



MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of English

Department of English

BYLAWS

Spring 2019

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT BYLAWS

Table of Contents

Section 1: The Faculty	4
1.1 Composition of the Faculty	4
1.2 Voting Faculty	4
1.3 Governance Responsibility of the Faculty	5
Section 2: The Students	5
2.1 Student Constituency of the Department	5
2.2 Student Participation in Academic Governance	6
Section 3: Department Organization	6
3.1 Chairperson of the Department	6
3.2 Department Academic Governance	8
Section 4: Terms of Employment and Evaluation Procedures for Faculty	17
4.1 Terms of Employment for Tenure and Non-Tenure System Appointments	17
4.2. Evaluation of Faculty	17
4.2.1. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Appointments	17
4.2.2. Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track and Academic Specialist Appointments	26
Section 5: Faculty Hiring Procedures	36
5.1. Search Procedure Guidelines	36
5.2. Requesting Positions	36
5.3. Search Committee Composition & Procedures	37
Section 6: Grievance and Hearing Procedures	38
6.1. Faculty Grievance Procedure	38
6.2. Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure	38
6.3. Graduate Student Grievance Procedure	38
Section 7: Bylaws	38
7.1. Initial Approval	38
7.2. Interpretation	39
7.3. Amendments	39
7.4. Review	39

Amendments	40
1. Clarifications of Promotion Language	40
2. Teaching Portfolio Contents	42
3. Revised Annual Review Process for AY 20-21	43
Appendices	45
1. Variable Work Policy	45
2. Department of English Mentoring Policy	47
3. Protocols for Communicating Student Concerns	50
4. Curricular Change Approval Process	52
5. CAL RPT Procedures for Jointly Appointed/Assigned Faculty	53
6. Memorandum of Understanding Checklist for Jointly Appointed/ Assigned Faculty	55
7. Merit Review Cover Form and Narrative Template	57
8. University Guidelines for Future Policy on Developing Community Norms	59

SECTION 1: The Faculty

1.1 Composition of the Faculty

1.1.1. The regular faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons in the Department who have been appointed under the rules of tenure and who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or as further defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.

1.1.2. The fixed-term faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, but not appointed under the rules of tenure, as defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.

1.1.3. The academic specialist faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons holding the rank of academic specialist, academic specialist-continuing, or senior academic specialist, but not appointed under the rules of tenure, or as further defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.

1.1.4. Honorary faculty shall be those persons designated as visiting professor or professor emeritus.

1.2 Voting Faculty

1.2.1. The voting faculty in Department, College, and University matters shall consist of all regular faculty (in 1.1.1.), fixed-term faculty (in 1.1.2.) who hold current positions and have served under a full-time basis in the university with a majority appointment in the Department for at least three consecutive years, and academic specialist faculty (in 1.1.3) who have served under on a full-time basis in the university with an appointment in the Department for at least three consecutive years.

1.2.1.1. The voting faculty of the Department shall be constituted as stated in Bylaw 1.2.1., with the exception of those instances in which the faculty is voting on changes in the Bylaws related to the whole of section 3.2.5., “The Salary Committee”. In these instances, the voting faculty shall consist of those tenured and tenure-system faculty who are affected by the Salary Committee Bylaws, that is, English Department faculty on the departmental “salary list” who are reviewed for merit by the Salary Committee and the Chairperson. Any changes in section 3.2.5. shall meet the requirement stated in Bylaw 7.3.1., requiring a majority of voting faculty on the salary list to make changes in the Bylaws.

1.2.2. A faculty member jointly appointed in two or more units may vote only once in a given College or University election.

1.2.3. A faculty member jointly appointed in two or more units may vote on English Department matters.

1.2.4. Only regular faculty members of the Department of English may be elected to an academic governance body as the department's representative.

1.3 Governance Responsibility of the Faculty

1.3.1. Faculty Meetings

1.3.1.1. The faculty of the Department shall meet at least once during each semester. Additional meetings of the Department may also be called by the Department Chairperson, or upon petition of 25% of the regular and temporary faculty (in 1.1.1. and 1.1.2).

1.3.1.2. The Chairperson or Chairperson's designee shall generally attend all faculty meetings and Policy Committee meetings.

1.3.1.3. The Chairperson should whenever possible provide an agenda at least four days in advance of a faculty meeting, and include on that agenda notification of any elections to be held.

1.3.1.4. A quorum is necessary for the conduct of official business at an officially constituted meeting of the Department. A quorum shall be defined as fifty percent of the voting faculty. A quorum for all officially constituted committees of the Department shall be defined as a simple majority of the voting members of the committees.

1.3.1.5. Conduct of all Department faculty meetings shall be governed by revised Robert's Rules of Order (Revised).

1.3.2. Faculty members shall have the right to submit matters for the consideration of the Chairperson, the Policy Committee, or faculty.

1.3.3. The faculty shall have the right to review the actions of the Chairperson, the Policy Committee, the Graduate Committee, and the standing Departmental committees, individual personnel matters excepted, and to advise the Chairperson and the Policy Committee on matters pertaining to the general direction and welfare of the Department.

SECTION 2: The Students

2.1. Student Constituency of the Department

2.1.1. The student constituency of the Department for the purpose of selecting student representatives to the Department, College, and the University committees, or for any other appropriate purpose, shall be all undergraduate students who have declared with the Registrar a major or major preference in English and all graduate degree and non-degree candidates in English.

2.1.2. The Chairperson and Associate Chairpersons shall encourage the formation of an organization of English graduate students and an organization of English undergraduate students each year; these organizations have the right to select their respective representatives to Department committees, using procedures determined by their members.

2.2. Student Participation in Academic Governance

2.2.1. The undergraduate student constituency of the Department shall select a representative to the Undergraduate and Student Engagement Committees and the graduate student constituency of the Department shall select a representative for Policy, the Graduate, Student Engagement, and Equity Committees. Student participation in the Department academic governance bodies shall in all cases be in the same mode as faculty participation, except as reserved. The matters reserved to the faculty are:

2.2.1.1. Policy concerning salary, leaves, insurance, retirement, and fringe benefits of faculty.

2.2.1.2. Decisions concerning the appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or dismissal of individual faculty members.

2.2.1.3. Evidence from students regarding the teaching performance of faculty shall be considered in decisions concerning the above matters.

2.2.2. The Department will solicit input from undergraduate and graduate students on hiring, fields, and appointments.

SECTION 3: Department Organization

3.1. Chairperson of the Department

3.1.1. The chief department officer of the Department is the Chairperson.

3.1.2. The Chairperson is responsible for educational, research, and service programs of the Department. This responsibility includes budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction, taking into account the advisory procedures of the Department.

3.1.3. The voting faculty of the Department shall have shared responsibility with the Dean to determine procedures for advising the Dean on the selection of the Department Chairperson.

3.1.4. Faculty and students of the Department shall advise or consult with the Dean in the appointment of the Chairperson.

3.1.5. The selection of assistant and associate administrators to be nominated to the Provost shall be the responsibility of the Chairperson, who shall receive the views of the faculty and students through the academic governance system or other appropriate means.

3.1.6. The Chairperson of the Department shall be subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years.

3.1.6.1. The Department faculty shall have shared responsibility with the Dean to determine procedures for the review of the Chairperson.

3.1.6.2. There is no limit, other than the limit imposed by the University rules on retirement from administrative positions, on the number of times an individual may continue in the position of Chairperson.

3.1.6.3. At any time during the term of office, the appointment of a Chairperson, as Chairperson, may be terminated either by resignation or by action of the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the President and the Provost.

3.1.7. The Chairperson shall assist, encourage, and participate in academic governance as part of his or her administrative responsibility. The Chairperson shall:

3.1.7.1. Provide for the dissemination of information and exchange of views regarding Department policy by faculty and students, through the academic governance system as well as other appropriate channels.

3.1.7.2. Call meetings of the faculty at least once per semester with a prepared agenda submitted to the faculty at least four days beforehand (whenever possible) or upon petition of 25% of the faculty in residence.

3.1.7.3. Call meetings of the Policy Committee at least once per month with a prepared agenda submitted to the faculty at least four days beforehand (whenever possible), or upon petition of three or more Policy Committee members, or upon petition of 25% of the faculty in residence. Notice of a Policy Committee meeting shall be given to the faculty at least four days before that meeting, except in the case of emergencies.

3.1.7.4. Act as Chairperson, with power to break tie votes, of meetings of the faculty and of the Policy Committee.

3.1.7.5. Appoint in the spring, after consultation with the Policy Committee, standing and other committees of the faculty.

3.1.7.6. Appoint, after consultation with the Policy Committee, the administrative officers of the Department. Associate Chair Graduate Studies; Associate Chair Undergrad Studies; Coordinator, English Education; Director, Film Studies; Director, Creative Writing; and Director, Literary Studies.

3.1.7.7. Confer with the Policy Committee and faculty on matters concerning departmental policies.

3.2. Department Academic Governance

3.2.1. Principles and Expectations for Committee Work

3.2.1.1. All tenure-stream faculty are expected to serve on one of seven major committees per year, except when on sabbatical. These committees include Policy; Undergraduate Policy; Graduate; Salary; Speakers; and the newly proposed Student Experience, Engagement, and Outreach (SEEO) and Equity and Justice committees. For faculty who are jointly appointed, service on a major committee in either program or department shall count. Merit considerations will also acknowledge service in other units, including the college and university.

Additionally, in line with an increasing trajectory of responsibility, tenured faculty and advanced assistant professors (those who have successfully completed third-year review) may be expected to serve on one or more ad-hoc committees per year. These committees include Search; Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT); Internal Review; and ad hoc committees to investigate complaints from students or faculty. Faculty with administrative appointments inside or outside of the department may be exempt from serving on ad hoc committees. Assistant faculty, before their third-year review, may serve on ad hoc committees on a voluntary basis.

Population of committees will be based on faculty preference and fairness, and be broadly diverse. The Chair will make committee assignments every spring semester for the following academic year. During the spring semester, faculty will indicate their preferences for which major and ad hoc committees on which they would like to serve for the following year. The Chair will take these preferences into account, along with the history of these committees, so that faculty will regularly rotate on and off of them.

3.2.2. The Policy Committee

3.2.2.1. The Policy Committee members elected by the faculty shall be five members of the voting faculty (as defined in 1.2.1.). The Committee shall have one elected faculty member from the untenured ranks, providing that there is at least one advanced untenured faculty member eligible and willing to serve. No more than one faculty member from the untenured ranks shall serve on the Committee. The term of office for elected faculty members shall be one year for advanced untenured faculty, and two years for tenured faculty; no elected faculty member shall be eligible to serve for two consecutive terms. In order to provide continuity between Policy Committees of consecutive years, the two-year terms of tenured faculty members shall be staggered. The position reserved for advanced untenured faculty shall be the first to be filled. The remaining positions shall be filled by elections at large.

3.2.2.2. Election of the Policy Committee

3.2.2.2.1. Elections to the Policy Committee shall be held within the first two weeks of the fall semester at the first Departmental meeting.

3.2.2.2.2. The election shall be conducted by the Chairperson and a member of the previous year's Policy Committee, who shall distribute, collect, and count ballots and announce the results. Members of the Policy Committee shall be elected in the following manner: there shall be open nominations, with seconds, from the floor, followed by a secret ballot. If one candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, such candidate is elected to the Policy Committee. If no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, the two with the most votes shall enter a run-off election. The same procedure shall be followed in each ensuing election.

