant professor or higher rank.

Duration of Probationary Period: The duration of the probationary period will be six-years, beginning with the initial probationary year. Individuals may elect to be reviewed for tenure prior to their final probationary year. Such faculty members should consult with their department chairs and or deans about the advisability of requesting an early tenure review.

Faculty members whose first appointment was at the rank of associate professor or professor will have a probationary period of three years, beginning with the initial probationary year, except that the period may be extended to four years for an associate professor, without a previous faculty appointment, if requested by the individual and approved by the dean of the college and the Provost prior to the end of the second year of the probationary term. The probationary period may be waived entirely by the president or Provost with immediate tenure granted.

Probationary appointees granted promotion to associate professor or professor are automatically considered to be in their last year of probation. If promotion is granted, the appointment at the higher rank will be with tenure. Please refer to the ACD manual section 506-02 and 506-03 for further information.

Except as provided here, the duration of the probationary period cannot be changed following initial appointment. A one-year leave of absence granted for personal reasons may be exempted from the probationary period if requested by the faculty member and deemed appropriate by the institution. Such exemption must be agreed to by both parties in writing at the time the leave is granted. A one-year leave granted for professional reasons, such as fellowships, visiting appointments, and research grants, will not interrupt the sequence of probationary years. Additional leaves during the probationary period may be exempted from the probationary period. Such exemptions must be agreed to by both parties in writing at the time the leave is granted.

Final Probationary Year: During the final probationary year, the department and/or college to which a probationary faculty member is attached must determine whether to recommend that tenure be granted to that individual. The faculty member must have the opportunity to present evidence in support of the granting of tenure. Judgment must be based on established criteria. The final decisions on promotion, tenure, and retention shall be made by the president after considering all evaluations, recommendations, and other evidence.

For appointees who are granted tenure, the notice of appointment for the following year and all succeeding years will be expressly "with tenure"; annual reappointment will cease only as provided in the severance policies (see Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual 507-01--507-06). For appointees who are not granted tenure, the notice of appointment for the following year
Established Review Periods: Probationary Faculty at the rank of assistant professor are reviewed in their third year, and evaluated for tenure and promotion in the fall of their sixth year. In the second, fourth, and fifth year of appointments, Probationary Faculty at the rank of assistant professor will complete a Progress Toward Tenure report. See DEN 502.4.

**DEADLINES for PROBATIONARY REVIEW** (for Tenure and Promotion, see **DEN 502-2**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Deadline Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>1. Submit all required materials on or before October 31 for probationary review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Committee</strong></td>
<td>2. Review material and make recommendation. Prepare letter no later than December 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td>3. Prepare forms and letter and submit materials to dean's office by stated deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td>4. Review material and submit recommendation to Provost by March 1 for probationary review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost</strong></td>
<td>5. Notification of &quot;conditional contract&quot; by mid April; notification for faculty whose next contract will be terminal by mid-May for probationary review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCEDURES FOR PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Procedure Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member</strong></td>
<td>1. Submits to the Personnel Committee an up-to-date vita that treats all areas relevant to evaluation and describes work or activities in progress. Writes a comprehensive statement (of not more than four pages) of his/her teaching, research/creative activities, and service activities over the past year and outlines academic goals (for research/creative activities). Provides single copies of up to four publications or other materials reflecting the research, scholarship and creative activities. Provides teaching materials (a) a summary table of courses taught including number of students in each, a summary of student evaluations including scale, mean, and standard deviation; (b) a statement of teaching philosophy and any professional development related to teaching and instruction. May provide supplemental material (e.g., additional evidence of instructional effectiveness for up to two courses (e.g., syllabi, major test, assignments, CDs, website, etc.), additional publications, individual student comments). See CLAS &quot;Evaluation of Probationary Faculty and Academic Professionals Checklist and Content Overview&quot; (which must be included with package) on CLAS website and supply the above materials in formats specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Committee</strong></td>
<td>2. Reviews all materials submitted by the probationary faculty member and makes recommendation for &quot;retention,&quot; &quot;conditional retention,&quot; or &quot;termination.&quot; Prepares a letter to the dean addressing the strengths and weaknesses in teaching, research and scholarly creative activity, professional activity and service, and university and community service and stating the recommendation of the committee. The letter will be signed by each member of the personnel committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td>3. Writes a letter that treats the above subjects and summarizes the process of the personnel committee or describes its composition. The letter should state the recommendation of the chair. Prepares form for submission to the dean's office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once a decision on retention is made, meets with faculty member to provide information on the process.
lead to the recommendation. Counsels the faculty member and makes recommendation on professional development relevant to tenure and promotion.
TIME REQUIREMENTS

1. **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.** Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor is typically combined with tenure. An assistant professor whose intent is to remain at the university must apply for promotion during the sixth year of service as an assistant professor at ASU. An assistant professor may apply for promotion before the final probationary year if s/he has met or exceeded established criteria for the full probationary period before the end of that period. Generally, the collective record of such candidates must be exceptional.

2. **Associate Professor to Professor.** Promotion from associate professor to professor is not associated with a particular time span. An associate professor is never required to apply for promotion. Promotion will be based on established departmental and college criteria.

CRITERIA

The Department of English consists of faculty members and programs in several diverse areas, including British and American Literatures, Rhetoric and Composition, English Education, Teaching English as a Second Language, Creative Writing, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics. Because of this diversity, expectations for individuals requesting tenure and/or promotion may not always be identical. The following criteria provide broad guidelines, not rigid requirements, since in individual cases the criteria will reflect different disciplinary emphases.

Promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure

In the general case, the entry-level assistant professor will be a new Ph.D. or M.F.A. (for creative writing) recipient. Such an individual will normally be considered for promotion and tenure during the sixth year of employment at ASU. If the candidate is exceptionally strong and/or has had previous experience, a case for early application can be made, although recent work at ASU will weigh more heavily in such decisions. The case for tenure and promotion will rest most heavily on publication of scholarly and/or creative works and demonstrated strength in teaching. Some record of service is important to establish a collegial profile but does not replace a strong record of publication and teaching.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarly or creative contribution to the field, through publication, is indispensable for candidates for promotion and tenure. Particular emphasis is placed on the quality of publications, as judged by specialists in the relevant field (the external referees) and by the departmental Personnel Committee. Publications carrying the most weight include scholarly and creative books, monographs, articles in appropriate refereed journals or other works, edited volumes in all media (e.g., electronic books and journals), critical editions of texts, critical translations, edited volumes, and/or special issues of refereed journals, innovative textbooks, anthologized works and technical reports. Where applicable, computer programs, CD-Rom texts, hypertexts, databases, and technological innovations with scholarly, creative, or pedagogical applications will also be considered evidence of appropriate faculty activity in this evaluative category. Other publications, such as book reviews, conference proceedings, or encyclopedia entries, carry less weight. Although research or creative endeavors in English studies are generally carried out individually, in certain areas of study within the larger field and in certain kinds of disciplinary methodologies, collaboration is appropriate and as valued as single-authored publications. Joint publication reflects joint work and multiple authors are usually listed alphabetically regardless of rank. If authors do not appear in alphabetical order, the first is usually, though not always, considered the senior or major author. Books by major academic publishers and articles in the most selective refereed journals or reviews are considered the most prestigious publications in all the subfields. While quality is stressed over quantity, a candidate for promotion to associate professor will normally have eight to twelve substantial publications or a book plus
two to three other publications. Because the period of time between the acceptance of a manuscript and its publication is often lengthy, works in press, with appropriate documentation, may be considered evidence of scholarly productivity. Candidates for promotion will normally have presented papers at professional conferences or have given public readings, but conference participation and reading does not take the place of publication. Often an assistant professor's early publications will be based on research done for the dissertation or creative thesis (for the M.F.A.), but by the time s/he is a candidate for promotion s/he will have developed a research program or substantive creative project that goes beyond that early work. The production and administration of grants, for either individual research and creative activity or for projects with broader implications for the department, college, university or the professions, will also constitute appropriate activity in this area of evaluation.

Teaching

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate interest and skill in teaching courses at all levels: lower division, upper division, and graduate. High quality teaching is essential to gaining tenure, and evidence of the quality of teaching and instruction must be assessed through multiple indicators, including the following two: a summary of student evaluations collected and reported in accordance with unit and university procedures, and a peer or supervisory review of instructional materials. This review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students, and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction. Other possible indicators might include peer evaluation of classroom performance, and attendance at teaching workshops. Additionally, teaching awards and honors are strong positive indicators, as is consistent service on graduate student committees. Mentoring of students at all levels, whether through independent studies, direction or service on honors theses, and graduate student committees, conducting workshops for graduate students, or other opportunities for enhanced teacher-student interaction, are highly valued in the evaluation process. The candidate for promotion and tenure will normally have shown ability in the area of curriculum development, for example, by developing and offering new courses, seminars, or workshops, or by redesigning existing courses. Excellence in teaching is an important component for tenure and promotion considerations. Unsatisfactory classroom teaching would provide grounds for a negative recommendation for tenure and promotion. However, such pedagogical efforts cannot compensate for insufficient scholarly or creative productivity.

Service

University service commitments for untenured assistant professors are normally limited to committees within the field (these are sometimes extra-departmental). Service to the profession is expected to be commensurate with junior standing. Examples of such service could include some refereeing and reviewing work and participation in conference organization. Other service commitments, including inter- and multi-disciplinary service (e.g. committee assignments in other departments or programs) are positively valued only if accompanied by an otherwise strong record of publication and teaching.

A qualitative evaluation describes the assistant professor’s commitment to supporting and sustaining the Departmental culture. Such a commitment includes active participation in assigned committees as well as a willingness to be a contributing part of an intellectual community involved in teaching and scholarship.

