

Submitted: September 2023

Approved: 9/27/2023

### **Department of English Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulation 10.003, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of English are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The post tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review packet, which comprises the material to be reviewed, will be comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review, the previous five years of annual performance reviews, the faculty member's CV, and the faculty member's disciplinary record (if there is any).

Department of English guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the discipline as it exists at research universities. These guidelines are based on department criteria for annual evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at top-tier research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectation that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over 3 of the last 5 years of the review period may be

deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The following criteria for post-tenure review in the Department of English are drawn from university approved criteria for annual evaluations.

## 1. Teaching

In the area of teaching, criteria for post-tenure review include evidence of curricular rigor, innovation, and maintenance; contributions to degree programs; and commitment to pedagogy. Evaluation of the area of teaching will give consideration to the effectiveness in (1) imparting knowledge and developing skills, (2) stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, particularly with respect to critical analysis and writing, and (3) meeting accepted standards of professional behavior when relating to students. Also considered will be student comments, teacher-designed student surveys, teaching awards, nominations for such awards, major external teaching fellowships, unsolicited letters from students, peer reviews, syllabi, tests, assignments, and web site innovations as reflected in Annual Evaluations.

1. **Exceeds Expectations:** should be awarded to faculty whose teaching record must provide evidence of curricular rigor, innovation and/or maintenance at the highest standards as well as commitment to pedagogy. A teaching record that Exceeds Expectations reflects a thoughtful, respectful, and thorough consideration of feedback about teaching and appropriate reflection about ways of improving or maintaining a high standard of teaching. Evidence of course development and revision of existing courses is present. Faculty will have successfully directed graduate students at the appropriate level (exceptions will be made for faculty on branch campuses who have more limited opportunities to engage with graduate students), and will have served on the appropriate number of committees at the graduate and undergraduate levels (taking into account the faculty member's rank and the availability of students in the particular area).

Among the documents submitted for Annual Evaluation, an instructor's syllabi should reflect logical, thoughtfully sequenced courses. Expectations are stated explicitly and assignments are explained in detail. Student evaluations indicate that instruction was delivered effectively and the instructor was very prepared, explained concepts clearly, and effectively used a variety of instructional strategies to deliver content. Teaching materials, handouts, course format, course requirements, and instructional approaches are clearly aligned with the course objectives and are creative and innovative, reflecting a variety of instructional approaches. The faculty member is available during posted office hours.

2. **Meets Expectations:** Illustrated by the materials submitted for Annual Evaluations, The teaching record includes evidence of curricular attention, innovation and/or maintenance. The teaching record reflects efforts to self-evaluate and attend to helpful feedback, but evidence of a corresponding change in teaching behavior is limited. Faculty will have directed graduate students and served on committees at the graduate

or undergraduate levels (taking into account the faculty member's rank and the availability of students in the particular area).

3. **Does Not Meet Expectations** should be awarded to faculty who consistently demonstrate ineffective teaching as evidenced by their materials submitted for Annual Evaluation. To receive a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations, the faculty member shows lack of success in directing graduate students or fails to serve on the appropriate number of committees at graduate and undergraduate levels; materials indicate below-standard course design and delivery. An instructor who merits Does Not Meet Expectations will have a specific improvement plan designed in order to address areas where expectations are not met.
4. **Unsatisfactory** should be awarded to faculty whose annual evaluations merited Does Not Meet Expectations for two or more of the five-year period under review.

## 2. Research/Creative Activity

Research, publication, and creative activity are to be evaluated with a view toward balancing the claims of short haul and long haul. In other words, a balance should be struck between giving credit for work done in the five-year period under consideration and giving credit for overall career development. If a colleague has been productive for many years, for example, the faculty member's ratings should not be lowered because of a seemingly unproductive period; the colleague should be given an opportunity to present evidence relevant to the overall performance. Similarly, if a colleague is heavily involved in service that also requires a good deal of current scholarly knowledge, their rating should not be lowered if such service temporarily slows their original output; they should be given the opportunity to explain the relevance to overall performance.

Absolute evaluative numbers cannot be assigned to individual items because quality must be evaluated as well as quantity. In this regard, evaluators should recognize that when a work is published, especially if refereed or invited, a certain qualitative judgment has already been made by peers, one to be heeded because it probably comes from a more impartial, and perhaps more informed, jury than a local committee.