In the event that an elected member of the Policy Committee must vacate that position, temporarily or for the remainder of his or her term, a special Department meeting shall be held to elect a replacement for the vacating member during his or her absence. This election shall conform to the requirements and procedures specified above. A person who replaces a vacating member for a year or less shall remain eligible for a full term consecutive to the replacement term; a person who replaces a vacating member for more than a year shall be ineligible for a full term consecutive to the replacement term.

3.2.2.3. Composition of the Policy Committee

3.2.2.3.1. The Policy Committee shall include the faculty members (described above) who sit with full voting rights.

The Chairperson of the Department shall chair the Policy Committee with the power to break tie votes.

One graduate student, when duly elected by their respective student organizations, shall sit as representatives on the Policy Committee with voice, but no vote.

Ex officio members of the Policy Committee will include the Associate Chairpersons. In the absence of the Chairperson, one of the Associate Chairpersons shall chair the Committee.

3.2.2.4. Responsibilities of the Policy Committee

3.2.2.4.1. To record and report to the faculty in writing the discussions and actions of the Policy Committee; to record and report in writing the discussions, actions, and each motion of the faculty at faculty meetings; to keep on file the minutes of meetings of the Policy Committee, the Graduate Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the faculty. These files shall be open to members of the faculty.

To advise the Chairperson on matters of departmental policy, and to serve as a standing advisory committee on personnel matters: that is, hiring, tenure, reappointment, promotion, salaries, and appointments and nominations to Department, College, and University committees.

To hold one special meeting per semester to which all faculty members shall be invited for the purpose of raising questions, making suggestions, and discussing matters pertaining to the general direction and welfare of the Department.

3.2.3. The Graduate Committee

3.2.3.1. Constitution of the Graduate Committee

3.2.3.1.1. The Graduate Committee shall be composed of the Associate Chairperson for Graduate Studies, who will serve as chair of the committee, and three appointed members of the faculty who represent a wide range of areas and interests across the Department. No appointed

member of the Graduate Committee shall be eligible to serve more than two successive years.

3.2.3.2. Responsibilities of the Graduate Committee

3.2.3.2.1. The Graduate Committee is responsible for all areas concerning graduate education in English (e.g., recruitment, graduate curriculum and degree requirements, admissions criteria, and course offerings). Members of the Graduate Committee will serve as the Graduate Admissions committee; implementation of recruiting plans, review and rank graduate student awards, fellowships, and prizes; participate in graduate recruitment activities; and participate in a series of professionalization proseminars required for first-year graduate students.

The Graduate Committee shall report procedural decisions in graduate matters to the Policy Committee and the Department by means of regular published minutes; it shall report all proposed changes of graduate policy to the Policy Committee for its approval, subject to the review of the Department as a whole in a Department meeting.

3.2.4. The Undergraduate Committee

3.2.4.1. Constitution of the Undergraduate Committee

3.2.4.1.1. The Undergraduate Committee shall be composed of the Associate Chairperson for Undergraduate Studies, who will serve as chair of the committee, and three appointed members of the faculty who represent a wide range of areas and interests across the Department.

3.2.4.2. Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Committee

3.2.4.2.1. The Undergraduate Committee shall exercise delegated responsibility in all areas concerning undergraduate education in English, including programs, curriculum, instruction, pedagogy workshops and classroom observation, the awarding of scholarships/prizes, and assessment.

The Undergraduate Committee shall report procedural decisions in undergraduate matters to the Policy Committee and the Department by means of regular published minutes; it shall report all proposed changes of undergraduate policy to the Policy Committee for its approval, subject to the review of the Department as a whole in a Department meeting.

3.2.5. The Salary and Awards Committee

3.2.5.1. Selection and Composition of the Salary Committee

3.2.5.1.1. The Salary and Awards Committee shall be composed of five tenure-system faculty members, each of whose salary is at least partially included in the departmental budget. The members of the Salary Committee shall be selected by the Chairperson of the Department, in consultation with the Policy Committee, so that the five members represent all three academic ranks in the following proportions: two full professors, two associate professors, and one assistant professor.

Members of the Salary Committee shall each serve staggered two-year terms. No member shall serve two consecutive terms, and no member shall participate in his/her own merit salary adjustment evaluation (or that of a significant other). No one shall serve simultaneously on the Salary Committee and the Policy Committee.

The Chairperson of the Department shall appoint a chairperson of the Salary and Awards Committee from among the five tenure-system faculty. The Chairperson of the Department shall be responsible for ensuring that representation on the Salary Committee conforms with university guidelines regarding the composition of committees. If the selection process described above does not result in a committee that meets those guidelines, the Chairperson of the Department shall, after consultation with the Policy Committee, name one additional tenure-system faculty member to the Salary Committee.

3.2.5.2. Responsibilities of the Salary Committee

3.2.5.2.1. The primary purpose of the Salary Committee is to solicit, receive, and evaluate materials for merit salary adjustments, and to make recommendations to the Chairperson of the Department regarding the award of merit salary adjustments. The Salary Committee will also identify progress of faculty members toward RPT actions.

The Salary Committee shall also be the peer review group with whom the Chairperson of the Department consults regarding other kinds of salary adjustments, including equity adjustments and market adjustments.

3.2.5.3. Procedures of the Salary Committee

3.2.5.3.1. The Salary Committee's deliberations shall take place in the Spring Semester of every academic year. Early in its deliberations, the committee shall meet with the Chairperson of the Department to review the results of the previous year's salary adjustment process. Each member of the salary committee shall read through and evaluate

the materials submitted by faculty members of the department for whom salary recommendations need to be made. No member of the committee shall evaluate himself/herself or a significant other.

Salary Committee recommendations regarding merit salary adjustments shall be based on the faculty member's cumulative record over the previous two calendar years.

In order to be considered for merit salary adjustments, faculty must submit the following supporting materials: 1) a current, annotated curriculum vitae, 2) a departmental cover form, 3) a narrative describing how accomplishments during the review period fit into future goals (see template), 4) evidence to substantiate teaching, service, and outreach activities. Faculty shall provide full documentation of all professional activities. If a faculty member fails to submit the all or any of the above materials to the Salary Committee, the Salary Committee shall not consider him/her for a merit salary adjustment.

Using the forms of evidence discussed in 4.2.1.3., members of the Salary Committee shall make a qualitative rating of highest merit, high merit, merit, or insufficient evidence for each individual in each of the following categories of evaluation: research and professional activity, teaching, service. In evaluating each individual's record, members of the Salary Committee shall keep in mind that outreach is a professional activity valued by the University that cuts across the categories of research and professional activity, teaching, and service. (Outreach involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with the University and unit missions). In the case of ratings for teaching and service during a leave, materials submitted for those categories from the most recent two years not spent on leave shall be used as a basis for evaluation.

Each member of the Salary Committee shall turn in to the chairperson of the Salary Committee his/her ratings (signed) of each individual in the categories of research and professional activity, teaching, and service. Those ratings shall include brief qualitative comments in each of the three merit areas, along with the qualitative rating; they shall aid in discussion within the committee, whose members shall decide upon a final rating in each merit category for each individual. Those ratings and the qualitative comments (with the committee members' names removed) shall be passed on to the Chairperson of the Department to inform his or her final recommendations regarding merit salary adjustments.

A final committee recommendation regarding each individual's overall merit level shall be weighted in the following way: research and professional activity = 40%; teaching = 40%; service = 20%. Each person's rating in each of the categories shall be negotiated to determine a holistic qualitative evaluation.

Once the Salary Committee has concluded its deliberations, it shall send its recommendations to the Chairperson of the Department. The Salary Committee's recommendations shall include the ratings and qualitative comments described above and a written list indicating into what merit category each faculty member falls.

The recommendations of the Salary Committee shall assist the Chairperson in determining the quantitative scale, based on the annual control figure, that corresponds to the Committee's qualitative ratings. This scale represents the percentage increase each faculty person receives.

After submitting its written list of recommendations, the Salary Committee shall meet with the Chairperson of the Department to discuss its recommendations and to consult with her/him regarding the percentage to be assigned for each faculty member. The percentage adjustment shall be the same for everybody with the same qualitative rating. The difference between the adjustments assigned for a given qualitative rating and those for the next highest and the next lowest ratings will be as close to equal as possible. At that meeting, the Salary Committee shall present its suggestions (if any) regarding changes in the criteria for merit salary adjustments.

The recommendations of the Salary Committee shall apply to 70% of the raise funds assigned to the Department. Of that 70%, three-quarters shall be applied to merit salary adjustments calculated as a percentage of the previous year's salary, the remaining quarter to merit salary adjustments in the form of straight dollar amounts pegged to qualitative rating. In conformity with university policies, the Chairperson of the Department shall use the remaining raise funds for additional merit adjustments or to address salary inequities, structural anomalies, and/or exceptional performance.

According to university by-laws, the Chairperson of the Department is responsible for merit salary adjustments and for assuring that all merit salary adjustments conform to the Academic Salary Adjustment Guidelines provided annually by the Office of the Provost.

3.2.5.4. Evidence of Meritorious Performance

3.2.5.4.1. The quality of each faculty member's professional accomplishments over the two-year period shall be evaluated in determining the appropriate level of merit, as described in 4.2.1.3.

Faculty members who believe that the forms of evidence described in 4.2.1.3. do not fit the kinds of work they are encouraged to do may include a statement explaining why that is the case and describing the forms of evidence they consider appropriate.

3.2.6. The Speakers Committee

3.2.6.1. Composition of the Speakers Committee

3.2.6.1.1. The Speakers Committee shall be comprised of the faculty responsible for programming in support of the Department's intellectual and creative life. Speakers Committee will consult with faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students about outside speakers.

3.2.6.2. Responsibilities of the Speakers Committee

3.2.6.2.1. The Speakers Committee is responsible for planning and coordinating a robust slate of speakers whose work is connected to faculty and graduate student research interests and interests of undergraduates. The members of the Speakers Committee will be responsible for the Department's intellectual life.

3.2.7. Student Experience, Outreach, and Engagement Committee (SEOE)

3.2.7.1. Composition of the SEOE Committee

3.2.7.1.1. The committee shall be comprised of two faculty members, the Department advisor, one elected undergraduate student, and one elected graduate student.

3.2.7.2. Responsibilities of the SEOE Committee

3.2.7.2.1. The SEEO Committee is responsible for enhancing the undergraduate and graduate student experience, advising on the Department's study abroad programs, coordinating engaged learning and co-curricular opportunities for students, and leading the Department in a range of public outreach efforts, including pursuing connections with local schools and institutions. The committee will work collaboratively

with our student groups, including Sigma Tau Delta, the Students of Color group, the NCTE chapter, and the Film Club, among others.

3.2.8. Equity and Justice Committee

3.2.8.1. Composition of the Equity and Justice Committee

3.2.8.1.1 The committee shall be comprised of three faculty members and one elected graduate student.

3.2.8.2. Responsibilities of the Equity and Justice Committee

3.2.8.2.1. Equity and Justice Committee is responsible for promoting equitable and ethical practices among students, faculty and staff in the Department of English. The Equity and Justice Committee is responsible for developing programming, initiatives, and policies that address said issues at the University (i.e., department, college) levels. The committee also addresses equity, justice and ethics at local (East Lansing & Lansing), state, national and international levels. Through partnerships with the Diversity Research Network, the Graduate School, and the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives, the committee supports equity and ethics in research, teaching, and advocacy work.