Promotion from associate professor to professor

Promotion to professor can occur at any point beyond the awarding of tenure and promotion to associate professor. Generally such promotion from associate to full professor occurs from four to ten years following the first promotion. Although tenure and promotion to associate professor are essential to continuing status in the profession, promotion to professor is neither necessary nor inevitable as a result of years of service. Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a demonstration of maturity and distinction in one's field of study as well as in the three areas of evaluation. Unlike the initial promotion from assistant to associate, promotion to full professor is neither necessary nor inevitable as a result of years of service.
Scholarship and Creative Activity

The candidate for promotion to professor should provide evidence of continuing creative activity or research and publication and should have achieved a substantial body of scholarship or creative works judged in the terms outlined earlier. In many cases the successful candidate for promotion to professor will have a book with a major press, along with other publications, since the previous promotion. In the subfields in which book publication is not as common, a substantial number of refereed journal articles would be the equivalent. Further, a candidate for professor will often have developed a reputation such that s/he will receive invitations to present lectures, to collaborate in printed volumes, or to give keynote addresses or readings. These or other measures will be used to determine if the candidate for promotion has achieved an appropriate level of external recognition for her/his research program or primary creative field. The work of the successful candidate for promotion to professor should be judged as highly original and creative by the external referees and certain of the publications should be considered leading contributions in the relevant subfield.

Teaching

The candidate for promotion to professor will be expected to have a sustained record of excellence in teaching. S/he will have continued to make teaching contributions at graduate and undergraduate levels and to have been active in graduate student committee work.

Service

Those seeking promotion to professor will be expected to have made significant service contributions to the department, college, and university, as well as to the profession. This service, internally, will consist of major committee work, including often the chairing of a working committee. Externally, the candidate will normally have been called upon to participate in editorial board work, committee work for the national organization appropriate to the subfield, or other such professional service.

PROCEDURES

External evaluation of research, publication and creative activities by a minimum of six and up to ten scholars external to ASU is required for promotion/tenure. Internal recommendations are made at the departmental, college, and university levels.

External Evaluation

1. Faculty member
   1. Supplies a minimum of ten names and addresses of outside reviewers who are qualified to evaluate research/publications; indicates the relation of the outside reviewer; provides the justification for each review gives list to chair in late January or early February of the year prior to the application for promotion/tenure.

   By late March or early April provides ONE hardcopy and ONE pdf copy on a read-write CD or DVD: a copy most recent CV, a 4-page self-evaluation, and copies of selected publications to the chair to send to the evaluators.

2. Chair
   2. Chair requests names and addresses and justifications of prospective evaluators from other faculty in the f
   Writes letters (and sends publications, self-evaluation statement, and CV and departmental tenure and prom guidelines) requesting an evaluation of the faculty member's research and publications.

Internal Evaluation

3. No later than August 15, supplies the following:
1. Faculty member

- Provides an up-to-date vita, including academic training, chronological listing of all academic positions (e.g., full-time university teaching/research positions), publications (with complete citations), works forthcoming and/or in preparation, teaching sections, mentoring, chronological listing of all part-time teaching/research positions, non-university positions related to the teaching/research field, complete bibliographic entries for all refereed publications, listing of all funded grants, concise overview of significant service, honors, awards, and other special recognition.

- Provides a personal statement no longer than four pages.

- Provides teaching materials (summary grid of teaching evaluations that includes all courses since tenure track position began at ASU; number of students in each course; summary of student evaluations (scannable mean, and standard deviation--data are available on the teaching evaluation forms), comparison data similar courses/level of courses and rank in the department of English).

- Additional materials on teaching may be provided in the supplemental materials section: e.g., philosophy of teaching statement, peer evaluations (if available), course materials for 2 courses, and so on.

- Provides four publications to be sent forward with the file.

- May include Supplemental Materials providing evidence of instructional effectiveness for up to two (2) courses, e.g. syllabi, copies of major tests and assignments, reading lists, websites, CDs, individual student evaluations or comments, philosophy of teaching statement, peer evaluations (if available); additional publications, letters from editor(s), contract(s) if available.

See CLAS guidelines and instructions on the CLAS website which specifies the materials and format of materials to be sent forward by the faculty member at https://clas.asu.edu/sites/default/files/clas_promotion_and_tenure_procedural_guide_2013.pdf (if you have trouble opening this file, use Mozilla Firefox as your browser).

Provides TWO hard copies of all the above materials with ONE copy inserted into a white three-ring binder arranged in the order specified by Provost and CLAS instructions. The other copy may be inserted in a folder. Also provides ONE electronic pdf copy on a read-write CD that includes a scanned copy of every hardcopy piece submitted.

2. Personnel Committee

4. Reviews material in file, including outside letters of evaluation; makes recommendation; prepares a letter addressed to the chair, setting forth a thorough and objective review of the candidate's teaching, research, and service, and justification by the committee for its recommendation. Submits letter and to chair, with signatures of all personnel committee members no later than September 15 or date specified by Chair.

3. Chair

5. Completes relevant form indicating the departmental recommendation; writes letter of recommendation to dean.

Forwards to the dean's office by early-October the completed forms, a copy of the letter sent to the outside evaluators requesting that they evaluate a faculty member, the vita, external letters, tenure and promotion guidelines, summaries of teaching evaluations, the letter from the Personnel Committee, the letter from the Chair, all outside letters of evaluation (there must be a minimum of 6), and the four publications chosen by the faculty member. See Provost and CLAS guidelines for exactly what to include and in what order.

6. Dean's Advisory Committee reviews all promotion/tenure material and makes its recommendation to the dean. The dean's recommendation is sent to the University tenure and promotion committee and then to the Provost early January.

Notification of the result of promotion/tenure decisions will be given by the first of May.
GUIDEPOSTS FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The Department is committed to mentoring junior and senior faculty through the probationary period. To that end, the Department offers the following suggestions to help probationary faculty develop plans for working toward tenure up to the sixth year. These guideposts are meant to explicate—but not supplant or alter—the departmental criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the Department of English Department Manual, section 500, “Hiring and Reviews”, and in particular, subsection 502.2, “Promotion and Tenure.”

Candidates for promotion and tenure participate in departmental programs in British and American Literatures, Rhetoric and Composition, English Education, Teaching English as a Second Language, Creative Writing, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics; some were hired under plans to expand information literacy in the College. Because the Department is comprised of teacher-scholars with diverse disciplinary training and research/creative activities—and because changing technologies continue to affect publication practices throughout the academy—the individual research and publication plans for successful candidates may vary widely, as may their teaching and service profiles.

These guideposts are organized according to the traditional areas of review—research and creative activity; teaching; and service. Each section begins with a quotation from the Department of English Department Manual listing the criteria for evaluating performance in the relevant area and proceeds to a chronological explication of suggested activities during a candidate’s successive years at A.S.U.

Guideposts for Research and Creative Activity

Background

The departmental criteria governing the evaluation of research and creative activity for a candidate seeking promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure are quoted below (from DEN 502.2). Scholarly or creative contribution to the field, through publication, is indispensable for candidates for promotion and tenure. Particular emphasis is placed on the quality of publications, as judged by specialists in the relevant field (the external referees) and by the departmental Personnel Committee. Publications carrying the most weight include scholarly and creative books, monographs, articles in appropriate refereed journals or other works, edited volumes in all media (e.g., electronic books and journals), critical editions of texts, critical translations, edited volumes, and/or special issues of refereed journals, innovative textbooks, anthologized works, and technical reports. Where applicable, computer programs, CD-Rom texts, hypertexts, databases, and technological innovations with scholarly, creative, or pedagogical applications will also be considered evidence of appropriate faculty activity in this evaluative category. Other publications, such as book reviews, conference proceedings, or encyclopedia entries, carry less weight. Although research or creative endeavors in English studies are generally carried out individually, in certain areas of study within the larger field and in certain kinds of disciplinary methodologies, collaboration is appropriate and as valued as single-authored publications. Joint publication reflects joint work and multiple authors are usually listed alphabetically regardless of rank. If authors do not appear in alphabetical order, the first is usually, though not always, considered the senior or major author. Books by major academic publishers and articles in the most selective refereed journals or reviews are considered the most prestigious publications in all the subfields. While quality is stressed over quantity, a candidate for promotion to associate professor will normally have eight to twelve substantial publications or a book plus two to three other publications. Because the period of time between the acceptance of a manuscript and its publication is often lengthy, works in press, with appropriate documentation, may be considered evidence of scholarly productivity. Candidates for promotion will normally have presented papers at professional conferences or have given public readings, but conference participation and reading does not take the place of publication. Often an assistant professor's early
publications will be based on research done for the dissertation or creative thesis (for the M.F.A.), but by the time s/he is a candidate for promotion s/he will have developed a research program or substantive creative project that goes beyond that early work. The production and administration of grants, for either individual research and creative activity or for projects with broader implications for the department, college, university or the professions, will also constitute appropriate activity in this area of evaluation.

Chronological Guideposts for Research and Creative Activity
In general, it is useful for candidates to establish a cycle of research activity with materials in progress, materials under review, and materials in press. Specific guideposts are given below.

End of Second Academic Year, Research and Creative Activity
Candidates should be engaged in an active program of research, creative activities, and writing, directed toward meeting tenure requirements as detailed in DEN 502.2, quoted above. Candidates should have made significant steps toward satisfying the requirements for tenure as demonstrated by completed chapters or articles or other appropriate works (whether in print or digital), presentations at professional meetings or readings, research, and other signs of scholarly and creative progress.

End of Third Academic Year, Research and Creative Activity
Candidates should have a combination of print and digital publications out, in press, or in progress.