Each activity below should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which they primarily work. Contributions to the field may be demonstrated by major external prizes and awards for scholarly or creative work.

1. **Exceeds Expectations** should be awarded for publication of ten or more well-placed articles, stories, essays, or graphic narratives or thirty or more poems in notable journals. Research **exceeds expectations** if the period under review includes publication by a respected press of a monograph, a novel, book-length graphic narrative, short story collection, or book of poetry. Equivalent work in electronic media should also qualify. Major grants or fellowships connected to a record of publication are further signs of distinction. Readings, papers delivered, and books reviewed are usually rated at a ratio of about two or three to one published article, although rarely would one be given the highest rating for doing nothing but readings, papers or reviews, no matter how many. A review essay, however, should be counted as an article. Textbooks are to be judged according to how much scholarly and critical effort went into their creation and how much pedagogical value they have. Articles,

stories, graphic narratives and poems accepted but not yet published should receive approximately one-third credit. Also considered will be publication associated with organization of a conference and making theoretical contributions as editor of a journal. The scholarly record and associated annual evaluations reflect a *coherent, organized, and systematic* program of scholarship.

2. **Meets Expectations** should be awarded for publication or acceptance of respectable scholarly or creative work. It should also be awarded for evidence of submission of such work or for evidence of significant progress on a book manuscript. Also taken into consideration will be publication associated with organization of a conference, service as editor or reader for a journal, peer review of manuscripts, readings and conference papers, book reviews, and textbooks. The scholarly/creative record and associated annual evaluations suggest contributions that meet average standards of quality in the field; the scholarly/creative record suggests the beginnings of an organized, systematic program of scholarship/creative record and clear evidence of intent to develop a program of scholarship/creative record.
3. **Does Not Meet Expectations** should be awarded to faculty whose record does not give evidence of the coherent development of a program of scholarship or a creative record. Faculty in this category have made little progress on any scholarly/creative projects in keeping with their assignment over the review period. Anyone who merits Does Not Meet Expectations will have a specific improvement plan designed in order to address areas where expectations are not met.
4. **Unsatisfactory** : there is no evidence of engagement with research and no evidence of progress on scholarly/creative publications in keeping with their assignment in the five-year period under review.

### 3. Service

Because service is part of each faculty member's contract with the university, it is appropriately evaluated as part of any performance review. In evaluating service-related activities, all aspects of a candidate's service will be evaluated and will not rely on a single measure of performance. As a department we recognize that the service load will differ among faculty. Applicants are fully responsible for providing evidence of their own service-related activities. Review of the five-year period takes into account the specific service commitments. For instance, membership in an organization might entail meeting attendance and event participation; serving on a committee of that organization would entail more involvement; and chairing that committee would entail even more involvement.

Service falls into three general categories: to the university, to the profession, and to the community. University service is further broken down into service to the department, the college, and the university at large.

1. **Exceeds Expectations** should be awarded to faculty who maintain a consistent record of good departmental service according to the standard assignment and hold key positions in important international, national, or regional professional organizations; or administrative work involved in editing, co-editing, or serving as book review editor for a journal in their area; or organize conferences; or participate actively in important university or

college committees or organizations; or perform departmental service well beyond the standard assignment. A record of leadership of community service activities (including service to public schools, community colleges, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education) in addition to a consistent record of departmental service can equal Exceeds Expectations merit.

2. **Meets Expectations** should be awarded to faculty who adequately perform departmental service activity according to the standard departmental assignment (e.g. three committee assignments as a general working rule) for each year of the five-year period under review.
3. **Does Not Meet Expectations** should be awarded to faculty who have not fulfilled the standard departmental service assignment and who have not shown evidence of service beyond the department. Anyone who merits Does Not Meet Expectations will have a specific improvement plan designed in order to address specific areas where expectations are not met.
4. **Unsatisfactory** should be awarded to faculty who have no effective service activity at the level of the expected rank and/or whose Annual Evaluations show a merit of unsatisfactory for two or more years in the five-year review period.

The post-tenure review requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average according to annual assignments based on of the scores in teaching, research, and service.