3.2.9. Ad Hoc Committees

3.2.9.1. In addition to the major committees described above, the Department will create ad hoc committees as needed in order to conduct department business. Examples of ad hoc committees include those devoted to personnel actions, such as hiring and RPT matters; issues related to department climate and self-study; as well as those devoted to the drafting and revising of major department documents, such as the bylaws themselves. Ad hoc committees will be assembled by the chair and approved by the Policy Committee. Ad hoc committee members will consist primarily of tenure-system faculty; fixed-term faculty will be invited to participate as needed on particular issues. Although participation in a particular ad hoc committee is optional, tenure-system faculty are expected to respect the principles and expectations outlined above. In keeping with those principles, and with our awareness of faculty time and energy, substantial service on ad hoc committees will thus be recognized and rewarded during merit review.

3.2.10. Program Committees

3.2.10.1. These are committees comprised of faculty who teach in various Department programs: Creative Writing, Film Studies, English Education,

and Literary Studies. Program committees will meet as required during the year, let by Program Directors.

SECTION 4: Terms of Employment and Evaluation Procedures for Faculty

4.1. Terms of Employment for Tenure and Non-Tenure System Appointments

4.1.1. Tenure-track appointments to the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor normally are made consistent with the current provisions of the Michigan State University Tenure System as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

4.1.2. Non-tenure track appointments to the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or academic specialist normally are made consistent with the current designations and provisions of Appointment as specified in the current Union of Non-Tenured Faculty contract.

4.1.3. The Chairperson shall provide the terms and conditions of employment in writing to the faculty member at the time of appointment. These terms should include: the time period covered by the appointment; salary provision; the general expectations in regard to the professional responsibilities of the person being appointed; conditions as indicated in the Michigan State University Faculty and Academic Staff Handbooks other than the appointee's performance of their responsibilities that may make a further appointment inadvisable.

4.2. Evaluation of Faculty

4.2.1. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Appointments

4.2.1.1. Annual Evaluation

4.2.1.1.1. Annual evaluation of tenure-track faculty will be conducted by the salary committee and department chair as outlined in section 3.2.5.3. Evaluation of jointly appointed or assigned faculty will abide by commitments and procedures established in individual Memoranda of Understanding (MoU). The particular criteria used are described in 4.2.1.3 below.

4.2.1.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

4.2.1.2.1. In making recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, the Chairperson, with the advice of the Policy Committee, is responsible for ensuring the quality of the Department with respect to its teaching function, its inner vitality, and its stature in the

profession. The criteria and procedures outlined below are intended to ensure quality, to promote fair and flexible judgments, and to provide recognition for the diversity of talents that are essential to a strong department. Recommendations of jointly appointed or assigned faculty are also subject to these criteria and procedures to the extent outlined in individual MoUs.

4.2.1.2.2. Requirements for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. The requirements for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are significant publication (in print or other recognized media), effective teaching, and responsible public and/or professional service. Candidates must meet all three criteria. However, since the University is committed to research, and since the goals of good teaching and responsible professional service are furthered by individual research, special consideration will be given to the candidate's publication and other forms of research and creative productivity. Reappointment. The candidate for reappointment must show definite promise of being able to meet the requirements for promotion. Reappointment does not, however, constitute a commitment by the Department to eventual promotion and tenure. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. The candidate must clearly demonstrate effective teaching, a willingness to participate in the activities of the Department, and, most important, excellence or the promise of excellence in professional publication (in print or other recognized media). Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have produced a record of new publication. At minimum these publications should include a book and/or significant number of scholarly or creative works as described in 4.2.1.3.1. Moreover, the candidate must be an accomplished teacher, with a record of participation and leadership in the activities of the Department and of the profession at large.

4.2.1.2.3. Procedure for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

4.2.1.2.3.1. Reappointment. In the fall of each year, candidates eligible for reappointment consideration (typically, the third year of an assistant professor's appointment) should submit a complete file (see section 4.2.1.3.) for evaluation by the Policy Committee.

4.2.1.2.3.2. Identification of Candidates for Promotion and Tenure. Assistant Professors normally undergo Promotion and Tenure review in their sixth year. Faculty should consult the University Faculty Handbook for possible alterations in this customary timeline. Associate Professors interested in undergoing review for promotion to Professor should alert the Chair to their interest

in the fall semester prior to this review at the latest. The Chair will confer with Policy Committee, considering previous Salary Committee recommendations. In identifying potential candidates for promotion/tenure, attention will be paid to (1) the length of service in each rank at MSU or peer institutions, (2) scholarly and/or creative productivity, (3) teaching record, and (4) service.

4.2.1.2.3.3. Promotion and Tenure Committee. Once appropriate candidates have been identified, the Policy Committee will name (and publicly announce) a Promotion and Tenure Committee for each candidate consisting of three faculty above the rank of the candidate, with one designated as chair. The composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is as follows: 1) At least one member shall be selected from a candidate's submitted list of three (see section 4.2.2.4); 2) When possible, one member shall come from the Policy Committee, 3) At least one member, if possible, should be familiar with the candidate's research area. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for the evaluation of the candidate's external letters, as well as for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching, service, publications and scholarly potential. In November this committee's written recommendation will be brought to the Policy Committee, which will make the final recommendation to the department Chair. The Chair will provide the candidate with a summary of the written report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as well as of the final decision of the Policy Committee.

4.2.1.2.3.4. Candidate's Responsibilities. In the Spring, the candidate will be asked to submit to the Policy Committee a minimum of three Department of English faculty members (all above their rank) from which the Policy Committee will select at least one to serve on the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate will be asked to submit to their Promotion and Tenure Committee a list of five to six potential external evaluators. The committee will then create a list of five to six additional potential external evaluators and provide both lists to the Chairperson, who will determine the final list of external evaluators to be contacted. The letters of evaluation should be received no later than mid-October. Letters from at least four (preferably five) external evaluators are required, and each evaluator will be offered the opportunity to see the candidate's complete file. The candidate is to prepare a complete file that minimally includes: 1) Form D (section IV to be filled out by the candidate); 2) an up-to-date curriculum vitae with complete bibliographical information (title, place of publication, date, page

numbers); 3) a reflective essay about accomplishments over the reporting period (5 page maximum); 4) copies of all published work and work accepted for publication, and, at the candidate's discretion, work in progress; 5) teaching evaluations (SIRS forms or the departmentally approved equivalents) and a teaching portfolio (see the document entitled "The Teaching Portfolio Required of Candidates for Promotion"); 6) other evidence of professional achievement (e.g., unsolicited letters, citations, reviews of published work, etc.); 7) evidence of professional service (Department or University committee assignments, consultantships, liaison work, editorial service, offices in professional organizations, administrative service to the Department, College, or University).

4.2.1.3. Evaluation Criteria for Annual Evaluation and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

4.2.1.3.1 Research and Professional Activity

Research and creative activity. Standards for evaluating quality of research and creative activities are established in the manner described below.

4.2.1.3.1.1. Although evaluating the significance and quality of research and creative activities is often difficult and subjective, a process of peer review is essential for evaluation. Peer review is defined as the evaluation of academic or professional work by experts in the same field. For scholarly journal and book publications, this typically means anonymous peer review. For creative activities, it may mean the acceptance and publication of work by editors, juries, producers, curators, or other experts. For digital scholarly production, peer review may take the form of pre-development evaluation of grant proposals or post-development review of work by experts in the field. In order to demonstrate the impact of their research or creative activities, faculty may include evidence that the work has been cited, taught, or otherwise used in external institutions.

4.2.1.3.1.2. The term "publication" refers to the formal and/or launching presentation to a public of a completed work in the medium and to the audience ideal for its circulation after peer review or comparable process.

4.2.1.3.1.3. The following subsections include examples of materials or activities by which research and creative activity shall be evaluated, in descending order of importance. Faculty

can make arguments for the relative importance of other activities particular to their case.

4.2.1.3.1.3.1 Producing a scholarly or creative book; producing a full-length film; a program of video shorts; a set of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and/or essays; or some combination of video-based and/or other media that make sustained and/or substantial contributions to scholarship, creative expression, and, where relevant, practice.

4.2.1.3.1.3.2. Editing peer-reviewed journals or other major publications. Editing a scholarly book of essays or a critical edition, publishing peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, short stories, poetry, short films, or works in other media that make a significant contribution to the field. Publishing in a trade or literary periodical that is peer-reviewed according to the standards of the genre or field. Editing an anthology or reader, or publishing a textbook.

4.2.1.3.1.3.3. Receiving a major outside fellowship, such as a summer-, semester-, or year-long postdoctoral fellowship, grant, scholarship, award for study or research, or Writing Residency. Examples of such awards include (but are not limited to) Fulbright, Andrew Mellon, Woodrow Wilson, Ford Foundation, NEH fellowships, and research grants from a museum or library or archive, etc. Examples of Writing Residencies include (but are not limited to) Millay Colony for the Arts or Banff Residency.

4.2.1.3.1.2.4 Delivering invited public papers, talks, readings, performances, screenings, or showings. Receiving an internal grant from Michigan State University to conduct research or produce creative work.

4.2.1.3.1.2.5 Delivering peer-reviewed conference papers at the international, national, or regional level. Submitting grant proposals.

4.2.1.3.1.2.6 Consulting with government, non-profit, corporate, private, or other outside agencies on projects and activities related to one's research expertise and scholarship. Examples include (but are not limited to) curating a museum exhibit, and serving on the selection committee for major grants and awards.

4.2.1.3.1.2.7 Producing reviews or public/community documents (including teaching materials disseminated beyond the classroom).

4.2.1.3.1.4. Collaborative work is to be valued as a legitimate form of inquiry and production and as co-equal with single authorship.

4.2.1.3.1.5. Multimedia production, computer software, web sites, or other technological contributions must be reviewed in the media for which they were intended.

4.2.1.3.1.6. Creative works can be considered in these and other ways:

4.2.1.3.1.6.1. Invited showings and peer-reviewed conference readings, performances, etc.

4.2.1.3.1.6.2. Curated gallery or film festival exhibits or screenings.

4.2.1.3.1.6.3. Positive reviews (outside of a formal peer-review context) by qualified academic and professional external judges.

4.2.1.3.1.6.4. Academic and professional commissions, honors, prizes, reviews, and awards received for the activity.

4.2.1.3.1.7. In general, the selectivity and/or significance of the entity evaluating a creative activity shall also be taken as an indicator of the overall quality of the project. Thus, for example, selection for a national film festival or event shall be considered more significant than for a regional event, and a juried showing or competition shall carry greater weight than a non-juried event.

4.2.1.3.1.8. Research will normally be evaluated after publication. In special circumstances when a long-range project involves extended research before publication, such research may be eligible to be considered. Research not published or incorporated in a delivered paper, yet which has a demonstrable effect upon the classroom, and projects of particular significance to the teaching mission of the Department, College, University, and beyond may be eligible to be considered.

4.2.1.3.2. Teaching

The evaluation committee (whether Salary or RPT) shall determine whether or not a person's teaching has been meritorious.

