

Department of English Policies and Procedures

Last updated: September 2017

Table of Contents

Department of English Policies and Procedures.....	1
Faculty Definitions and Voting.....	3
I. Administration.....	4
1. Department Chair.....	4
Term of Office.....	4
Temporary Absence of the Chair.....	4
Vacancy of the Position on Short Notice.....	4
Selection of a New Chair.....	4
2. Graduate Coordinator.....	7
Description:.....	7
Responsibilities:.....	7
3. Undergraduate Coordinator.....	8
Description:.....	8
Responsibilities:.....	8
4. Writing Coordinator.....	8
Description:.....	8
Responsibilities:.....	8
5. Steering Committee.....	9
II. Evaluation.....	9
1. Peer Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty.....	9
Period of Review.....	10
Evaluation Procedure.....	10
Obligations of Peer Reviewers.....	10
Criteria and Expectations.....	11
2. Peer Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty.....	14
Period of Review.....	14
Evaluation Procedure.....	15

3. Annual Report Directions.....	15
Directions for Faculty	15
Preparing Your Report	16
Sample Annual Report on Professional Activities	16
4. Classroom Observation	20
5. Graduate-Faculty Status.....	21
Procedure.....	21
Criteria.....	21
6. Emeritus Status.....	22
7. Post-Tenure Review	22
Procedure.....	23
The Faculty Member's Report.....	23
Outcomes	23
Criteria for Evaluations	24
8. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)	24
The Probationary Period	25
Chair's Annual Evaluation of Probationary Faculty.....	25
Length of Probationary Service.....	25
RTP Application.....	26
Definition of Senior Faculty.....	26
External Review of Candidates.....	26
Criteria.....	27
9. Appointment and Reappointment of Lecturers and Appointment to Senior Lecturer Status	31
Appointment and Reappointment of Lecturers Teaching on a One-Year Contract	31
Appointment to an Initial Three-Year Contract	32
Promotion to the Rank of Senior Lecturer	32
III. Hiring	33
1. Hiring Procedure: Professorial-Rank Faculty	33
2. Hiring Procedure: Full-Time Lecturers.....	34
IV. Mentoring.....	36

1. Faculty Development & Mentoring Committee : Mentoring in the English Department	36
A. General Mentoring	36
B. Mentoring of Tenure-Track Faculty	36
2. TA Mentoring Program.....	37
First-Year Composition & Teaching Assistants	37
Selecting Mentors	37
Expectations of Mentors.....	37
Things to Consider.....	38
Evaluation of First-Year Mentors and Teaching Assistants.....	38
Responding to unusual situations.....	38
Questions/Concerns	39
Evaluation of Second-Year Teaching Assistants	39
3. Travel and Research Support.....	39
V. Teaching.....	40
1. Assignment to University Studies Courses.....	40
2. Standard Textbooks for University Studies Courses.....	40
3. Applied Learning Experience Requirement	42
4. Faculty Class Cancellation Procedure.....	43
5. Final Exams	44
6. Grade of Incomplete.....	45
7. Office Hours.....	45
8. SPOT Teaching Evaluations	46
9. Credit for Thesis Supervision.....	46

Faculty Definitions and Voting

Senior faculty are defined as tenured faculty.

Professorial faculty are defined as faculty holding the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor. Only professorial faculty take part in the selection, hiring, and evaluation of other professorial faculty.

Lecturers are full-time faculty with one-year and/or three-year contracts, which may be renewed. A continuing lecturer shall share in the range of responsibilities normally assigned to professorial-rank faculty and may vote on all policy issues brought before the department. Exceptions to the above are noted below:

- Although continuing lecturers are subject to the same mode of annual evaluation as other faculty, they will not participate in the assessment of other professorial-rank faculty and lecturers.
- Involvement in personnel matters concerning professorial-rank faculty shall be restricted to tenure-track and tenured faculty. However, all continuing faculty are encouraged to voice their opinions on all departmental issues.
- As per revision of chair selection procedures of March 27, 2015, lecturers may vote on selection of department chair.