Candidates authoring a monograph should have finished a complete draft of the book manuscript and should have submitted a book prospectus to a publisher. Candidates publishing the equivalent of a monograph (8 to 12 articles) should have at least two articles accepted for publication and at least three other article-length manuscripts under review. Candidates authoring technological innovations should have completed at least one major project.

Candidates should also provide evidence of developing a research program or substantive creative project beyond their early work (that is, beyond the dissertation or creative thesis); candidates working on grant projects should show evidence of that activity.

End of Fourth Academic Year, Research and Creative Activity
Candidates authoring a monograph should have submitted the book manuscript. They should also have published at least one additional refereed article/book chapter, and have evidence of efforts to place another piece in refereed journals/books within the next year. Candidates publishing the equivalent of a monograph (8 to 12 articles) should have published or have in press at least eight articles/book chapters, and have evidence of efforts to place one or two other pieces in refereed journals/books within the next year. Candidates authoring technological innovations should have completed at least one other major project since the third year. Candidates may have a combination of print and digital publications out, in press, or in progress.

All candidates should provide evidence of further developing a research program or substantive creative project beyond their early work; candidates working on grant projects should show evidence of that activity.

End of Fifth Academic Year, Research and Creative Activity
Candidates authoring a monograph should have completed the book manuscript, and have acceptance of the book from a scholarly publisher. Ideally, the book will be in press. These candidates should also have published at least one additional refereed article/book chapter, and have demonstrated continued scholarly or creative activity. Candidates authoring 8 to 12 article-length manuscripts should have published one to two additional pieces, and have definite plans to place one or two more in refereed journals/books within the next year. Candidates authoring technological innovations should have completed at least one or two more major projects. Candidates may have a combination of print and digital publications out, in press, or in progress.

Guideposts for Teaching

Background
The departmental criteria governing the evaluation of teaching for a candidate seeking promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure are quoted below (from DEN 502.2). Faculty members are expected to demonstrate interest and skill in teaching courses at all levels: lower division, upper division, and graduate. High quality teaching is essential to gaining tenure, and evidence of the quality of teaching and instruction must be assessed through multiple indicators, including the following two: a summary of student evaluations collected and reported in accordance with unit and university procedures, and a peer or supervisory review of instructional materials. This review of instructional materials should consider relevant factors such as student learning, the currency of taught courses, the creation of new courses, technological and pedagogical innovations, workshops conducted for teachers and graduate students, and the contributions of courses to the unit's curriculum, pedagogy and scholarship of instruction. Other possible indicators might include peer evaluation of classroom performance, and attendance at teaching workshops. Additionally, teaching awards and honors are strong positive indicators, as is consistent service on graduate student committees. Mentoring of students at all levels, whether through independent studies, direction or service on honors theses, and graduate student committees, conducting workshops for graduate students, or other opportunities for enhanced teacher-student interaction, are highly valued in the evaluation process. The candidate for promotion and tenure will normally have shown ability in the area of curriculum development, for example, by developing and offering new courses, seminars, or workshops, or by redesigning existing courses. Excellence in teaching is an important component for tenure and promotion considerations. Unsatisfactory classroom teaching would provide grounds for a negative recommendation for tenure and promotion. However, such pedagogical efforts cannot compensate for insufficient scholarly or creative productivity.

**Chronological Guideposts for Teaching**

**High quality teaching is essential to gaining tenure.**

**End of Second Academic Year, Teaching**
Candidates should have carried out teaching assignments related to their position, and should present evidence of course materials consistent with Department teaching policy. The department recognizes that some faculty may have adjustments to make as a new teacher; thus, it expects teaching indicators to be near the department average for both rank held and level of courses.

**End of Third Academic Year, Teaching**
Candidates should have made a contribution to the pedagogical mission of the Department by way of new courses, revisions of existing courses, or other comparable contributions. Candidates should participate in the graduate program as appropriate and as commensurate with the opportunity to do so.

**End of Fourth Academic Year, Teaching**
Candidates should have continued to make contributions to the pedagogical mission of the Department by way of new courses, revisions of existing courses, or other contributions. Candidates should provide evidence of working with graduate students as well as undergraduates. Candidates’ teaching evaluation indicators should be near the department average for rank and level of course.

**End of Fifth Academic Year, Teaching**
Candidates should have continued to make contributions to the pedagogical mission of the Department by way of new courses, revisions of existing courses, or other contributions. Candidates should provide evidence of working with graduate students as well as undergraduates. Candidates’ teaching evaluation indicators should be near the department average for rank and type of course. Candidates should provide additional evidence of excellence in teaching such as a teaching award or other teaching honors, participation in pedagogical workshops, leading teaching workshops, mentoring teaching assistants and other indicators as deemed appropriate by them.

**Guideposts for Service**

**Background**

The departmental criteria governing the evaluation of service for a candidate seeking promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure are quoted below (from DEN 502.2).
University service commitments for untenured assistant professors are normally limited to committees within the field (these are sometimes extra-departmental). Service to the profession is expected to be commensurate with junior standing. Examples of such service could include some refereeing and reviewing work and participation in conference organization. Other service commitments, including inter- and multi-disciplinary service (e.g. committee assignments in other departments or programs) are positively valued only if accompanied by an otherwise strong record of publication and teaching.

A qualitative evaluation describes the assistant professor’s commitment to supporting and sustaining the Departmental culture. Such a commitment includes active participation in assigned committees as well as a willingness to be a contributing part of an intellectual community involved in teaching and scholarship.

**Chronological Guideposts for Service**

**End of Second Academic Year, Service**
While the Department will endeavor to protect a candidate from unduly heavy service, candidates will be expected to show a level of service appropriate to rank.

**End of Third Academic Year, Service**
Candidates should have engaged in professional service (e.g., by serving on committees in professional organizations, participating in scholarly or creative conferences, public readings, writing book reviews, or participating in local activities in the community). Candidates should have served on a departmental, college or university committee as appropriate to rank.

**End of Fourth Academic Year, Service:** Candidates should have engaged in professional service (e.g., by serving on committees in scholarly organizations, participating in scholarly conferences, writing book reviews, or participating in local activities in the community). Candidates should have served on a departmental, college or university committee as appropriate to rank.

**End of Fifth Academic Year, Service:**
Candidates should have evidence of professional service (serving on committees in professional organizations, participating in scholarly or creative conferences, writing book reviews, or participating in local community activities) commensurate with building a national profile. Candidates should have served on a departmental, college or university committee as appropriate to rank.
DEN 502.4  Progress Toward Tenure Report  Revised 9/2/08

University policy (see ACD 506-03 http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-03.html) requires an annual review of progress towards tenure for those probationary faculty members who are not undergoing a formal third-year or final probationary review. Associate professors without tenure will be formally reviewed in the second year of their appointment.

The Progress Toward Tenure Report is distinct from the annual performance review and the online FAR (Faculty Activity Report) that all faculty submit in February. Whereas the latter reflects on what has happened during the preceding calendar year(s), the Progress Toward Tenure Report looks forward and evaluates an individual’s progress toward meeting department and university tenure criteria.

A Progress Toward Tenure Report memo is written by the Chair with input from the Personnel Committee and from other units if there is a joint appointment. This memo is given to the probationary faculty member for review at an individual meeting between the Chair and the probationary faculty member, during which the Chair discusses progress toward tenure and answers any questions the probationary faculty member may have. Following the meeting, the faculty member signs the memo, indicating that he/she has reviewed the memo and met with the Chair.

To prepare this progress report, the Chair needs from each untenured faculty member a description of past and planned activities in research, teaching, and service that indicates the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion. After consulting the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines in the Department of English Manual at http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/facspace/deptmanual/den502-2.htm and Guideposts for Probationary Faculty also in the Department Manual at http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/facspace/deptmanual/den502-3.html, a probationary faculty member must submit the following materials:

- A current curriculum vitae with full documentation for each entry
- A one- to-two page self assessment of contributions in research or creative activities, teaching, and service, especially in light of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. To the extent possible, a candidate should offer context for these contributions rather than just listing what appears on his/her CV. The candidate might also offer a tentative timetable of a work plan toward tenure and promotion. The self-assessment should include the following:
  - Brief description of research and creative activities accomplished over the previous year (refer to projected work from previous progress report, if applicable); and brief description of plans for research and creative activities for this year;
  - Brief description of teaching activities (e.g., courses developed, courses taught, number of students mentored, teaching awards, etc.) over this past year, and brief description of teaching plans for this year.
  - Brief description of service activities for this past year and service commitments for this year.

PROCEDURES

1. Faculty member  1. Supplies a pdf and a hard copy of current CV and one- to two-page self assessment of progress toward tenure no later than October 1.

2. Chair and  2. Chair and Personnel Committee review the Progress toward Tenure materials; the
Personnel Committee makes a recommendation to the Chair assessing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

3. Chair

3. Prepares a memo evaluating the candidate’s progress toward tenure and meets with the candidate to discuss the candidate’s progress. Chair forwards the memo (and written response, if any) to the college dean.

Candidates are provided the opportunity to reply to the review in writing within 30 days of their meeting with the Chair. A copy of the reply will be attached to the review memorandum. Once the comment period has expired, a copy of the letter (with any replies) will be placed in the unit file. A copy of those documents is then sent to the CLAS Dean of Humanities.