4.2.1.3.2.1. In evaluating each person's record as a teacher, the committee shall weigh evidence of effective teaching and efforts to improve pedagogy. Faculty should submit the following, as applicable:

4.2.1.3.2.1.1. Course syllabi and assignments;

4.2.1.3.2.1.2. Student evaluations of the teacher's work by way of SIRS forms along with (optional) approved supplemental forms;

4.2.1.3.2.1.3. Directing student research, if applicable during the evaluation period: service on M.A. or Ph.D. committees; directing an M.A. thesis or Ph.D. dissertation to completion; directing independent studies; directing senior or Honors theses; supervising undergraduate or graduate research projects; supervising student internships or experiential learning.

4.2.1.3.2.1.4. When teaching in other units of the College or University during the reporting period, any necessary information for the committee to contextualize teaching competence: catalog course description, letter of evaluation from supervising unit.

4.2.1.3.2.1.5. Recognition of teaching excellence: nomination by the Department for any teaching awards, any teaching award received.

4.2.1.3.2.1.6. Annual classroom observation conducted by a faculty member. Annual observations are required for assistant professors and recommended for associates in the semester prior to bid for promotion to full. In these instances, observations should be conducted by someone at the aspirational rank or above. Other faculty are encouraged to invite their colleagues into their classrooms for observation purposes.

4.2.1.3.2.1.7. Teaching statement of no longer than 2 pages that contextualizes teaching accomplishments for the year

as well as for non-majors, large IAH classes, or courses in other units in which one teaches; strategies for improvement in teaching; evidence of effective instruction; innovation in assignments, methods, or course conception; updating of courses frequently taught or development of new courses (whether within existing course numbers or by putting forward new courses for the catalog); feedback taken from students and how you changed the course in response; any other supporting materials showing evidence of teaching adaptability; demonstrations of promoting graduate student progress or responsiveness to graduate students.

4.2.1.3.2.2. Additional items that should be included in promotion/tenure portfolios. See the section “THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO REQUIRED OF CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION” appended to the by-laws. The list is not meant to be complete, nor should faculty be judged on the variety of items they submit—it is not a checklist. What matters most is the quality of teaching exemplified in the submitted material.

4.2.1.3.2.2.1. Representative assignment(s) to highlight how students’ learning meets course objectives. This may also include assessment.

4.2.1.3.2.2.2. Letters from students, awards or prizes won by students, or other items that demonstrate significant effects of instruction.

4.2.1.3.2.2.3. Teaching a course in English, Film Studies, or IAH that produced a high total of student credit hours.

4.2.1.3.2.3. Contributions to the Teaching Culture beyond the classroom. Evidence from these instructional activities allows for acknowledgement of work done towards enhancing the culture of teaching in the Department, College, or community.

4.2.1.3.2.3.1. Teaching in non-credit instruction: instructional activities including non-credit courses/certificate programs, licensure programs, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc. Include non-credit instruction that involves international, comparative, or global content delivered either to domestic or international groups, either here or abroad. Conducting sessions for Grandparents University, MSU Broad Underground

series, or interdisciplinary writing fellows programs would exemplify this. Honors college fireside events.

4.2.1.3.2.3.2. Mentoring Graduate Assistants in pedagogical practices in the course of teaching with Graduate Assistants.

4.2.1.3.2.3.3. Organizing or contributing to departmental workshops on pedagogy.

4.2.1.3.2.3.4. Conducting peer teaching evaluations.

4.2.1.3.2.3.5. Conducting peer teaching evaluations.

4.2.1.3.2.3.6. Engaging in curricular or co-curricular development beyond service on standing curriculum committees (such as UPC, CCC, UCC_C). Examples would be organizing literary readings, Film series, implementing a team-taught interdisciplinary or cross departmental low-credit course, or program development on ad hoc committees would fit here as well.

4.2.1.3.2.3.7. Writing grants to enhance teaching either within MSU or extramurally.

4.2.1.3.2.3.8. Briefly summarizing the ways in which faculty have worked with other teachers to improve the quality of teaching at MSU, either by providing or receiving guidance or mentoring (Reviewers should recognize that many of the items in this area apply more to senior faculty than to junior faculty, who may not yet have had opportunities to act as mentors and trainers of others). Examples are: efforts to develop graduate student teaching; mentoring a fellow faculty member in teaching; working with a mentor to improve one's own teaching; collaborative teaching efforts; participation in or direction of workshops to improve teaching skills.

4.2.1.3.3. Service

4.2.1.3.3.1. The Salary Committee shall determine whether or not each person's service has been meritorious, and if it has been, to what merit level: I, II, or III.

4.2.1.3.3.2. In evaluating each person's contributions in the merit area of service, the Salary Committee shall consider the amount

of time devoted to service activities by the individual and the value of the person's service activities to the department, college, university, and profession. The Committee shall take as evidence of exceptional service any award given by the college, the university, or an external agency.

4.2.1.3.3.2.1. The Salary Committee shall evaluate whether each person's contributions are commensurate with rank.

4.2.1.3.3.3. The Salary Committee shall also look for evidence of how faculty, as they move up the faculty ranks, mentor and otherwise support their colleagues, especially those colleagues at a lower rank.

4.2.1.3.4. Outreach

4.2.1.3.4.1. Outreach—which involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions—cuts across the categories of research/publication, teaching, and service. It should be considered as intrinsic or in relation to research, teaching, and service. Outreach activities should be considered as part of the candidate's overall record.

4.2.2. Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track and Academic Specialist Appointments

4.2.2.1. Annual Evaluation of UNTF faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty should receive annual evaluations as according to the Union of Non-Tenure Faculty (UNTF) contract. This evaluation will typically be completed by the end of the summer, before the official start of the new academic year. The Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies will typically evaluate non-tenure-track faculty according to a standard form provided by the UNTF. Typically, non-tenure-track faculty will be evaluated entirely based on teaching, but the percentages of the overall score attributable to different categories of responsibility (such as research, teaching, service, etc.) should be designated on the evaluation form. At the end of the academic year, non-tenure-track faculty should be asked to submit syllabi, student evaluations (such as SIRS) and other optional material which demonstrates effectiveness of teaching to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Chair will then score each faculty member according to the rubric of the form and provide comments in support of the scores. The Associate Chair should then send the evaluations to the non-tenure-track faculty members and allow them to meet in person to discuss the evaluations. Once agreement has been reached about the evaluations, the forms should be signed by the Associate

Chair and the non-tenure-track faculty member. The forms will be kept by the department in a file for the non-tenure-track faculty member and may be used to decide if that faculty member is given a future assignment in the department. If the non-tenure-track faculty member does not agree with the evaluation of the Associate Chair, they may appeal to the Chair of the department for reconsideration of the evaluation.

4.2.2.2. UNTF Fixed Term Designation B Guidelines

The collective bargaining agreement between Michigan State University and the Union of Non- Tenure Track Faculty provides that “during the first month of the eighth or subsequent semester of teaching employment within seven years of the first of these semesters, in a given employing unit, the employee may submit a written request to the unit head or designee, including required documentation of teaching excellence, to be reappointed as a Designation B employee for the teaching portion of the assignment.

According to MSU policy, the following procedure implements that provision:

1. Reclassification to Designation B is predicated on exemplary instructional performance in UNTF bargaining unit assigned teaching duties. Individuals who believe they have established a clear record of sustained, outstanding achievements in teaching must assemble a compendium of materials that documents teaching excellence and submit such documentation to the unit head or designee. “Form B: Recommendation for Designation B Appointment in the Union of non-Tenure Track Faculty” must be used to apply for Designation B consideration. Eligibility criteria, timelines, and forms for Designation B consideration are found at: https://hr.msu.edu/ua/hiring/faculty-academic-staff/DesignationB_FAQ.html
2. Where unit administrators utilize a review committee for advice in making a recommendation to the Provost (through appropriate subordinate administrators), the unit review committee should be provided with guidelines and directed to determine objectively the level of accomplishment and excellence in UNTF related teaching duties.
3. Recommendations of the review committee are forwarded to the appropriate academic unit administrator. The faculty or academic staff member should be provided an opportunity to meet with the review committee prior to it making a recommendation to the unit administrator. Where there is no review committee, the faculty or academic staff member shall be provided an opportunity to meet with the unit administrator before a recommendation is provided to the next level of review. The recommendation of the academic unit administrator is forwarded for subsequent review and action by the relevant major academic unit administrator (usually the dean) and by the Office of the Provost. After review by the Office of the Provost, the UNTF represented fixed term faculty

or academic staff member will be notified of the final decision on appointment to Designation B.

Procedures

In the College of Arts and Letters the review process for fixed-term UNTF instructors at the department level will follow unit and college guidelines and procedures that will provide for a substantial review process to “determine objectively the level of accomplishment and excellence in UNTF related teaching duties,” in compliance with the University Recommendation Document. CAL units will appoint a Designation B review committee for fixed-term faculty members requesting reappointment under Designation B.

No later than September 30th for review during fall semester or January 31st for review during spring semester, the candidate submits to the Chair a self-evaluation (recommended length 2-3 pages), addressing teaching, and service activities. The self-evaluation should specifically address the candidate’s claim of teaching excellence in light of the unit’s and the University’s criteria for Designation B reappointment. At this time the candidate should also provide the Chair a current curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations and/or portfolios (see below), documents supportive of quality service/outreach, as relevant, and any other materials required by University guidelines, the unit bylaws/guidelines, or solicited by the Chair. Form B: Recommendation for Designation B Appointment in the Union of non-tenure Track Faculty must be used to apply for Designation B.

The dossier is first reviewed by the departmental personnel review committee or committees. Committee recommendations are advisory to the Chair. Committee recommendations to the Chair should be in writing and include both the recommended personnel action and an explanation of how the committee arrived at the recommendation (i.e. a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the materials in the dossier and the case in general with respect to the criteria). The faculty or academic staff members should be given the opportunity to meet with the review committee prior to it making a recommendation to the unit administrator.

The Chair/unit administrator reviews the dossier, and forwards a recommendation to the Dean. Once the Dean receives the recommendation it is reviewed in the Dean’s Office and he/she then submits a recommendation to the Provost. After review by the Office of the Provost, the UNTF represented fixed term faculty or academic staff member will be notified of the final decision on appointment to Designation B.

Criteria

As noted above, reclassification to Designation B is predicated on exemplary instructional performance in UNTF bargaining unit assigned teaching duties.

The review process in CAL for fixed-term UNTF instructors at the department level will follow unit and college guidelines and procedures that will provide for a substantial review process to “determine objectively the level of accomplishment and excellence in UNTF related teaching duties,” in compliance with the University Recommendation Document.

Materials that must be assembled as evidence include:

- A teaching narrative (see text box below)
- SIRS and other recognized student evaluation instruments
- Syllabi (the latest version from each course taught over the past three years) and a selection of other course material, such as activities, exams, and paper assignments.
- Evidence of participation in professional development activities
- Classroom observation materials (e.g., a written report by the observer)

Materials that may be assembled as evidence include:

- Participation in high-impact co-curricular activities
- Self-crafted and self-administered student evaluation instruments
- Honors Options and other extensions of teaching responsibilities
- Undergraduate and graduate committee service
- Teacher research or scholarship of teaching and learning activities
- Teaching awards

The function of the teaching narrative is both reflective (it informs the committee about how you are thinking about your practice, goals, and development over time) and integrative (it situates the available forms of evidence in relation to an ongoing story of your work and development).