Senior Lecturers are full-time faculty with three-year contracts, which may be renewed.

I. Administration

1. Department Chair

Term of Office

The department chair is typically appointed to a three-year term. Upon recommendation of the department and approval by the dean, the chair may be reappointed to one or more additional terms.

Temporary Absence of the Chair

When the chair is absent from campus or unable to perform the duties of office, those duties are temporarily assumed by the senior program coordinator. If that person is also unavailable, the senior of the other coordinators (seniority determined by years of UNCW service) performs the chair's duties.

Vacancy of the Position on Short Notice

If the chair resigns on short notice or if the position otherwise becomes suddenly vacant, the senior program coordinator performs the chair's duties until the dean appoints an acting chair or a full-term successor.

Selection of a New Chair

See [CAS Policy and Procedures Manual, sec. II-2-3-3](#).

When a vacancy in the chair position occurs or is anticipated, the department recommends a candidate to the dean. The dean initiates the recruitment process and solicits input from the faculty with respect to the preferred option (see below). Final approval of all recommendations rests with the dean. In the spring

semester prior to a current chair's last year of service, the dean will communicate the options available for department leadership to all full-time members of the faculty. All full-time members of the faculty may vote on matters concerning chair selection.

Renewal

In the spring of the chair's second year, the senior member of the steering committee convenes a meeting of all full-time faculty, except for the chair, to determine whether others are interested in being chair and/or whether to pursue renewal, an internal, or an external search. The senior member of the steering committee then conveys the result to the chair and to the dean.

Internal Search

If the dean authorizes an internal search, the search process is supervised by a "search coordinator," who cannot be the outgoing chair or a candidate for the position and who is appointed by the dean.

Only full professors are eligible for appointment as chair or, in exceptional cases, associate professors. The coordinator solicits nominations, including self-nominations, from the professorial-rank faculty. The coordinator then contacts all nominees to ask if they accept candidacy and makes the slate of candidates known to the department. From each candidate the coordinator requests a curriculum vita, supporting materials including publications and teaching evaluations, a statement of administrative philosophy, and a statement of the applicant's vision for the department's future. The coordinator makes these available to the department and to the dean.

The search coordinator arranges interviews with the department and the dean for each candidate. For each interview, the full-time faculty meet in executive session with the candidate, except that the outgoing chair and any other candidates for the position may not be present. At the interview the candidate makes a presentation and answers questions.

After the last of the interviews, the coordinator calls another meeting of the full-time faculty, except that the candidates may not be present and may not vote. The outgoing chair may not be present but may vote by absentee ballot. The outgoing chair will also have a separate, informal interview with the applicant(s) and will submit a separate written assessment of the candidate(s) to the dean. The coordinator chairs the meeting and invites discussion. Following discussion, full-time faculty cast a secret ballot in which each voter names the preferred candidate. The results are immediately tallied and made known to the assembled faculty. If no candidate receives a majority among those present, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated and a second ballot is taken. The process is repeated as needed until one candidate attains a majority. Procedures for breaking ties and for recording the votes of absent faculty are those stated in the procedures for hiring new faculty. Finally, a single yes/no ballot is taken on whether the department supports a recommendation for the majority candidate, and the tallied results are reported to the assembled faculty.

Following this meeting, the search coordinator communicates the results of the balloting to the dean. In addition, the dean may request that each full-time faculty member send a letter to the dean, stating a recommendation accompanied by supporting reasons. If the dean concurs with the department's majority recommendation, the dean offers the position to that candidate. If the dean does not concur, the dean meets with full-time faculty to explain the reasons for non-concurrence. The dean and the department then determine what steps are to be taken to select a chair.

National Search

If the dean authorizes a national search, the dean initiates the search by appointing a search committee comprised of members of both the senior and junior faculty in the department and one member-at-large at the senior rank from a comparable discipline; the current chair does not serve on the search committee. The search committee drafts an advertisement, which the committee chair makes available to the department for review. Following review, the committee chair forwards the revised draft to the dean for approval.