Schedule of Progress Toward Tenure Reports

Assistant Professor hired for academic year (first year)—no report
Progress Towards Tenure review in Fall of second year
Third-Year Probationary Review in Spring of third year—see DEN 502.1 for details on Third-Year Review.
Progress Towards Tenure review in Fall of fourth year
Progress Towards Tenure review in Fall of fifth year (submit materials for external review for tenure and promotion in the spring of fifth year,

see DEN 502.2 )
Promotion/Tenure review in Fall of six year—see DEN 502.2 for details on tenure and promotion.
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The lecturer and clinical professor is expected to demonstrate excellence in instructional activity at the undergraduate level in order to have his/her contract renewed. Renewal of both rolling and three-year contracts will be determined using the same evaluative criteria. Evidence of the lecturer’s and clinical professor's work may include the following:

### TEACHING

**Core Components:**

- **Student evaluations and faculty evaluations:** Course evaluation numbers at the departmental mean or better for comparable classes and rank.
- **Syllabi and assignments:** Evidence of effective pedagogical strategies that advance the Mission/Goals of the English Department in terms of quality of assignments and coherence/effectiveness of syllabi and course plan. *(Possible evidence: sample syllabi, unsolicited letters from students evaluating the course, students’ summative comments on the department evaluation instrument, teaching awards.)*
- **Needed Courses:** Regular teaching of undergraduate courses that meet departmental/university needs. *(Possible evidence: list of courses taught.)*
- **Range of Courses:** Experience and skill in teaching a variety of recognizably difficult courses and a willingness to teach classes at the 100-, 200-, and 300- levels. *(Possible evidence: list of courses taught.)*
- **Student Mentoring:** Evidence of mentoring students where appropriate (e.g. honors’ theses, independent study).

### Course and Curriculum Development

- Develop and offer new courses that serve departmental needs *(Possible evidence: syllabi along with memo that outlines the need for the course and the way it serves the department.)*
- Significantly redesign existing courses *(Possible evidence: Syllabi from previous course and new course along with a memo that outlines the changes along with the rational for and effectiveness of changes.)*
- Participate in program-wide assessment and possible revision of courses/course structures *(Possible evidence: Letter from chair/director of assessment project detailing participation, documents produced.)*

### SERVICE

**Core Components:**

- **Formal Classroom Observations:** Observe and evaluate teachers in their classrooms *(Possible evidence: list of teachers and copies of letters given to teachers.)*
- **Departmental Administration:** Through positions appointed by the Chair, assist WPA and/or Chair to undertake essential tasks crucial to running the Writing Programs and/or Department. *(Possible evidence: end of year report of administrative tasks, extended discussion in letter of self-evaluation.)*
- **College and University Service:** Serve on college- and university-level committees.

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Core Components:**

- Receipt of and/or submission of grants or other external funding opportunities that promote effective and improved teaching.
- Evidence of helping to improve teaching beyond one’s classroom through such activities as publishing articles, textbooks, books, or serving in a leadership role for a state or national group working for the improvement of teaching.
- Preparation of manuscripts for publication.
- Scholarly presentations at national conferences.

### PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Submit two hard copies and one CD-ROM that is READ-WRITE only (do not submit as read-only) of the following by the first week in January. **Make sure ONE of your hardcopies is in a White Notebook that has Tabbed dividers for every section.** For more information, see CLAS guidelines at

[https://clas.asu.edu/sites/default/files/clas_fixedterm_faculty_promotion_or_multiyear_faculty_renewal_procedural_guide_2013_0.pdf](https://clas.asu.edu/sites/default/files/clas_fixedterm_faculty_promotion_or_multiyear_faculty_renewal_procedural_guide_2013_0.pdf)

- Table of contents;
- Current curriculum vitae;
- Personal statement (up to 4 pages in length);
- Summary of job or teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations; see CLAS forms and click on "Teaching evaluation Summary Template" under "All Promotion, Continuing Appointment and Tenure Recommendations" (it is not included in the promotion instructions for MY faculty this year)
- Copies of up to 4 publications (if applicable);
Supplemental materials (e.g. additional publications, peer reviews, teaching philosophy, or other pertinent information).

In evaluating performance of lecturers, the Chair and Personnel Committee may request input from two lecturers/lecturer representatives.
DEN 503.2  Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer  Revised 8/11

Per ACD Manual 505-02, a senior lecturer normally holds a doctorate degree and has a minimum of five years of successful, college-level teaching experience. The English Department expects that this teaching has been full-time. Requests for promotion to senior lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review: during the second year of the contract period. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal. For those who have two or more years of successful, full-time college teaching experience before coming to ASU, requests for promotion to senior lecturer can be made during their second year at ASU. Those who have fewer than two years of successful, full-time college teaching experience, either at ASU or elsewhere, may request promotion at the normal review time in any contract period after the first review period. As in the renewal criteria, the case for promotion will rest most heavily on demonstrated excellence in teaching. Consistent with a specific lecturer’s administrative assignment(s), administration and service responsibilities that support teaching will be considered important.

Per ACD Manual 505-02, a principal lecturer normally holds a doctorate degree and has a minimum of seven years of successful, full-time college-level teaching experience. Requests for promotion to principal lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review: during the second year of the contract period. Typically, requests for promotion come from those who hold the Senior Lecturer position. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal. For those who have five or more years of successful, full-time college teaching experience before coming to ASU, requests for promotion to principal lecturer can be made during their second year at ASU. As in the renewal criteria, the case for promotion will rest most heavily on demonstrated excellence in teaching. Consistent with a particular senior lecturer's administrative assignment(s), administration and service responsibilities that support teaching will be considered important.

In evaluating the performance of lecturers, and senior lectures, the Chair and the Personnel Committee may request counsel and input from two lecturer representatives and from their supervisor(s). Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer involves the following qualities.

**Instructional Activity**

The lecturer or senior lecture is expected to demonstrate interest and skill in teaching undergraduate-level courses. High quality in teaching is expected and is normally judged by use of the departmental student teaching evaluations and faculty evaluations. Additionally, teaching awards and honors are strong positive indicators. The candidate for promotion and renewal will normally have shown ability in the area of curriculum development: for example, by developing and offering new courses or by redesigning existing courses. Ability in teaching is an important component of the renewal and promotion requirements. Failure to conduct high quality classroom instruction would be grounds for a negative recommendation on promotion.

**Administration/Service**

For every lecturer and senior lecturer, valued work will include the following: excellent participation and cooperation in department, college and/or university committee work and in the overall appropriate curriculum program in the English Department. Both the quality and quantity of this participation and cooperation are important.

The lecturer or senior lecturer seeking promotion may have experience in program administration and curriculum development. Valued work may include the following: supervising of multi-section courses; observing and evaluating teachers in their classrooms; examining, critiquing, and collaboratively constructing syllabi; mentoring teachers; handling student questions and complaints; offering community outreach; and/or providing service to professional organizations. For those lecturers who are involved in program administration and curriculum development, both the quality and the quantity of this work are important. The quality should be excellent.

**Professional Development**

Evidence of an excellent, ongoing professional development program is necessary. Such evidence may consist of several of the following: integration of current theory and practice in teaching; participation in appropriate professional workshops and conferences; receiving grants or honors; contributing to scholarly publication; and/or writing or editing significant textbook(s). Most highly valued will be professional development that brings positive local, regional, and/or national attention to the Department of English at ASU. Both the quality and the quantity of this work are important. The quality should be excellent.

For specific information on what to include for your application for promotion and how to organize these materials, prepare hard copies and CDs, see CLAS webpage at http://clas.asu.edu/files/CLAS-MultiYear-PromotionChecklist.pdf and at the Provost website at http://www.asu.edu/clas/asuenglish/facspace/deptmanual/den503-2.htm
Procedures

Submit two hard copies and one CD-RW that is READ-WRITE only (do not submit as read-only) of the following by the first week in January. Make sure ONE of your hard copies is in a White Notebook that has Tabbed dividers for every section. For more information, see CLAS guidelines at 

https://clas.asu.edu/sites/default/files/clas_fixedterm_faculty_promotion_or_multiyear_faculty_renewal_procedural_guide_2013_0.pdf

- Table of contents;
- Current curriculum vitae;
- Personal statement (up to 4 pages in length);
- Summary of job or teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations; see CLAS forms and click on "Teaching evaluation Summary Template" under "All Promotion, Continuing Appointment and Tenure Recommendations" (it is not included in the promotion instructions for MY faculty this year)
- Copies of up to 4 publications (if applicable);
- Supplemental materials (e.g. additional publications, peer reviews, teaching philosophy, or other pertinent information).

The Personnel Committee will review these materials and make a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair and Associate Chair will review these materials and make a recommendation to the Dean. Notification of the University's decision on the promotion is typically made on or before May 15.
DEN 503.2  Procedures for Applying for Reappointment as an Instructor

Instructors may be reappointed for an academic year on the basis of performance and department need. To be considered for reappointment, an instructor must have successfully completed a full academic year and have submitted an annual self-evaluation packet to the department in that year. Hence, in the fall semester, after their first full year of teaching as an instructor in the English department, instructors may apply for reappointment for the following academic year.

To apply for reappointment, instructors need to submit the following:

* Current CV
* Brief, formal letter to the Chair of the English Department indicating that the instructor “would like to be considered for reappointment as an Instructor” (Instructors must use this above language in their letter).

**Deadline:** December 1

Applications for reappointment will be evaluated based on departmental need (as determined by the number of instructor lines that are allotted by the CLAS dean’s office) and by performance (as determined by the annual self-evaluation packet and Chair’s evaluation letter from the previous academic year).

Instructors will be notified of reappointment on or before February 1.
DEN 504     Notification of Promotion and Tenure     Revised 8/92

Faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure will be informed in writing of the final decision by the Provost.

Faculty members under review may only be informed orally of the recommendation of the chair and the dean. Reasons for the decision are not to be provided either in oral or written form. Written notification will be given by the chair or dean only when written notification of decisions on retention from the Provost has been received.

Faculty members who are recommended for conditional contracts must be notified by the dean no later than April 15. The faculty member will have 30 calendar days to petition the dean with reasons for an independent review of the decision. If the petition is not received within 30 calendar days, the conditional contract will not be reconsidered. If a conditional contract is offered to a faculty member, the condition(s) warranting an unconditional contract must be specified and communicated to the faculty member.