Specifically the teaching narrative:

1. Supplies reflection on your work in relation to your pedagogical goals;
2. Frames and contextualizes other forms of evidence (e.g., teaching materials, observation reports, course evaluations); and
3. Makes visible the values, practices, and learning for which other forms of evidence may be insufficient (or partial) indicators.

Link for Classroom Observation:

http://www.usu.edu/teachingacademy/teaching_coaches/docs/Evaluating_Teaching_through_Peer_Classroom_Observation.pdf

Helpful links:

Form B: Recommendation for Designation B Appointment in the Union of non-Tenure Track Faculty (PDF)

<https://hr.msu.edu/ua/hiring/documents/UNTFDesignationBForm.pdf>

UNTF Designation B Appointments Frequently Asked Questions

https://hr.msu.edu/ua/hiring/faculty-academic-staff/DesignationB_FAQ.html

4.2.2.3. UNTF Fixed Term Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate to Full Professor

While the procedures detailed below follow a process similar to the review process for the promotion of tenure system faculty, it is to be understood that promotion of fixed term system faculty will be based solely on an evaluation of the duties and responsibilities specified in the candidate's actual appointment and position description.

Candidates for fixed term faculty promotion from assistant to associate professor must have attained UNTF Designation B status before being considered for promotion. Candidates who are not eligible for UNTF or have a less than 50% teaching appointment should have been at MSU for six years before being considered for promotion. Candidates for fixed term faculty promotion from associate to full must have been in rank for an appropriate amount of time, usually equivalent to at least six years.

1. The promotion criteria for teaching excellence used by College of Arts & Letters and its affiliated units are the same as those used in evaluating those duties for tenure system faculty as described in the "Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure in the College of Arts & Letters at Michigan State University," for the corresponding promotion. As with tenure

system faculty, these may be in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service/outreach depending on the position. The successful candidate for a fixed term system faculty promotion is expected to have demonstrated leadership excellence in the areas of their assignment.

2. The procedures that the College of Arts & Letters and its affiliated units will use for reviewing the promotion of fixed term faculty are as follows.

1. Each year, during the required annual performance review, unit administrators should discuss with eligible fixed term faculty the criteria for promotion in rank, the faculty member's progress toward promotion, and discuss whether he or she wishes to seek promotion in the coming academic year. The administrator shall provide a written copy of this review to the faculty member.

2. If the faculty member elects to seek promotion, the unit administrator will prepare a description of the candidate's assignment including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research, teaching, and/or service/outreach. This description will form part of the promotion review portfolio and will be distributed to all individuals of the unit's review committee who evaluate the candidate's materials. At least one fixed term faculty member should be included in the review of the candidate at the unit level. The College suggests that the fixed term faculty member of the unit review committee hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor rank if such an individual is available; if not, the College suggests a fixed term faculty member who has attained Designation B status instead or an academic specialist with continuing status.

3. If teaching is a primary activity in the candidate's assignment, the College suggests that the unit assemble a Teaching Review Committee by having the unit chair work with the candidate to assemble a committee consisting of at least one tenure-system faculty member, one fixed term faculty member, and one other faculty member of any rank. If the candidate teaches online or hybrid courses, then at least one member of the committee should have experience in teaching online or hybrid courses as well in order to help with the evaluation of these courses.

The Teaching Review Committee should use the following general process in assessing the candidate's teaching performance:

- Meet with the individual to discuss course syllabi, assignments, philosophy of teaching, and methodologies and strategies. Prior to this meeting, the individual will provide the Teaching Review Committee with a teaching portfolio (as described in item 2.d.iii. of this document).

- Set two agreed-upon dates during one (preferably the fall) semester for classroom visitations when at least two of the three committee members can be present; the candidate can request additional visitations if they so desire.
 - Meet with the candidate after the classroom visitations are completed for discussion, questions, clarifications, and feedback.
 - Write a committee report focusing on:
 - Organization and presentation of concepts, skills, and reading and discussion materials;
 - Interaction with students; and
 - Effective and productive use of class period in relation to instructional objectives.
 - Submit a draft of the report to the candidate, who shall have the opportunity to respond to it in person or in writing, in order to make relevant comments regarding points of substance, emphasis, or neglect.
 - Submit a revised and final report to the unit promotion review committee. Teaching review committees should restrict their reports to the substance of the teaching and instruction according to the areas identified above and to the course and instructional materials made available to them. Committee members should also recognize a diversity of instructional methodologies and strategies that can be used to reach common curricular goals.
4. In preparing materials for the review portfolio, the candidate is required to provide information or documents related to the activities that are part of his or her assignment, using the Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action form (Form D, as implemented in the CAL RPT guidelines) as a guide. MSU guidelines specify that these materials must include:
- i. A current curriculum vitae.
 - ii. A reflective essay about accomplishments during the reporting period (5 pages maximum), detailing the leadership activities undertaken in the areas where they have duties (teaching, research, and/or service/outreach). If, for instance, teaching is an assigned duty, this would include a reflective teaching statement, showing ongoing development of effective instructional practices.

iii. A representative sample of the candidate's best work that corresponds to the candidate's assignment. The candidate should reference these in their above narrative to provide context.

If teaching is an assigned duty, the candidate must provide the unit with a "Teaching Portfolio" that must include the following items:

- Syllabi and instructional materials (heuristics, activities, multimedia learning materials, projects, assignments, etc.) consistent with the unit's pedagogical aims.
- Unit-approved Student Instructional Ratings Forms (or online equivalent) for all classes taught (every course, every section, every semester) to the unit review committee for analysis. (The College advises that reviewers should not afford undue weight to these SIRS forms and similar student evaluations. They should not be used as the sole source of data, but rather as one indicator of many in the portfolio.)
- If applicable, evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring, including service on exam and thesis/dissertation committees, advising, and professional development.

The Teaching Portfolio may also include select examples of the following that are representative of the candidate's best work:

- Examples of student papers and projects.
- Evidence of effective formative and summative commentary on student papers and projects.
- Letters of commendation written by colleagues or peers.
- Reflective statements or learning narratives written by students.
- Honors or awards.
- Evidence of course and curriculum development.
- Evidence of participation in professional development workshops, seminars, and/or activities.
- Evidence of teacher-research.
- Evidence of work in the instruction and mentoring of other teachers as well as program and TA coordination.

- Evidence of outreach, including outreach instruction, which might include credit-bearing courses offered off-campus; noncredit-bearing seminars, workshops, conferences, exhibits, and performances related to teaching.
- Evidence of instructional materials and activities particular to online or distance education; such materials should be reviewed in the media for which they were intended.

Evidence of excellence in performing assigned duties, e.g., significance, impact, and innovation of instructional activities, research/creative activities, professional development, curriculum development, program coordination, or administrative activities.

5. In all cases, four review letters must be included and can come from within the College or University. Whenever possible these letters should come from outside of the unit. If research/creative activity is an assigned duty, at least one or more letters (depending on percentage of workload) external to MSU must be obtained evaluating said activity in accord with the CAL tenure-system RPT guidelines. In other cases, if the faculty member has worked with other partners external to the unit, whether in teaching, service, or outreach, a letter should come from one of those MSU or community or equivalent partners. A letter might also come from an officer or member of a scholarly pedagogical organization where the faculty member has been especially active. All letters must come from individuals who hold a rank above the candidate's current rank. The candidate is not informed of those individuals who provide letters of evaluation. (See also Confidentiality of Letters of Reference for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Recommendations" in the Faculty Handbook.

6. Units should review the promotion materials submitted by fixed term faculty candidates in the same manner in which they review tenure system promotion candidates, focusing only on their assigned duty categories. If a unit does not have an existing tenure review system, then the supervisor should consult with the Associate Dean for Personnel, Administration, and Undergraduate Education.

7. Unit administrators are encouraged to include these reviews in the regular RPT timelines of the unit. Promotion recommendations for fixed-term faculty must be sent to the CAL Dean by January 15 of a given year, submitting Form D and supporting materials (those relevant for the assigned duties as described in the CAL RPT guidelines), and must include copies of the written annual reviews of the candidate (see item 2a in this document) during the reporting period. This recommendation should provide an analysis of the candidate's performance in their assigned duties, as well as the leadership activities in which they have been involved.

8. The CAL Dean will consult with the CAL Fixed-Term RPT committee and make a final recommendation to the Office of the Provost, according to the timetable for the academic year in question. The committee should be made up of one fixed-term and two tenure stream faculty. The fixed term faculty member must be at the Associate or Full Professor rank. (A Senior/or Continuing Academic Specialist may serve if there are no fixed-term faculty at the Associate Professor rank available).

4.2.2.4. Annual Review of Academic Specialists

Because the source of merit pay funding comes from the tenure-system faculty pool, Academic Specialists will submit annual review materials to the department's Salary Committee on the same schedule as the tenure-system faculty. Academic specialists shall be evaluated for merit in terms consistent with their letters of appointment.

Academic Specialists will submit the following information and materials regarding the review period to be considered for evaluation:

4.2.2.4.1. Course materials for courses being taught during the review period, including syllabi, assignments, exercises, and related course materials.

4.2.2.4.2. SIRS evaluations for all courses during the review period, including IAH.

4.2.2.4.3. A current curriculum vitae.

4.2.2.4.4. A statement of goals and accomplishments relating to the person's duties and responsibilities as articulated in their appointment letter.

4.2.2.5. Reappointment and Promotion of Academic Specialists

The Department Committee designated for the review of an Academic Specialist shall advise the Department Chair about the reappointment, award of continuing appointment status, or promotion of the academic specialist. Every attempt should be made to ensure that the review committee is composed of individuals knowledgeable about the position under review and the Academic Specialist Appointment System and should include at least one academic specialist. An academic specialist from outside the unit may be appointed.

The evaluation of an academic specialist's performance shall be based on the duties and responsibilities specified in the letter of appointment for the position of that specialist and the provisions of the Academic Specialist Appointment System.

The academic specialist with a probationary appointment shall be evaluated annually to determine progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. Units may also use the annual evaluation to assist in the assignment of merit and other salary adjustments.

The academic specialist shall be notified when the evaluation is to take place, what procedures are to be followed, and what criteria are to be used for the evaluation. This notification should be at the time of appointment and, subsequently, two (2) months prior to the evaluation.

A written summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the academic specialist's personnel file in the unit.

An academic specialist with a fixed-term appointment should be reviewed regardless of the probability of reappointment in order to assess progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. The academic specialist appointed on a fixed-term basis for six (6) months or more shall be evaluated by the Department Chair no later than two (2) months prior to the appointment ending date. A summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the personnel file in the unit and be given to the academic specialist.

4.3. Reallocation of Effort for Non-Tenure Track Appointments

4.3.1 If academic specialists or UNTF faculty are elected to either a departmental or major university standing committee, they will negotiate with the Chair their percentage allocation to service for annual review purposes.

SECTION 5: Faculty Hiring Procedures

5.1. Search Procedure Guidelines

5.1.1. Search procedures shall follow guidelines provided by Academic Human Resources in the Academic Hiring Manual (<https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/academic-hiring-manual/index.html>) as well as by the College of Arts & Letters regarding faculty searches. The MSU Faculty Search Toolkit devised by the ADAPP-ADVANCE grant shall also be followed (https://inclusion.msu.edu/_assets/documents/hiring/FacultySearchToolkit-final.pdf).