Internal candidates may apply, but all applicants in a national search, whether external or internal, must hold at least the rank of associate professor, although it is preferred that a candidate qualifies for the rank of full professor at UNCW. Also the candidate should have some degree of administrative experience. Applications must include (1) a statement of administrative philosophy, (2) a summary of the applicant's research, (3) evidence of teaching effectiveness, (4) *curriculum vitae*, (5) official copies of all university transcripts, and (6) the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of five references. They may also include a statement of the applicant's vision for the department's future.

After the date established for screening of applicants, the committee selects a pool of semi-finalists. Upon permission of the dean, the committee interviews semi-finalists, either at a conference or by other means, which may include telephone interviews, and researches their qualifications. The committee recommends to the dean a slate of finalists to be invited to campus.

Upon approval of the dean, the committee chair invites finalists to campus and superintends all aspects of the visits. The committee chair makes the credentials of the finalists available to the department and to the dean. The committee chair also obtains permission from the finalists to contact references and others familiar with their records. The search committee makes extensive efforts to research the backgrounds, qualifications, and administrative records of the finalists. Campus visits include one or more interviews with the dean and a presentation/interview with the full-time faculty. Neither the outgoing chair nor any other finalists for the position may be present at the interviews. Non-departmental members of the search committee may be present.

At the conclusion of the last interview, the department will have seven days to make its recommendation to the dean. The committee chair calls another meeting of the full-time faculty, except that any internal finalists may not be present and may not vote. Non-departmental members of the search committee may also be present and may participate in discussion but may not vote. The outgoing chair may not be present but may vote by absentee ballot. The meeting is chaired by the search committee chair. For each candidate, the search committee reports on its investigation of the candidate, and the faculty discuss that candidate. Following discussion of the final candidate, the full-time faculty members present cast secret ballots following the same procedure as for an internal search (above), including a final vote on whether to support a recommendation for the majority candidate.

After this meeting, the committee chair communicates the results of the balloting to the dean. In addition, during this same seven-day period, each full-time faculty member sends a letter to the dean, stating a recommendation accompanied by supporting reasons. If the dean concurs with the department's majority recommendation, the dean offers the position to that candidate. If the dean does not concur, the dean meets with the full-time faculty to explain the reasons for non-concurrence. The dean and the department then determine what steps are to be taken to select a chair.

Last updated: March 27, 2015

2. Graduate Coordinator

Selection Process: Appointed by the Chair upon recommendation of the Steering Committee.

Term of Office: Three-year renewable term.

Description:

The Graduate Coordinator administers the department's graduate program under the supervision of the Chair. The Graduate Coordinator receives one course release each semester.

Responsibilities:

- Advises the Chair on matters related to the graduate program.
- Advises the Chair regarding the membership of the Graduate Committee
- Serves on the Steering Committee
- Chairs the Graduate Committee
- Schedules and conducts meetings of the Graduate Faculty
- Acts as departmental liaison with the Graduate School and attends period meetings with the Dean of the Graduate School
- Coordinates the departmental nominations for Graduate School awards (faculty and students)
- Coordinates the selection process for departmental graduate student awards
- Provides information and advice about the program for prospective applicants
- Revises the Graduate Handbook annually
- Maintains and revises the graduate program's section of the departmental website
- Advises all graduate students and conducts an orientation for new graduate students
- Reviews the degree audits of all students who apply for graduation to ensure that they have fulfilled all requirements and that their audits clear
- Completes paperwork for all students for course substitutions, degree extensions, and travel
- Maintains student records
- Supervises graduate interns
- Schedules and coordinates the comprehensive examination and reports results to the Graduate School
- Coordinates the admissions process
- Coordinates the selection of Teaching Assistants and recipients of other scholarships
- Coordinates and recommends to the Chair the graduate course offering for the next academic year
- Advises the GEA and assists them with planning their annual Graduate Student Conference
- Advises students on the composition of thesis committees
- Keeps records of faculty service on thesis committees as directors and readers
- Oversees collection of program assessment data for use in the departmental assessment report and writes a yearly analysis of the data
- Conducts exit interviews with graduating students each semester to collect information about their experience as MA students at UNCW, future plans, and suggestions for improving the program
- Promotes the graduate program by updating and disseminating print and electronic materials
- Directs periodic reviews of the graduate program by leading the graduate committee in composing the self-study report, working with the graduate school to select external reviewers, and assisting with the coordination of the site visit

3. Undergraduate Coordinator

Selection Process: Appointed by the Chair upon recommendation of the Steering Committee.