Those faculty who will receive a terminal contract or whose contracts are not being renewed for a succeeding year will be notified in writing by the Provost.
DEN 505.1 Annual Performance Evaluation Guidelines: Track Faculty
Revised 9/19/2011

All English Department faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the departmental community through working to achieve both individual goals and departmental goals. The guiding principle in the distribution of work and its evaluation will be to achieve BALANCE within the Department. It is the goal of the Personnel Committee and Chair to insure that work is equitably distributed among all members of the faculty.

According to Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis. The annual review is one element of post-tenure review. The following procedures outline the annual review process and the consequences of an unsatisfactory rating in any area or overall, as determined by the Board of Regents.

For evaluation purposes, faculty members will submit each spring (on or before February 1) the following online through Blackboard and in hardcopy documents:

- **Appendix A CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form** (Submit Online at http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/facspace/deptmanual/append-A.html)

- **Annual Performance Evaluation** (Submit the following in hardcopy and Online at Blackboard, naming each file with your last name and first initial and description of content)
  - A current hardcopy CV with research activities and service for the last three calendar years, and instructional activities for the last calendar year, highlighted in yellow
  - Hardcopies of title and copyright pages of publications (do not submit books, journals, or whole articles)
  - A one-page hardcopy cover letter (optional) explaining any special circumstances or developments not covered in the CV

These documents will aid the department Chair and the Personnel Committee in determining teaching assignments for the upcoming year and in interpreting the research/creative activity, instructional contributions, and service activities of each faculty member during the period under evaluation in accordance with the designated weighted assignments in these areas of faculty performance.

**Guidelines for Appendix A CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form**

Appendix A, the CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form, is used to formalize assignments for the upcoming academic year. Post-tenure reviews of faculty will examine how they have performed in relation to the distribution of their effort among the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, instructional contributions, and service. It is important, therefore, that a record of the assignment be recorded prior to the start of the academic year.

**Areas of Responsibility in Making the Assignment.**

1. **The Chair.** It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that each faculty member is assigned a set of activities that, if completed satisfactorily, constitutes a full load. These assignments should be annual and prospective, should be established following approved policies, and should be arrived at only after consulting with faculty about their preferences. It is the chair's responsibility to make assignments that reflect an appropriate use of a faculty member's time.
II. Faculty. Each faculty member should accept the assigned responsibilities and expect to provide services in support of institutional needs that reflect a full load. He/She should expect that the quality of these activities and their importance to the institution will be the basis of post-tenure review evaluations. Faculty members should recognize that assignments/contributions will vary among faculty members and from year to year. More detailed information for track faculty on work distribution follows.

The determination of work distribution will take into account the need to provide courses for graduate students and English majors, the need to provide high-quality service courses for non-major students who require English classes to graduate, the need to provide time for faculty research and other creative activity, the need for efficient department administration, and the need to support the principle of faculty governance. The percentage of effort assigned to instructional contributions will include classroom teaching (usually 10% for each class taught during the year) and all other activities that contribute to the teaching mission of the department (i.e., mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, curriculum development, etc.). The "default" assignment is 60% for instructional activities, 20% for research and/or creative activities, and 20% for service. However, each faculty member will take into account both the faculty member's individual goals with respect to scholarly and creative activities (e.g. current research or creative activities projects, course development ideas) and departmental goals (see Den 202), and may assign 40% for instructional activities, 40% for research and/or creative activities, and 20% for service. (Distribution of percentage of effort across the three areas is contingent on a faculty member's contribution to the department in all areas.)

Complete Appendix A online at (http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/facspace/deptmanual/append-A.html)

Guidelines for Annual Performance

The Personnel Committee's performance evaluations and recommendations to the Chair will take into consideration each faculty member’s previous year's contributions to teaching and the previous three calendar years' productivity in research, creative activity, and professional development activities; and service.

Please highlight in yellow your contributions to teaching, research/creative activities, and service on a current CV.

Evaluation Procedures

All submitted materials will be considered by the Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee. For each of the three categories—instructional contributions, research and creative activity, and service—a rating on a 1-4 scale will be assigned; the overall rating will be the average weighted score of each category.

A **highly meritorious** rating (level 4) will require evidence that the faculty member performed at an exceptional level, as per the indicators.

A **meritorious rating** (level 3) will require evidence that the faculty member has performed at a superior level, as per the indicators.

A **satisfactory rating** (level 2) will require evidence that the faculty member has met the minimum requirements for fulfilling the responsibilities in the assigned area, as per the indicators.

An **unsatisfactory rating** (level 1) will require evidence that the faculty member has failed to perform assigned duties in a particular area, as per the indicators.

Evaluations will be made on the basis of multiple indicators. For detailed indicators, see below. Faculty are *encouraged* to review the indicators for each area prior to submitting their annual performance. For additional help, see the section titled *Guidelines for Interpreting Submitted Materials* below.)

For each of the three areas, the Personnel Committee and Chair will be guided by the following indicators as appropriate.
to the individual faculty member's approved work distribution for the past calendar year, and the previous two calendar years:

**Instructional Contributions (One calendar year):**

**Merit Rating of 4:** Achieves widely-recognized teaching success, such as receiving a major teaching award, superior evaluations across the board; is successful in teaching a recognizably-difficult course; carries out internal programmatic assignments to the highest level; supervises an extensive number of Honors student and/or graduate students; takes on exceptional responsibility for developing and advancing an area of specialization that is often difficult to staff; gives evidence of accessibility to students outside the classroom and holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit Rating of 3:** Receives evaluation scores at the departmental mean or better for comparable classes; uses innovative strategies in teaching materials and presentation and helps students understand how these contribute to learning; mentors other teachers; teaches a variety of courses; participates in new course development or curriculum development; is effective in carrying out programmatic assignments; demonstrates commitment to departmental needs (teaching at the lower division; teaching at night/early morning/weekends; teaching high enrollment/ multicultural content courses, etc.); serves on graduate student and/or Honors students thesis committees or applied projects; gives evidence of providing a challenging but supportive learning climate; gives evidence of accessibility to students outside of class time and holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Meets classes; receives evaluations for each course taught within one (1) point of the departmental mean for comparable classes; defines course requirements clearly on all syllabi; uses effective pedagogy; works as a member on graduate student and Honors student committees; holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Fails repeatedly to meet classes and provide office hours; and/or fails repeatedly to provide adequate teaching materials/course guidelines to students; and/or fails repeatedly to provide students with the opportunity to fill out course evaluations; repeatedly receives evaluations more than one (1) point worse than the departmental mean for comparable classes; violates the professional student/teacher relationship.

**Research/Creative Activity/Professional Development (Three calendar years):**

**Merit Rating of 4:** Is awarded major national or international grants or honors; demonstrates highly significant creative or scholarly publication/performance/professional development.

**Merit Rating of 3:** Publishes significant works in professionally-recognized venues; participates in professional conferences and workshops; reads/edits manuscripts; provides evidence of an ongoing research/professional development agenda.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Demonstrates evidence of ongoing professional development and/or progress toward publication (such as conference papers, article submissions, acceptance letters, well-informed teaching, etc.) for each calendar year of the reporting period.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Shows no evidence of an ongoing research/creative activity/professional development agenda and/or production.

**Service (Three calendar years):**

**Merit Rating of 4:** Accepts and carries out departmental and/or other university service and/or
administrative assignments to the highest level; performs exceptional widely-recognized community outreach assignments and/or exceptional service to national/international organizations.

**Merit Rating of 3:** Accepts rigorous service/administrative load at any university level; provides evidence of professional community outreach; provides service to professional organizations; mentors other teachers; builds/participates in team environment.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Accepts and fully participates in appropriate service, as mutually agreed upon between faculty member and Chair; serves at the college and university levels, in the faculty member's professional discipline, and/or in the community.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Fails to accept and participate effectively in any assigned service/administration responsibility beyond the department area committee; gives no evidence of providing external professional service or professional community outreach.

**Contributions to Affirmative Action Principles**

The Personnel Committee and the Chair will also be guided by the Departmental Plan for Diversity and Affirmative Action in the evaluation process. Those faculty members actively contributing to the Affirmative Action and Diversity aims of the department and the university in their pedagogy, their research, creative activity, and professional development activities, and in service should appropriately note these contributions. The Personnel Committee and the department Chair will credit these activities as an addition to the above evaluative indicators.

**Sabbaticals, Leaves, and Funded Research**

Faculty on leave from teaching responsibilities will be evaluated in the categories of research and service (where applicable).

**Outcome of Annual Review and Consequences of Performance Evaluation**

An overall rating will be determined, according to the percentages of effort in each faculty member's work distribution. In a typical distribution (40%, 40%, 20%), the score for teaching will be multiplied by .4, that for research by .4 and that for service .2. These will be added up to come to a weighted average score.

Satisfactory (level 2) or better (level 3 or level 4) performance in all areas of evaluation allows the faculty member to remain in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises.

Overall satisfactory performance with a single area of unsatisfactory leads to a faculty development plan, as determined by the Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee.

An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory (for example, teaching), depending upon the percentages assigned to that area in the goal-based agreement and the extent of the deficiency. An overall unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan approved at the college level.

Each faculty member will be notified of his/her evaluation in each assigned area, as well as an overall evaluation average rating.

**Guidelines for Interpreting Submitted Materials**

The following are intended to aid faculty members in the presentation of their annual performance. Further, they will guide the Personnel Committee and the Chair in interpreting specific elements of faculty performance. The guidelines
are designed to address specifically those areas that have presented particular problems in evaluation in past years. They are meant to make the evaluation criteria less ambiguous. They are meant, also, to emphasize quality, rather than merely measuring the quantitative aspects of performance.