5.2. Requesting Positions

5.2.1. The Department will follow University and College of Arts & Letters procedure for requesting academic positions. Under normal circumstances, the Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, submits a proposal for faculty searches for the upcoming academic year as part of the Fall Planning/Spring Budget Request processes in the College of Arts & Letters.

5.2.2. The Dean of the College of Arts & Letters normally notifies the Department Chairperson about approved faculty searches in the summer or early fall following the Spring Budget Request.

5.3. Search Committee Composition & Procedures

5.3.1. After receiving approval for a search, the Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, is responsible for determining the final composition of an ad hoc search committee.

5.3.2. A tenure-system search committee will be comprised of a chair and normally four additional members from among the departmental voting members, or others at the Chairperson's discretion. When possible, a member of the Policy Committee will be a member of the search committee. Also, when possible, a graduate student in the Department will also serve on the committee as a consulting, non-voting member. A fixed-term search committee may be smaller in composition.

5.3.2.1. It is highly desirable, but not required, that a search committee will be comprised of members with broad expertise in the areas of the search as well as members who represent the Department as broadly and diversely as possible, including women faculty and faculty of color.

5.3.3. The Department Chairperson, with assistance from the College Faculty Excellence Advocate, will call the first search committee meeting to provide the committee its charge and to conduct an affirmative action session in which the committee selects its affirmative action representative. During this charge meeting, the Chairperson and search committee members establish search procedures, strategies, and timelines in line with University policy.

5.3.4. The search committee will draft the position description and submit it for approval to the Department Chairperson, who will review it with the Policy Committee. Once the Department Chairperson receives approval of the ad from units outside the Department, the Search Chair will work with the departmental administrative staff to post and advertise the position in consultation with the search committee.

5.3.5. Following College and University guidelines, the search committee will screen applicants following the procedures established previously by the committee and based on agreed upon selection criteria, including (1) programmatic need, (2) excellence of qualifications and credentials based on clearly delineated job-related criteria, (3) placement goals, and (4) diversity considerations.

5.3.6. The search committee will prepare a ranked list of candidates for preliminary interviews and/or final interviews for approval by the Department Chairperson, who will review the list based in terms of diversity requirements. Once approved internally,

the candidate list will be forwarded to the Dean's office for review, following College and University guidelines.

5.3.7. Once external approvals have been secured, the search committee will arrange preliminary and/or campus interviews with the assistance of departmental administrative staff.

5.3.8. For campus interviews, formal meetings will normally be arranged with the policy and search committees, faculty through the job talk presentation, graduate students, the Department Chairperson, and the Dean/Associate Dean.

5.3.9. The search committee will collect departmental feedback on candidates and, upon review, will prepare a search committee report with a ranked list of finalists, which will be submitted with other required documents for approval to the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, and subsequently to the Dean.

5.3.10. Once approved, the Department Chairperson will be the liaison with the ranked finalist regarding terms of offer and negotiations.

SECTION 6: Grievance and Hearing Procedures

6.1. Faculty Grievance Procedure

6.1.1 The faculty grievance procedure shall accord with the "Faculty Grievance Policy" approved by the Board of Trustees on April 5, 1991 and revised on June 28, 2002, August 16, 2009, and December 18, 2015. https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/grievance_policy.html

6.2. Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure

6.2.1. The undergraduate student grievance procedure shall accord with the procedures detailed in the document titled "Students Rights and Responsibilities" <http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/student-rights-and-responsibilities-at-michigan-state-university>

6.3. Graduate Student Grievance Procedure

6.3.1 The graduate student grievance procedure shall accord with the procedures detailed in the document entitled "Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities." <http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/graduate-student-rights-and-responsibilities>

SECTION 7: Bylaws

7.1. Initial Approval

7.1.1. Initial approval of these Bylaws shall be a shared responsibility of the voting faculty of the Department and of the Chairperson. A majority vote of the voting faculty is required.

7.2. Interpretation

7.2.1. The voting faculty of the Department shall be the final authority with regard to the interpretation of these Bylaws.

7.3. Amendments

7.3.1. The Bylaws may be amended by a simple majority vote of the voting faculty as defined in 1.2.1. Any amendment to the Bylaws requires a mail ballot after the proposed change has been discussed in a Department meeting. Balloting must be completed within thirty days after the ballot is distributed. A proposed amendment shall be publicized at least one week in advance on the agenda announcing the Department meeting at which the proposed amendment is to be considered. The officers of the recognized undergraduate and graduate student groups whose members select representatives on the Department committees shall be given the opportunity to review amendments that may pertain to them.

7.4. Review

7.4.1. These Bylaws shall be reviewed by the College Advisory Council at intervals not to exceed five years. Decisions of the Council can be appealed to the University Committee on Academic Governance.

Approved by Department 4/27/90
Amended by Department 5/6/92
Amended by mail ballot 11/29/93
Amended by mail ballot 5/10/94
Amended by mail ballot 12/7/95
Amended by mail ballot 1/24/96
Amended by mail ballot 2/19/97
Amended by mail ballot 4/1/99
Amended by mail ballot 1/28/00
Amended by mail ballot 2/4/00
Amended by mail ballot 5/1/00
Amended by Department ballot 9/9/09
Amended by vote in Department meeting, 12/11/15
Amended by Department electronic ballot, 2019
Amended by Department electronic ballot, 1/29/21

Amendments

Interpretations and Clarifications of Bylaw Language Concerning Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

“Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have produced a record of new publication. At minimum these publications should include a book or a substantial set of refereed items. Moreover, the candidate must be an accomplished teacher, with a record of participation in the activities of the Department and of the profession at large.” (Bylaws 4.2.1)

“Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have produced a record of new publication.”

1. What does “publication” mean? An article or book in print, between covers (approved by mail ballot 13 October 1995).

2. What does “new” mean? Did not play a substantial role in the candidate’s previous promotion decision. Where there is doubt, the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for deciding whether the publication(s) in question is or is not “new” (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

“At minimum these publications should include a book or a substantial set of refereed items.”

3. What sort of “book” is meant here? A book authored by the candidate alone. The candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will have to make the case for a co-authored book (or books). The candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for whether publications such as scholarly editions and scholarly tools (e.g., dictionaries, annotated bibliographies) should be counted as “a book.” Edited or co-edited collections will normally not be counted as satisfying this minimum, but the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Committee can make the case for counting them in exceptional instances (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

4. What does “substantial set” mean? Equivalent in aggregate as well as in scope and depth to an individually authored book (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

5. What does “refereed” mean? Published as a result of a process that involves assessment by readers whose involvement the journal or press arranges or by the editor(s) of the journal or press (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

6. How does one deal with “items” that are co-authored? As with books, the expectation is that the “items” will be written by the candidate alone. If they are

not, the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for how they meet the minimum (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

7. What does "at minimum" mean? "At minimum" means necessary but not sufficient. Meeting the minimum does not of itself establish that the candidate is entitled to promotion (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

"Moreover, the candidate must be an accomplished teacher, with a record of participation in the activities of the Department and of the profession at large."

8. Should there be an explicit balance or ratio between publication, teaching, and service when formulating promotion recommendations? If so, what should it be? No, there should not be an explicit balance or ratio. Publication sufficient to meet the minimum is a necessary component of every candidate's record (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

9. When considering "service," should administrative work be taken into account? Yes, it should be, as part of a record that includes at least the minimum publication requirement (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

10. What value or weight should be given to grants when formulating promotion recommendations? They should be considered as part of the candidate's over-all record, and the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee should make the case for their importance. They should not count towards meeting the minimum publication requirement (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

11. What value or weight should be given to outreach when formulating promotion recommendations? Outreach-which involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions-cuts across the categories of research/ publication, teaching, and service. Outreach activities should be considered as part of the candidate's over-all record, and the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee should make the case for their importance (approved by mail ballot 13 October 1995).

Teaching Portfolio Contents

The teaching portfolio required of candidates for promotion may include any or all of the following:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy, objectives and reflections based on experience teaching at MSU.
2. Course descriptions, syllabi, course preparation.
3. Evidence of effective teaching: student papers with comments, videotapes, cassettes, slide projects, essays, letters from students reflecting success, student accomplishments (e.g., dissertations, independent studies, job placement, publications, presentations).
4. Publications, exhibitions, and performances related to teaching.
5. Peer observation evaluations.
6. Statement of committee work that deals directly with teaching.
7. Descriptions of involvement in teaching-related outreach activities.
8. Other letters of evaluation regarding teaching.

In the case of faculty whose current responsibilities do not include classroom teaching, the Policy Committee will develop an alternative to the teaching portfolio.

5 February 1997

Revised Annual Review Process for AY 20-21 | COVID-19

To acknowledge the extraordinary disruptions of faculty work caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of English proposes the following modifications to its annual review process for the year 2020. These changes follow the guidelines established by the College of Arts & Letters, as described in the document “Faculty and Academic Staff Annual Evaluation Guidelines During COVID-19.”

The modified process, approved by the Policy Committee, aims to alleviate additional burdens on faculty submitting the annual reviews, and to expedite the review process for the Salary and Merit Committee.

For the 2020 Annual Review, the following procedures will replace those described in 3.2.5.3 and 4.2.1.3 of our Department of English bylaws

Faculty Submission Process

1. Faculty shall submit to Salary an annotated CV highlighting achievements during our two-year reporting window (2019-20).
2. Faculty are recommended to submit a brief (1/2-page to 1-page) COVID-19 impact statement. Guidelines for this statement have been pre-circulated, and CAL has hosted a workshop on writing these materials; see the link in the “Supplementary Materials” below. Pre-tenure faculty and Associate Professors are recommended to comment briefly on their RPT progress in this statement, and describe how that has been impacted by COVID-19.
3. Faculty shall upload their Annual Review materials to the G-Drive, as per usual, by January 31st.
4. No submission of FAIS form is required.

Review process

1. Salary Committee shall review the files and assign each faculty member either a “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” rating. The intent of this rating is to maximize generosity, given the extraordinary circumstances, and to suspend the four-tiered qualitative rankings for the year. This change makes the Salary Committee’s review of the files a less onerous process, since we expect all of our colleagues to have had satisfactory years, given the additional demands and pressures of the pandemic.
2. Upon completion of their review, the Salary Committee shall meet with the Chairperson to discuss their assessment.
3. Prior to that meeting, Salary shall provide the Chairperson written qualitative feedback on our four pre-tenured faculty members, and this will be included in

the Chairperson's Annual Review letter. The Salary Committee will also make recommendations to the Chairperson regarding nominations for All-University Awards, and be the peer review group with whom the Chairperson of the Department consults regarding other kinds of salary adjustments, including equity adjustments and market adjustments, as per 3.2.5.2 in the bylaws.

4. The Chairperson will not circulate in May a letter summarizing the Salary Committee's ranking. However, faculty members will be notified by the Chairperson of their S/NS ranking.

5. The Chairperson shall write an annual review letter for each faculty member, as normal, to be included in their personnel file. This is required by the University and these letters are submitted to the internal and College PRT committees during personnel actions.

Supplementary Materials

At several points over the past year, the College has provided guidelines pertaining to workload expectations and a culture of care during COVID-19. In addition, the Provost provided guidance in her COVID-19 impact statement memo of December 2.

Dean's "Adjusting Expectations"

<https://cal.msu.edu/news/adjusting-expectations/>

Associate Deans "Message of Reassurance"

<https://cal.msu.edu/news/message-reassurance/>

"Culture of Care During COVID-19"

<https://cal.msu.edu/news/culture-of-care-in-covid-19/>

CAL Annual Review Template available on the CAL Faculty/Academic Staff HR Website (free for adapting to unit/COVID needs)

https://cal.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/56/2020/09/CAL_Annual_Evaluation-tenure_system.pdf

Charting Your Path to Intellectual Leadership model

<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/04/23/staying-with-the-trouble-designing-a-values-enacted-academy/>

CAL Workshop on Writing Annual Reviews During COVID-19 from December 8

<https://soundcloud.com/msucal/writing-annual-reviews-during-covid-19/s-lxDTtN3elic>

Appendices

1. Variable Work Policy

Variable Work Assignment Policy for Tenure-System Faculty

This policy addresses the fact that concentrated effort in one of the three areas may require the faculty member to redistribute the normal percentages of effort.

Standard Distribution

The standard distribution of effort for tenure-system faculty in an academic year is as follows: 40% teaching; 45% research and publication; 15% service/engagement

Each faculty member is expected to make demonstrable contributions in the three areas each year, unless otherwise stipulated.

Guiding Principles

The Variable Work Assignment Policy is guided by the following principles and values:

- All three areas — teaching, research, and service/engagement — are part of the regular responsibility of tenure-system faculty. Under normal circumstances, no category may be reduced to zero effort.
- At different times or in response to different opportunities, emphases can temporarily shift.
- Tenure carries with it both the right and the responsibility of the faculty member to determine, in concert with the department chair, priorities for carrying out one's work in light of the missions of the department, college, and university.

Redistribution Agreement

Each case of redistribution of effort must be accompanied by a Redistribution Agreement, prepared and agreed to by both the chair of the department and the faculty member before the redistribution may take effect.

- The Agreement should detail the length of time for which the redistribution is to be in effect.
- The Agreement must detail how the reassignment will affect the evaluation of the faculty member's work for merit pay.

- Faculty are obliged to negotiate these arrangements in a timely manner, especially in order to facilitate programmatic scheduling.
- In most cases, the Agreement should be agreed upon at least one semester before the semester in which the redistribution would take effect.

Redistribution of Effort

Request for redistribution of effort may be initiated by either the faculty member or the chair. Redistribution of effort may be triggered by one of the following:

1. A contractual administrative responsibility
2. A sabbatical agreement
3. Receipt of a grant, fellowship, or award that buys out some portion of a teaching assignment
4. Leaves of absence (paid or unpaid)
5. In addition to the above four conditions, an agreement for the redistribution of effort may be reached between the chair and the faculty member as a long-term plan to respond to changing circumstances in the faculty member's professional work. Typical arrangements would be the following:

- 10% redistribution from research to teaching for a 50-35-15 arrangement. This arrangement requires that the faculty member teach 2 courses one semester and 3 courses the other.
- 20% redistribution from research to teaching for a 60-25-15 arrangement. This arrangement requires that the faculty member teach 3 courses per semester.
- 10% from research to service for a 40-35-25 arrangement. This arrangement increases the expected service work and reduces the expected research output.
- 20% redistribution is the maximum allowed.

Faculty members who have arranged for retirement and/or consultancies leading to retirements (prior to the formal departmental adoption of this policy) are excluded from this policy.

2. Department of English Mentoring Policy

Note: the policy outlined below aligns with the CAL mentoring policy, but provides some specifics in terms of how mentoring is undertaken, and expands on that policy in terms of who (ideally) is included in mentoring. There are a number of helpful resources listed in the document and in the endnote. We may want to develop a departmental mentoring handbook, preferably a web-based set of guidelines and resources.

Because mentoring is central to the retention and development of faculty at all levels, it is an important component of service.

Mentoring is a responsibility of the Department as a whole, and of each member of the Department individually. It includes both formal and informal support, and is available to each member of the faculty, regardless of rank and employment status. It includes Group Advising Sessions, Focused Support Workshops, and other necessary interactions in group settings, as well as individual interactions. Faculty serving as mentors will be provided with guidance in understanding their role as mentors, and in how to fulfill that role effectively; mentees will be provided guidance on their role and responsibilities in the mentor/mentee relationship. Both mentors and mentees should consult <http://fod.msu.edu/resources-faculty-mentoring> for policies and suggestions. Additional resources that may be helpful in defining roles and establishing specific practices are listed in this endnote: i

Group advising and mentoring – Full and Associate faculty work in teams with groups of untenured faculty, covering areas necessary for success in achieving tenure and promotions:

- Clarify department and college expectations for promotion and tenure, and discuss strategies for success in evaluation processes
- Advise on optimal time allocation across research, teaching, and service missions
- Offer workshops and other group activities aimed at helping mentees setting long-term goals and short-term objectives; also on setting priorities and planning for professional development
- Offer workshops on Teaching: course preparation, innovative teaching, classroom dynamics and interactions, student-centered assignments and projects, working with TAs, community engaged and service learning, meeting University Learning Goals, etc. These can also be peer to peer, or peer to all, so that new and developing faculty can share strategies they're using, and introduce innovative models of teaching. Experts brought in as deemed useful, such as those from Service Learning and Civic Engagement Center. A regular schedule of such workshops and interactions should be offered each year to

cover aspects of advising and mentoring best addressed in groups. In addition, new faculty will be assigned a peer mentor and a more senior mentor, the latter preferably in a related field. Peer-to-peer mentoring can help in developing networks, teaching strategies, and perhaps also in exchanging research. [The specific responsibilities in peer-to-peer mentoring should be explicitly defined.] Senior mentors will hold responsibility for the majority of formal mentoring not covered in workshops and group mentoring interactions.

Assignment of mentors should take place at the beginning of the first year of a junior faculty member 's service at MSU, and continue through tenure. If either the mentor or the mentee feels that the relationship is not effective, they will meet with the chair individually to discuss concerns and issues, and the Chair will either offer recommendations and interventions for establishing a better relationship, or appoint a different mentor. Mentors should be readily available, be proactive in establishing the relationship and the schedule of meetings and interactions, and they should be prepared to assist in the following ways, accommodating, as best they can, individual needs and policy expectations:

- Listen actively and attentively to the mentee's needs and concerns, and respond to those either with direct suggestions or by connecting them with others who can address their concerns
- Serve as a source of information, or as a guide to others who can provide needed information
- Provide support and advice. Confidential information shared must remain confidential
- Consult with the Chair, with the mentee's approval, to convey needs and concerns that you cannot address
- Advise on setting priorities and creating a professional development plan, in connection with the workshops on these areas
- Encourage submission of proposals and papers, and help critique drafts; suggest conferences journals, and publishers likely to be beneficial to mentee.
- Advise on development of new research collaborations; connect with other scholars at MSU and beyond
- Help identify appropriate opportunities for engagement and leadership within the department, college and university
- Assist with developing professional networks, at MSU, regionally, nationally, and internationally

- Suggest strategies for avoiding pitfalls, overcoming difficulties, and saying “no” when appropriate
- Meet with Chair and mentee at least once annually

Associate Professors will be offered workshops on developing their careers, defining a trajectory toward promotion, strategizing research and creative effort toward longer-term goals, strategically engaging with administrative and other advancement opportunities, etc. Recently promoted faculty should participate in College Mentoring Group for 1-2 years shortly after promotion. They will also be assisted in identifying and approaching mentors for this phase of their career if they do not already have at least one on campus and one in their field.

Full Professors will be encouraged to take on administrative positions, participate in university governance, and contribute in other ways to the culture of service and support. They will participate in the College Mentoring Group for 1-2 years shortly after promotion.

Non-tenure stream faculty are encouraged to attend mentoring workshops pertinent to their needs and interests. Additionally, they will be assigned a mentor when they are present in a visiting capacity, and on request if they are on a continuing contract.

3. Protocols for Communicating Student Concerns

These protocols outline how students in the Department of English can voice concerns about their experiences in our courses, our programs, and our events. Faculty, Academic Staff, and Administrative Staff should share these protocols with undergraduate and graduate students.

Instructional Concerns

Students who have concerns about a course syllabus, assignment, or activity should first attempt to discuss these matters with the course's instructor of record.

If obstacles exist or the attempts at discussion fail, students should make an appointment to express their concerns with the Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies or the Associate Chair of Graduate Studies, or the Department Chairperson.

These Department members will help the student assess the situation and may recommend/undertake a further course of action.

Mentoring Concerns

Students in a mentoring relationship with faculty, such as graduate students who assist in IAH sections, should first raise their concerns with the mentor/instructor of record, if possible.

If obstacles exist or the attempts at discussion fail, students should make an appointment to express their concerns with the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies or the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, or the Department Chairperson.

These Department Administrators will help the student assess the situation and may recommend/undertake a further course of action.

Title IX Issues, Bullying, and Other Forms of Harassment and Discrimination

NOTE: Under Title IX, Faculty, Academic Staff, and Administrative Staff are mandatory reporters.

Title IX holds that "discrimination on the basis of sex includes:

- Excluding, separating, denying benefits to, or otherwise treating a person differently on the basis of gender

- Sexual Harassment

- Sexual Violence, which includes sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking” (titleix.msu.edu)

Students who experience discrimination that falls under these categories should talk to any Faculty or Staff person. If the student identifies a Faculty or Staff person in the Department of English as an alleged perpetrator of this discrimination, the student should talk to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, or the Department Chairperson.

These discussions are subject to mandatory reporting protocols. Investigations and/or disciplinary action may result.

Students who experience bullying and/or other forms of harassment and discrimination, including violations of MSU’s Anti-Discrimination Policy (ADP), in their classrooms or in relation to their connections with Department Faculty or Staff, should talk to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, or the Department Chairperson.

These conversations may result in the filing of a report with MSU’s Office of Institutional Equity.

In all cases, though, Department Administrators will help the student assess the situation and may recommend/undertake a further course of action, including disciplinary action.

4. Curricular Change Approval Process

The process for changing courses (focus, prerequisites) should come before the UPC. The group of faculty affected by the change should be making the decisions about that course. If the affected faculty are a subset of the department (e.g., English Ed, Creative Writing), they should approve the changes first, and then the proposal goes to UPC. If the changes affect the department as a whole, the UPC can develop and approve the proposal, and then take that to the faculty for discussion and a vote, or the changes can emerge from faculty discussion and move to UPC for formal proposal and approval, before returning to Department for a vote.

For program changes, discussion should take place first among the faculty involved, then move to UPC for approval/vote, then Policy to vote, then Department as a whole votes.

5. CAL RPT Procedures for Jointly Appointed/Assigned Faculty

Guidelines Specific to Jointly Appointed or Assigned Faculty

Each tenure-system faculty member with a joint appointment or assignment within CAL, regardless of percentage of appointment or assignment, must have a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to further supplement and clarify agreements outlined in their offer letter. (Please refer to the College of Arts & Letters Memorandum of Understanding and Annual Review Guidelines for Tenure-system Faculty with Joint Appointments and Assignments in CAL.)

A candidate will be recommended for renewal, tenure, or promotion only when it is in the best interest of the University, when the totality of the record is consistent with renewal or promotion, and when there is a high level of performance under the expectations as outlined in the MoU.

All faculty members with majority appointments or assignments in CAL will be evaluated according to the criteria and procedures specified in the bylaws/RPT guidelines of the CAL unit in which they have their majority appointment or assignment.