**General**

Faculty members who do not submit the relevant materials in the requested format will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee and the Chair on the basis of readily available information.

Less-than full time faculty will be evaluated on the basis of an appropriate percentage relative to the accomplishments of full-time faculty.

**Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Development (Three Calendar Years)**

Normally, only articles, books, creative works, etc., actually in print or on the internet will be considered under the category of "publications." Works in progress, circulation, or accepted for publication will be considered as evidence of an ongoing research and publication program and may be referred to in cover letter (if applicable). In cases where publication delays or other extenuating circumstances would unfairly penalize a faculty member, evidence of a publication commitment would be considered and should be explained in the in cover letter. If a faculty member chooses to have a manuscript considered which has been accepted for publication but is not yet in print or on the internet, the burden is on the faculty member to present evidence that the journal/publisher has accepted the manuscript.

All faculty research and publication subject to annual evaluation should contribute to the department's mission and/or reputation. Faculty members are encouraged to achieve excellence in the field(s) in which they are hired. Publications outside the faculty member's primary departmental responsibilities will normally supplement the faculty member's record of publication. Both Department administration and faculty member must recognize the programmatic needs of the former and the intellectual growth of the latter and come to some flexible compromise addressing both concerns.

Written work will be evaluated on the basis of its quality and on the publication or press from which it is issued. Publication will also be evaluated on the basis of the originality of the work and/or its ongoing importance in the faculty member's fields of expertise.

1. **Books**

   Edited volumes may be considered book-length publication if they are:

   a. critical editions, or  
   b. collections in which each article is refereed.

   Collections of invited articles may be so considered if they are highly significant, part of an important series, or are published by a high quality press (documentation or explanation for this should be included, if appropriate).

   Other kinds of edited volumes also will be considered as publication, if the particular subdiscipline recognizes it as such. This puts the burden on the faculty member to describe the volume's importance and clarify its status in the cover letter.

   Translations (book length) will be evaluated along the lines given above and may be explained in the cover letter.

2. **Articles, Chapters, Essays, Poems, and Short Stories in Refereed Venues**
Chapters in edited volumes will be given full value as refereed publications if they appear in volumes that have been refereed, form part of an important series, or are issued by a high quality press (documentation or explanation should be provided in the cover letter.

Review essays will be given full publication credit if they appear in a significant publication in the faculty member's field.

Translation essays will be evaluated along the lines given above and may be explained in the cover letter.

3. Co-authored works will be given credit proportional to the contribution of the faculty member (as indicated on the CV).

4. Projects funded by grants will receive credit under the category of research if the faculty member is the primary or co-primary investigator.

5. Conference papers and scholarly or pedagogical presentations vary in importance. The quality of the venue for presentation (i.e. keynote address, refereed process, national or regional meeting) will be taken into consideration (and may be explained in the cover letter). It is possible that such an activity is both research and service.

6. Participation in workshops that would advance an individual faculty member's research can be considered either part of research/creative activity/professional development or service.

7. Travel to collections and/or conferences that would advance an individual faculty member's research can be considered either part of research/creative activity/professional development or service.

8. Certain kinds of publication (i.e. book reviews, encyclopedia entries, etc.) are signs of the faculty member's visibility as an expert in a field, and are normally considered partially as publication and partially as professional service. (Exceptions to this policy may be justified in the cover letter.)

9. Honors and awards for scholarship and creative activity are signs of the faculty member's visibility as an expert in a field.

10. Sabbatical final report for sabbatical leaves within the last three calendar years need to be included and should indicate scholarly/creative growth and production.

11. Scholarly growth and consistent production will be considered in the annual evaluation on the basis of the full current CV submitted. Work in progress will be considered as evidence of an active ongoing research and publication program.

**Instructional Contributions (One Calendar Year)**

1. Number of credit hours in teaching each year will be considered in relation to the teaching assignment and to the percentage proportion of emphasis the faculty member places on teaching.

2. Chairing and serving on honors and graduate student committees and the mentoring of teachers are important and valued teaching activities and are considered as evidence of commitment to quality teaching. Such work, including service on interdisciplinary committees, should be reported in the summary of teaching activities. Faculty should receive credit for this teaching function during the years of service on each committee, not only when the student completes the work.

3. Independent studies courses are important teaching assignments and review of them should be included in the summary of teaching activities in the cover letter.
4. Course and curriculum development should also be considered as an instructional contribution.

5. Participation in workshops that would advance an individual faculty member's pedagogy should be considered an instructional contribution.

6. Other contributions should be noted in the cover letter.

Service (Three Calendar Years)

1. Certain kinds of publication (i.e. book reviews, encyclopedia entries, etc.) are signs of the faculty member's visibility as an expert in a field, and are normally considered partially as publication and partially as professional service. (Exceptions to this policy may be justified in the cover letter.)

2. Conference papers and scholarly or pedagogical presentations vary in importance. The quality of the venue for presentation (i.e. keynote address, refereed process, national or regional meeting) will be taken into consideration. It is possible that such activity may be both research and service.

3. Edited volumes that fall outside the criteria for credit as publication will be considered service to the profession.

4. Paid editing will normally be considered service.

5. Participation in a funded research project for which someone else is the PI may be considered service or research.

6. Service, including that performed in the community, must be related to the academic sphere of activity.

7. Each faculty member will be expected to participate actively on her or his area committee. Further, each member of the faculty is expected to participate actively in the governance and administration of the department and university by attendance at and service on committees.

8. Conference organization should be considered a professional service activity.

Administrative work (Three Calendar Years)

Faculty members who perform ongoing administrative services to the department, and who are not compensated by having fiscal salaries, will have reduced requirements in other areas of departmental work. Their performance will be evaluated in light of the administrative duties and their administrative performance will be evaluated by the Chair. In the other areas, they will be subject to the same evaluation as all other faculty.

Appeal Process

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her merit rating must notify the Department Chair in writing within five business days of receiving evaluation results. With that notification, the faculty member may submit additional information to the Chair. If the disagreement is founded on an "unsatisfactory" rating (a rating of 1), the merit rating will be suspended until the conclusion of the appeal process at the departmental level.

2. The faculty member will meet with the Department Chair and the arbitrator, or with the Department Chair and a member of the evaluating Personnel Committee. If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.

3. The Department arbitrator, in consultation with the Department Chair and with the aggrieved faculty
member, will appoint an ad hoc committee to be chaired by the department arbitrator as a non-voting member, and to include 3 tenured faculty members who are not members of the Personnel Committee. This committee will evaluate the materials and make a recommendation to the Chair.

4. The Chair will consider all the evidence and will make a final recommendation to the faculty member.

5. If the aggrieved faculty member is still not satisfied with the Chair's recommendation, he/she may seek relief through the Faculty Grievance process at the College level. According to ACD 506-10 (Annual Evaluations of Faculty), the request for such a review must be made within 30 days after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member, who must complete the review within 30 days after it is requested. There are no procedures for appeals or hearings unless a grievance is alleged as described above.
DEN 505.2 Annual Performance Evaluation Guidelines: Lecturers and Clinical Professors
Revised 9/19/11

All English Department faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the departmental community through working to achieve both individual goals and departmental goals. The guiding principle in the distribution of work and its evaluation will be to achieve BALANCE within the Department. It is the goal of the Personnel Committee and Chair to insure that work is equitably distributed among all members of the faculty.

According to Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis. The following procedures outline the annual review process and the consequences of an unsatisfactory rating in any area or overall, as determined by the Board of Regents, for lecturers and clinical professors.

**Guidelines for Appendix A CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form**

For evaluation purposes, faculty members will submit each spring (on or before January 5) online:

- **Appendix A CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form**

Appendix A, the CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form, is used to formalize assignments for the upcoming academic year.

**Areas of Responsibility in Making the Assignment.**

I. **The Chair.** It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that each faculty member is assigned a set of activities that, if completed satisfactorily, constitutes a full load. It is the chair's responsibility to make assignments that reflect an appropriate use of a faculty member's time.

II. **Faculty.** Each faculty member should accept the assigned responsibilities and expect to provide services in support of institutional needs that reflect a full load. Faculty members should recognize that assignments/contributions will vary among faculty members and from year to year.

Per ACD 505-02, lecturers and clinical professors are non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching undergraduate or clinical courses. Lecturers and clinical professors are expected to make substantial contributions in teaching, and to demonstrate a level of professional development appropriate for their teaching responsibilities. The normal teaching load for lecturers and clinical professors is four courses per semester, totaling 80% for the year; the percentage of effort assigned to instructional contributions will include classroom teaching (usually 10% for each class taught during the year) and all other activities that contribute to the teaching mission of the department (i.e., mentoring students, curriculum development, etc.). The remaining 20% of effort will be divided between professional development and service, as the individual lecturer or clinical professor and the department Chair mutually agree. In some cases, lecturers will have programmatic responsibilities in the Writing Programs in lieu of classroom teaching, which support and sustain the departmental teaching mission. At the discretion of the Chair, individuals may be assigned workloads that differ from these departmental averages.

Guidelines for Annual Performance

For or annual performance evaluation, submit hardcopy and online copy on Blackboard of the following on January 5:

- A current CV, with instructional activities and if applicable, administrative activities for the last calendar year and activities in professional development and service for the last three calendar years highlighted in yellow
- A one-page hardcopy cover letter (optional) explaining any special circumstances or developments not covered in the CV

The Department will provide the statistical summaries of and student comments from student evaluations. These documents will aid the department Chair and the Personnel Committee in determining teaching assignments for the upcoming year and in interpreting the instructional contributions, professional development, and service activities of each faculty member during the period under evaluation in accordance with the designated weighted assignments in these areas of faculty performance. For the online files on Blackboard, please name each file with your last name and first initial and a description of the content. (E.g. Jones_E_CV and Jones_E_personal_statement)

The Personnel Committee's performance evaluations and recommendations to the Chair will take into consideration the previous year's contributions to teaching (and administrative if applicable) and the previous three calendar years' productivity in terms of the individual faculty member's contributions to professional development activities and service.

Evaluation Procedures

All submitted materials will be considered by the Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee. For each of the three categories—instructional contributions, professional development, and service—a rating will be assigned.

A highly meritorious rating (level 4) will require evidence that the faculty member performed at an exceptional level, as per the indicators.

A meritorious rating (level 3) will require evidence that the faculty member has performed at a superior level, as per the indicators.

A satisfactory rating (level 2) will require evidence that the faculty member has met the minimum requirements for fulfilling the responsibilities in the assigned area, as per the indicators.

An unsatisfactory rating (level 1) will require evidence that the faculty member has failed to perform assigned duties in a particular area, as per the indicators.

Evaluations will be made on the basis of multiple indicators. For detailed indicators, see below. Faculty are encouraged to review the indicators for each area prior to filling out the annual performance materials. For additional help, see the section titled Guidelines for Interpreting Submitted Materials below.)

For each of the three areas, the Committee and Chair will be guided by the following indicators, as appropriate to the individual faculty member's approved work distribution for the past calendar year, and the previous two calendar years:

Instructional Contributions (One calendar year):

Merit Rating of 4: Achieves widely-recognized teaching success, such as receiving a major teaching award, superior evaluations across the board; is successful in teaching a recognizable-difficult course; carries out internal programmatic assignments to the highest level; takes on exceptional responsibility for developing
and advancing an area of specialization that is often difficult to staff; gives evidence of accessibility to students outside the classroom and holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit rating of 3:** Receives evaluation scores at the departmental mean or better for comparable classes; uses innovative strategies in teaching materials and presentation and helps students understand how these contribute to learning; mentors other teachers; teaches a variety of courses; participates in new course development or curriculum development; is effective in carrying out programmatic assignments; demonstrates commitment to departmental needs (teaching at the lower division; teaching at night/early morning/weekends; teaching high enrollment/multicultural content courses, etc.); gives evidence of providing a challenging but supportive learning climate; gives evidence of accessibility to students outside of class time and holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Meets classes; receives evaluations for each course taught within one (1) point of the departmental mean for comparable classes; defines course requirements clearly on all syllabi; uses effective pedagogy; holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Fails repeatedly to meet classes and provide office hours; fails repeatedly to provide adequate teaching materials/course guidelines to students; fails repeatedly to provide students with the opportunity to fill out course evaluations; repeatedly receives evaluations more than one (1) point worse than the departmental mean for comparable classes; violates the professional student/teacher relationship.

**Professional Development (Three calendar years):**

**Merit Rating of 4:** Is awarded major national or international grants or honors; demonstrates highly significant scholarly professional development. Gives conference papers at national and regional professional conferences.

**Merit Rating of 3:** Participates in national and regional professional conferences and workshops; reads/edits manuscripts; provides evidence of an ongoing research/professional development agenda.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Demonstrates evidence of ongoing professional development (such as attending regional and local conferences and workshops) for each calendar year of the reporting period.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Shows no evidence of an ongoing professional development.

**Service (Three calendar years):**

**Merit Rating of 4:** Accepts and carries out departmental and/or other university service and/or administrative assignments to the highest level; performs exceptional widely-recognized community outreach assignments and/or exceptional service to national/international organizations.

**Merit Rating of 3:** Accepts rigorous service/administrative load at any university level; provides evidence of professional community outreach; provides service to professional organizations; mentors other teachers; builds/participates in team environment.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Accepts and fully participates in appropriate service, as mutually agreed upon between faculty member and Chair; serves at the college and university levels, in the faculty member's professional discipline, and/or in the community.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Fails to accept and participate effectively in any assigned service/administration responsibility beyond the department area committee; gives no evidence of providing external professional service or professional community outreach.
Outcome of Annual Review and Consequences of Performance Evaluation

An overall averaged rating will be determined, according to the percentages of effort in each faculty member's work distribution.

Satisfactory (level 2) or better (level 3 or level 4) performance in all areas of evaluation allows the faculty member to remain in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises.

An overall unsatisfactory rating leads to a Performance Improvement Plan approved at the college level.

Each faculty member will be notified of his/her evaluation in each assigned area, as well as an overall evaluation rating.

Appeal Process

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her merit rating must notify the Department Chair in writing within five business days of receiving evaluation results. With that notification, the faculty member may submit additional information to the Chair. If the disagreement is founded on an "unsatisfactory" rating (a rating of 1), the merit rating will be suspended until the conclusion of the appeal process at the departmental level.

2. The faculty member will meet with the Department Chair and the arbitrator, or with the Department Chair and a member of the evaluating Personnel Committee. If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.

3. The Department arbitrator, in consultation with the Department Chair and with the aggrieved faculty member, will appoint an ad hoc committee to be chaired by the department arbitrator as a non-voting member, and to include 3 tenured faculty members who are not members of the Personnel Committee. This committee will evaluate the materials and make a recommendation to the Chair.

4. The Chair will consider all the evidence and will make a final recommendation to the faculty member.

5. If the aggrieved faculty member is still not satisfied with the Chair's recommendation, he/she may seek relief through the Faculty Grievance process at the College level. According to ACD 506-10 (Annual Evaluations of Faculty), the request for such a review must be made within 30 days after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member, who must complete the review within 30 days after it is requested. There are no procedures for appeals or hearings unless a grievance is alleged as described above.
DEN 505.3   Annual Performance Evaluation Guidelines: Instructors     Revised 2/07

All English Department faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the departmental community through working to achieve both individual goals and departmental goals.

According to Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis. Instructors are evaluated on the basis of teaching, service/administration, and professional development, although their primary responsibility to the Department is teaching. Each instructor being evaluated will provide the following:

1. A letter of self-evaluation (not more than 2 pages), noting contributions in these areas
2. A current CV
3. Teaching materials, such as samples of syllabi, writing assignments, and other instructional materials that provide evidence of theoretical sophistication and pedagogical creativity
4. Optional: A statement of teaching philosophy for further evidence that the instructor understands connections between theory and practice in rhetoric and composition.

**Teaching:** The materials provided by the instructor will be supplemented by the Department with the mean scores from the University’s machine-readable student evaluation forms completed at the end of each semester. Instructors may include optional class visit reports.

**Service/Administration:** Contributions in this category vary, according to the particular assignment the instructor may have, and will be evaluated for the time and effort invested. Contributions may include:
- Participation in any of the administrative committees
- Activities may include evaluating possible textbooks, holding meetings with teachers of the courses, reviewing course syllabi, collecting materials to be made available to all teachers of the courses, etc.
- Liaison with other programs, such as the Service Learning Program
- Preparation of in-service workshops for other teachers in the program.
- Workshops may focus on theory or strategies for teaching specific courses or on more broadly applicable theory and practice
- Preparation of a writing workshop or service on a board as community outreach.

**Professional Development:** Contributions in this category may include:
- Current graduate course work in the field as evidence of growth
- Participation in local, regional, and/or national professional conferences, such as those sponsored by the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the Modern Language Association, the Arizona English Teachers Association, and the Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Conference
- Publications that demonstrate some knowledge of work in the field.

**Evaluation Procedures**
All submitted materials will be considered by the Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair and the Director of Writing Programs. For each of the three categories—instructional contributions, research and creative activity/professional development, and service—a rating will be assigned.

A **highly meritorious rating (level 3)** will require evidence that the faculty member performed at an exceptional level, as per the indicators.

A **satisfactory rating (level 2)** will require evidence that the faculty member has met the minimum requirements for fulfilling the responsibilities in the assigned area, as per the indicators.

An **unsatisfactory rating (level 1)** will require evidence that the faculty member has failed to perform assigned duties in a particular area, as per the indicators.

Evaluations will be made on the basis of multiple indicators. For detailed indicators, see below. Faculty are encouraged to review the indicators for each area prior to filling out their annual evaluation. The Instructor’s
workload is typically divided as 80% teaching, with the remaining 20% divided between service and professional development.

**Instructional Contributions (One calendar year):**

**Merit rating of 3:** Receives evaluation scores at the departmental mean or better for comparable classes; evidences innovative strategies in teaching materials and presentation and helps students understand how these contribute to learning; participates in course development and/or curriculum development; is effective in carrying out programmatic assignments; demonstrates commitment to departmental needs (teaching at the lower division; teaching at other campuses; teaching overloads; teaching at night/early morning/weekends; teaching multicultural content courses, etc.); gives evidence of providing a challenging but supportive learning climate; gives evidence of accessibility to students outside of class time and regularly scheduled office hours.

**Merit rating of 2:** Meets classes; receives evaluations at or within one (1) point of the departmental mean for comparable classes; defines course requirements clearly on all syllabi; uses effective pedagogy; holds regularly-scheduled office hours.

**Merit rating of 1:** Fails to meet classes and provide office hours; fails to provide adequate teaching materials / course guidelines to students; fails to provide students with the opportunity to fill out course evaluations; repeatedly receives evaluations more than one (1) point worse than the department mean for comparable classes; violates the professional student / teacher relationship.

**Service Contributions**

**Merit Rating of 3:** Accepts and carries out departmental and/or other university service and/or administrative assignments to the highest level; builds/participates in team environment; performs community outreach assignments; provides service to professional organizations. Other programmatic contributions can include: reviewing course syllabi; collecting teaching materials; mentoring other teachers; conducting in-service teacher workshops.

**Merit Rating of 2:** Accepts and fully participates in appropriate service, as mutually agreed upon between faculty member and Chair or Director of Writing Programs.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Fails to accept and participate effectively in any assigned service/administration responsibility.