Each CAL department will use its own standard weighting scheme for accomplishments in teaching, research, and service for faculty jointly appointed or assigned, bearing in mind the fraction of the overall appointment that resides in the minority appointment unit.

In terms of procedures for RPT review, supplementing the General Guidelines included above:

- The candidate will submit one Dossier.
- The candidate's most recently negotiated joint appointment or assignment MoU will be included in the Dossier.
- A summative evaluation of the candidate's overall contributions to the minority unit will be provided by the head of that unit to the head of the majority unit and the associated RPT committee for consideration in the departmental reappointment and tenure review.
- The majority unit will follow the following RPT Committee guidelines:

RPT Committee: For faculty with a majority appointment in one CAL department and a minority appointment or assignment in another CAL unit, the make-up of the RPT Committee will follow the guidelines for the majority department, but include one representative from the minority unit. This representative will be chosen jointly by the majority department

executive officer and the minority unit's executive officer. The minority unit committee member will have the same participatory and voting rights as the other RPT committee members from the majority unit. The nature of the candidate's appointment, including any MoUs, will be shared with the RPT Committee.

RPT External Evaluators: For faculty with a majority appointment in one CAL department and a minority appointment or assignment in another CAL unit, external evaluations are a critical component of the reviews for tenure, promotion to associate professor, and promotion to professor, but are not utilized for the third-year reappointment.

The referees will be informed of the nature of the joint appointment or assignment, the particulars of the candidate's appointment or assignment and expectations, and the criteria for the review.

If the candidate's research portfolio includes interdisciplinary work, then the referees will be chosen such that their combined expertise spans all of the relevant fields.

The candidate will submit the names of up to four potential referees, from which the majority CAL administrator and the minority unit administrator will jointly choose a minimum of two; all of these will meet the criteria of rank and independence described above. The CAL unit leaders will then jointly add additional names not suggested by the candidate to make up the full list of those to be asked for letters; the candidate will not be told the identities of any of the individuals on the final list. The final number of letters received from referees chosen by the CAL unit leaders will match or exceed the number received from individuals suggested by the Candidate.

6. Memorandum of Understanding Checklist for Jointly Appointed/ Assigned Faculty

College of Arts & Letters Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) Checklist

This checklist is designed as a guide for the writing of a variety of types of MoUs and contains potential language that should be modified so that it pertains to the details of the particular position shared by the two units. All unit heads and the faculty member must be consulted when drawing up the MOU. This document does not provide legal advice. A copy of the MoU needs to be sent to the majority unit head, the minority unit head, the faculty member, and the CAL Associate Dean in charge of personnel.

_____ 1. State the names of the units involved in the joint appointment or joint assignment as well as the faculty member. Include faculty member's rank and type of appointment [tenured, tenure track, fixed term faculty, fixed term academic specialist, academic specialist in the continuing system]

_____ 2. Location of the appointment of the faculty member. If a joint appointment, then list the percentages of both appointments and locations. If a joint assignment, then list the percentages of both assignments and locations.

_____ 3. Outline the teaching, mentoring, and advising load in each unit with percentages. To the extent possible, their teaching assignment will be chosen to support their research program.

_____ 4. Provide clear definitions of expectations, so that the research and service/ outreach/ leadership expectations are clear to all parties. It is important that both units take the service requirements of the other into account, so that the faculty member is able to successfully balance expectations. These activities could be very well defined here to include, if needed, what committee(s) would be served on, etc.

_____ 5. Links to the expectations for promotion and tenure in both units should be made clear.

_____ 6. Any other research or office space, support services, equipment issues should be clarified.

_____ 7. Any indirect funds generated by an external grant or other pertinent budgetary issues should be clarified if they are to be shared between units.

_____ 8. Mentors should be offered in both units and the mentoring policy of each should be made clear.

_____ 9. If there is a time limit on the agreement, then it should be specified. If a joint agreement is to be terminated, then the CAL Associate Dean in charge of personnel should be consulted.

_____ 10. The memo is signed and dated by the faculty member, the head of both units.

_____ 11. Include the date of most recent meeting when agreement was made and/or reviewed. Signatures should be included to acknowledge review of the document.

Updated 4/3/18

7. Merit Review Cover Form and Narrative Template

Cover Form

Name:

Appointment:

percentage of effort to research: _____ teaching: _____ service/outreach: _____

Are you jointly appointed? ___ yes ___ no

if so, with what program/dept? _____

what is the percent of your appt in ENG? _____

Do you have add'l responsibilities (as editor, administrator, etc.)? ___ yes ___ no

Please identify your role and acknowledge how you are compensated (e.g. buyout, salary percentage; if you have no special arrangements, you should note the standard 45%/40%/15%):

Narrative: Please use the following sections as an opportunity for careful reflection and the articulation of future professional plans over the next three years.

Part One: Research/Publication and Professional Activity

How have your research/creative and professional activities during the period under review contributed to your broader goals? What are the milestones and endpoints of those goals? In what ways do your accomplishments and plans engage with the department's and college's goals and mission? Be sure to draw attention to items not explicitly foregrounded on your annotated CV.

Part Two: Teaching

How have your teaching activities during the period under review contributed to your broader goals (looking forward into the next three years)? What are the milestones and endpoints of those goals? In what ways do your accomplishments and plans engage with the program's and department's learning goals and mission? Be sure to draw attention to items not explicitly foregrounded on your annotated CV, such as new course preparations, contributions to course and program development, attendance at pedagogical workshops and the changes prompted by these sessions, etc.

LIST MSU COURSES TAUGHT (Indicate those in which you worked with a TA)

SPRING yr 1	(SCH)	FALL yr 1	(SCH)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
SPRING yr 2	(SCH)	FALL yr 2	(SCH)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Part Three: Service

How have your service responsibilities during the period under review contributed to your broader goals (looking forward into the next three years)? What are the milestones and endpoints of those goals? In what ways do your accomplishments and plans engage with the program’s and department’s goals and mission? Be sure to draw attention to items not explicitly foregrounded on your annotated CV, such as the level of your contributions (dept, college, univ, profession), work intensiveness of specific committees, and how your service contributions scale to your rank. Senior members of the department should also be precise about how they have actively mentored colleagues at lower ranks and/or otherwise contributed to the department’s culture of reciprocity, recognition, and respect.

Part Four: Outreach

How have your outreach activities during the period under review contributed to your broader goals (looking forward into the next three years)? What are the milestones and endpoints of those goals? In what ways do your accomplishments and plans engage with the department’s goals and mission? Be sure to draw attention to items not explicitly foregrounded on your annotated CV.

Part Five (Optional): Additional Comments and Plans

8. University Suggestions for Community Norms Documents

Prepared by Bill Donohue (Faculty Grievance & Dispute Resolution Office, <https://aan.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Community-Norms.pdf>) and Juli Wade (Academic Advancement Network), April 2018

Michigan State University outlines three core values: Quality, Inclusiveness, and Connectivity. Many of us are reflecting on how well we and the individuals we lead are upholding these principles, and what we all can do to create and maintain a climate in which our actions genuinely embody them. MSU's statement on our core value of inclusiveness highlights the importance of "varying perspectives and a promise of mutual respect".

In support of this idea, handbooks and other materials outlining policies and procedures for MSU employees, for both academics and support staff, contain sections on expectations of professional behavior. We encourage you to increase awareness of these university-level requirements, and suggest that each unit consider corresponding sections for their bylaws. Regardless of whether units approve regulations within their governing documents, we encourage the development of texts outlining Community Norms. Here, we offer some suggestions for process and topics. The material below is not exhaustive and may not apply to all units, but is intended to provide ideas for consideration.

Development of Document

Please be inclusive in the creation of the text, in terms of both ideas and language. All stakeholders should be involved, and substantial buy-in will be required for meaningful impact. Refrain from excessive detail, but provide sufficient examples for clarity. It is impossible to imagine every situation that may arise. Consider including language related to expectations that:

1. We each take responsibility for our words and actions.
2. When a violation of community norms occurs, observers will speak up and will be listened to (you might also note where they should report various types of incidents).

Examples

Collegiality Standards might address factors including, but not limited to:

1. **Power Differences:** University life can be hierarchical, and power differentials exists across numerous levels, including students, administrators, faculty, and academic and support staff. These differences can create an atmosphere in which power is an overt dimension of the relationship, or the effects of differential control can be far more subtle. Professional conduct assumes that individuals are aware of, and avoid abusing,

increased rights and capacities that can be associated with a range of positions and degrees of experience.

2. Respect and Civil Behavior: Language endorsed by the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University Committee on Student Affairs, and approved by the Academic Council on April 20, 2010, includes a “call upon all who participate in university events to promote tolerance and civil behavior and to hold themselves to high standards that reflect the university’s commitment to respect viewpoints that may be different from their own. Only by respecting individuals with diverse perspectives and ideas can we build an environment of civility that is conducive to advancing knowledge and transforming lives”.

3. Bullying: MSU has clear policies against harassment and discrimination, which relate to protected characteristics. While MSU does not yet have a university level definition of or policy on bullying, it is useful to consider related material from similar institutions. For example, Oregon State University defines bullying in the following manner (<http://eoa.oregonstate.edu/bullying-policy>): “conduct of any sort directed at another that is severe, pervasive or persistent, and is of a nature that would cause a reasonable person in the victim’s position substantial emotional distress and undermine his or her ability to work, study or participate in his or her regular life activities, and actually does cause the victim substantial emotional distress and undermines the victim’s ability to work, study, or participate in the victim’s regular life activities.” Bullying can take many forms, including overt verbal or physical aggression to exert power, as well as more subtle forms that often come from individuals C.K. Gunsalus calls “victim Bullies... [who] are aggrieved and are trying to get their own way as recompense for their perceived mistreatment” (from the College Administrator’s Survival Guide, 2006, p. 124).

4. Rude or Inconsiderate Behavior, Microaggressions: Conduct that is not severe, pervasive or persistent is generally not viewed as bullying, but it may fall short of reasonable expectations for behavior toward others. Some language regarding appropriate interactions with others may be valuable.

5. Transparency and Privacy: What types of information should be shared within a unit, under what conditions, and by whom? Clarifying intentions and decision making processes, as well as relevant data on which decisions are based, can facilitate a culture of respect and enhance productivity. However, it is not appropriate that all individuals have access to all information.

6. Fairness and Balance: Consider providing material on the importance of engaging multiple, diverse perspectives in decision making.

7. Good Intentions: It may be of value to include a statement related to underlying assumptions about the behavior of others. Perhaps an agreement to avoid jumping

to conclusions and to start from the idea that others mean well (or at least are not acting with an intention to harm) might be useful.

Communication Practices that facilitate adherence to collegiality standards might include, but not be limited to, situations such as:

1. **Email:** This form of communication should not be used to disrespect, demean or in any other ways foment an atmosphere of intimidation or intellectual dishonesty. For example, email should be succinct, respectful, and not be used to harass or slander individuals in any way. When is it appropriate to use all CAPS? When is it appropriate to bcc, cc, and/or reply to all? By when is a response expected?
2. **Scheduling:** Procedures associated with scheduling (and control of shared calendars) should be clearly understood. The importance of involvement of stakeholders in meetings and the potential impact of scheduling at particular times based on availability should be considered.
3. **Faculty Meetings:** Deliberations in meetings must be respectful and aimed at addressing issues; personal attacks must be avoided. These exchanges should demonstrate intellectual honesty and openness to criticism and change.