**Professional Development**

**Merit Rating of 3:** Demonstrates a high level of ongoing professional development for the reporting period such as conducting pedagogical scholarship, attending conferences; presenting at conferences; conducting workshops for teachers; taking graduate-level coursework in the field; reviewing or editing journals related to the field

**Merit Rating of 2:** Demonstrates evidence of ongoing professional development for the reporting period which can include participation in workshops and/or seminars in the field.

**Merit Rating of 1:** Shows no evidence of professional development for the reporting period.
DEN 506  Salary Adjustment Plan  

1. **Approved Written Plan.** The evaluation criteria, the evaluation process, and the salary adjustment process were approved in a formal Department vote on April 5, 1995. Further revisions to the evaluation criteria and evaluation process were approved in a formal Department vote on November 6, 1996 and by ballot in January, 1998.

2. **Satisfactory Performance Criterion.** The English Department's criteria for determining the threshold of satisfactory performance is stated in the Department Manual [DEN 505.1](http://www.asu.edu/clas/auenglish/facspace/deptmanual/den506.htm).

3. **Salary Issues to be Addressed.** Using the procedures outlined below, the English Department will attempt to reward performance that provides valuable institutional contributions; to remedy problems of inappropriate salary compression and inversion; and to correct unlawful discriminatory inequities that may exist:

   a. Each faculty member will be assigned a reference salary, assuming a salary floor for each rank and factoring in his/her contributions to the department and university, as well as contributions to his/her professional discipline (this will involve all or some of the following, not necessarily in prioritized order: external market, internal market, salary compression, salary inversion, unrecognized merit, and other possible salary inequities).

   b. Faculty members will be brought a certain percentage toward their reference salaries, based on criteria expressed in the departmental annual evaluation guidelines in place through 1992, and the current departmental workplan (1996-present).

   c. Special equity cases, particularly those involving inversion and compression, will be pulled out of these groups for individual adjustment of salary. d. The percentage increase for each faculty member is dependent on the amount of the salary distribution pool.

4. **Performance Evaluation.**

   a. The [English Department's Annual Evaluation guidelines](http://www.asu.edu/clas/auenglish/facspace/deptmanual/den506.htm) since 1990 determine merit for individual faculty members based on excellence in teaching (on the basis of student evaluations, syllabi, occasional peer evaluations, etc.), research or creative activity (on the basis of quantity and perceived quality of publications), and service (on the basis of committee assignments in the department, college, and university, and on professional service as described by the individual faculty member). Contributions to Departmental and/or university affirmative action and minority student recruitment and retention goals will also be recognized.

   b. These guidelines allow individual faculty members to emphasize teaching or research, or a combination of both. The unit as a whole gives equal weight to teaching and research/creative activity.

   c. The Chair provides a letter to each faculty member, in which both positive and negative aspects of performance are discussed. Further, the workplan submitted by each faculty member provides an opportunity for the Chair to make suggestions concerning a faculty member's prospective professional activity.

5. **Review Window and Cycle.**
a. The English Department will be taking into account the annual evaluations of its faculty members for the last three academic years. In addition, in order to better address historical inequity, we will take into account career status and accomplishments.

b. Faculty members will be evaluated every year. This evaluation will be the basis of any performance-based salary adjustment decision.

6. **Performance Agreements.** Each faculty member submits a [CLAS Faculty Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form](http://www.asu.edu/clas/asuenglish/facspace/deptmanual/den506.htm) to the Chair as part of his/her annual self-evaluation. In this plan, the faculty member outlines his/her projected distribution of effort among teaching, research/creative activity, and service. After consultation with the Personnel Committee, the Chair either approves the plan or works with the faculty member to revise it. This performance agreement does not supersede established promotion criteria.

7. **Appeal Process**

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his/her merit rating must notify the Department Chair in writing within five business days of receiving evaluation results. With that notification, the faculty member may submit additional information to the Chair. If the disagreement is founded on an "unsatisfactory" rating (a rating of 1), the merit rating will be suspended until the conclusion of the appeal process at the departmental level.

2. The faculty member will meet with the Department Chair and the arbitrator, or with the Department Chair and a member of the evaluating Personnel Committee. If the issue remains unresolved, the aggrieved faculty member may proceed to step 3.

3. The Department arbitrator, in consultation with the Department Chair and with the aggrieved faculty member, will appoint an ad hoc committee to be chaired by the department arbitrator as a non-voting member, and to include 3 tenured faculty members and/or academic professional with continuing status who are not members of the Personnel Committee. This committee will evaluate the materials and make a recommendation to the Chair.

4. The Chair will consider all the evidence and will make a final recommendation to the faculty member.

5. If the aggrieved faculty member is still not satisfied with the Chair's recommendation, he/she may seek relief through the Faculty Grievance process at the College level. According to ACD 506-06 (Annual & Probationary Evaluations for Faculty), the request for such a review must be made within 30 days after the individual receives his or her written evaluation. The final decision to appeal at the college level rests with the aggrieved faculty member, who must complete the review within 30 days after it is requested. There are no procedures for appeals or hearings unless a grievance is alleged as described above.
DEN 507     Post-Tenure Review Policy     Revised 7/98

Post-tenure review has three components that all faculty will undergo: the annual review, the Dean’s Level Audit, and the Academic Program Review.

Annual Review

The Chair shall evaluate each tenured faculty member’s performance annually. The performance shall be evaluated upon goal-based written expectations and responsibilities agreed to in advance between the faculty member and the Chair (prospective workplan) and by reference to performance standards described in the “Annual Evaluation Guidelines” (DEN 505) and to departmental and university goals. The review will normally cover the preceding three-year period, with substantial emphasis on the current year for the evaluation of teaching. Faculty will be given high merit, merit, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory ratings, where appropriate, for the areas of instructional contributions; research, creative activity, and professional development; and service, as well as a composite rating for overall performance. Faculty will be notified of these evaluations on or before May 1. Faculty members will submit all materials relevant to evaluation approximately one month earlier.

See DEN 505.1 for a full description of the policy and procedures governing annual evaluation.

Definition of Satisfactory Overall Performance

A faculty member achieves an overall satisfactory performance when he/she earns a numeric average of “2” in the performance of all assigned duties. The following indicators describe “satisfactory performance” in each of the three areas:

Satisfactory Performance in Instructional Contributions: Meets classes; receives evaluations for each course taught within one (1) point of the departmental mean for comparable classes; defines course requirements clearly on all syllabi; uses effective pedagogy; works as a member on graduate student and Honors student committees; holds regularly-scheduled office hours;

Satisfactory Performance in Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Development: Demonstrates evidence of ongoing professional development and/or progress toward publication (such as conference papers, article submissions, acceptance letters, well-informed teaching, etc.) for each calendar year of the reporting period;

Satisfactory Performance in Service: Accepts and fully participates in appropriate service, as mutually agreed upon between faculty member and Chair; serves at the college and university levels, in the faculty member’s professional discipline, and/or in the community.

Outcome of Annual Review and Consequences of Performance Evaluation

An overall rating will be determined, according to the percentages of effort in each faculty member’s workplan. In order to be considered for a level 4 rating, a faculty member must have highly meritorious evaluations in two or more areas or in more than 70% of the assigned workload.

Satisfactory or better performance in all areas of evaluation allows the faculty member to remain in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises.
Overall satisfactory performance with a single area of unsatisfactory leads to a faculty development plan, as determined by the Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee.

An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory (for example, teaching), depending upon the percentages assigned to that area in the goal-based agreement and the extent of the deficiency. An overall unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan approved at the college level.

Each faculty member will be notified of his/her evaluation in each assigned area, as well as an overall evaluation rating.

**Faculty Development Plan**

If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any one area, a faculty development plan will be developed in order to address this single area of deficiency, before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member’s overall performance. This plan will also identify the means by which the faculty member will improve performance. Immediately after the faculty member receives his/her evaluation (normally before the end of the spring semester), the faculty member will meet with the Chair in order to develop this plan. (During the regular evaluation process, the Personnel Committee will have an opportunity to make specific recommendations to the Chair.) The plan is a maximum of one-year duration, with appropriate monitoring and feedback. If the faculty member’s performance is satisfactory in all areas at the end of the Faculty Development Plan, the faculty member returns to the regular performance evaluation process. If plan objectives are not achieved at the end of the year, the faculty member shall receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory and must enter the performance improvement process.

**Performance Improvement Process**

Development and implementation of a performance improvement plan shall occur no later than the semester following the overall unsatisfactory evaluation. This plan is developed in concert by the Chair and the dean, in consultation with the English Department’s elected Personnel Committee. The performance improvement plan identifies areas of specific deficiency and identifies the means by which the faculty member will improve performance. Teaching and service deficiencies will generally be addressed through a one-year performance improvement plan. In those rare circumstances where the nature of the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in one year, the duration of the plan may go beyond one year. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Provost. Annual or more frequent benchmarks tied to performance goals must be met. Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to these annual or more frequent benchmarks and performance goals shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal. For a research/creative activity deficiency or for the research/creative activity component of an overall deficiency, the duration of the plan shall be as brief as is reasonable, but under no circumstances will it be longer than three years.

**Dean’s Level Audit**

The English Department will undergo a dean’s level audit every five years. A panel convened by the Dean checks the adequacy of the process and makes appropriate recommendations to the department’s Personnel Committee. If appropriate, the panel refers individual faculty files back to the department’s Personnel Committee.

**Academic Program Review**

The English Department programs are normally reviewed every 5-7 years. This review is conducted by the Dean
and a panel of qualified members, which includes external experts, community representatives, and recent alumni of the program. Where appropriateness of contribution is questioned by this panel, the file will be returned to the Personnel Committee for examination.