Term of Office: Three-year renewable term.

Description:

The Undergraduate Coordinator administers the department's undergraduate program under the supervision of the Chair. The Undergraduate Coordinator receives one course release each semester.

Responsibilities:

- Produces all departmental assessment reports based on data collected and assembled by the curricular committees
- Coordinates and ensures degree checks (performed by all advisors) and performs PW certificate checks (while this task remains necessary)
- Administers transient study & substitution waiver requests (with assistance from other faculty specialists)
- Oversees advising
- Oversees departmental applied learning and ensures University Studies compliance
- Oversees Teacher Licensure needs in conjunction with the Watson School of Education

Last updated: September 6, 2012

4. Writing Coordinator

Selection Process: Appointed by the Chair upon recommendation of the Steering Committee.

Term of Office: Three-year renewable term.

Description:

The Writing Coordinator administers the department's writing program under the supervision of the Chair. The Writing Coordinator receives one course release each semester.

Responsibilities:

- Oversees the composition program (including curricular, hiring, and programmatic issues)
- Serves as liaison with other intra- and inter-campus entities for matters related to composition, including:
 - Department Graduate Coordinator
 - Registrar's Office
 - Testing Office

- University College
- CTE
- Dean of Students
- Counseling Services
- Isaac Bear
- Athletics Department
- Chairs Composition Committee
- Advises the Professional Writing Committee
- Retains review copies of accepted textbooks for composition courses
- Orients FT and PT faculty in the composition program through pre-semester workshop and continuing ad-hoc support
- Ensures FT and PT compliance with programmatic/departmental policies and standards
- Meets with GTAs regularly for mentoring and to ensure their compliance with programmatic/departmental policies and standards
- Typically teaches ENG 503 (“Theory and Practice of Teaching Composition”)
- Synthesizes classroom observation reports provided by Composition Committee members

Last updated: September 6, 2012

5. Steering Committee

The **steering committee** meets each month, prior to the department meeting, to assess policies, goals, and performance, and to propose policies and actions for faculty consideration at the department meetings. The steering committee is composed of the departmental chair and two faculty members from each rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and lecturer) excluding the serving coordinators. A schedule of steering committee membership will be established and available to the faculty. The Department Chair will adjudicate the schedule as need arises due to changes in faculty membership, changes of coordinator status, or changes in rank. All steering committee members will serve a term of two years. Terms will be staggered within each rank such that each year the term of one committee member at each rank will expire. All members of the department are welcome to attend any steering committee meeting.

The principal purposes of the steering committee are to

- Act as an advisory body to the chair and act as liaisons to the department.
- Propose policies, advise on matters for larger departmental deliberation, and review proposals from departmental committees prior to sending them to the department as a whole for action.
 - In its deliberations, the steering committee may suggest revisions of committee proposals and return them to the committee chair.
- Form the agenda for the monthly department meeting.
- Set yearly goals for the department.
- Advise the chair on hiring of lecturers.

[rev. April. 2012]

II. Evaluation

1. Peer Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty

rev. Jan 2011

Period of Review

Permanent faculty are reviewed annually for their professional performance from April 1 of the preceding year through the last day of March of the current year. Annual evaluations provide faculty with feedback about their performance and are the principal basis for recommending salary increases based on merit.

Evaluation Procedure

By March 31, each full-time faculty member submits an annual report that follows a prescribed format. Annual reports and accompanying documents are placed on the departmental SharePoint site, where they are available for consultation and review by colleagues.

All tenured faculty review and evaluate each untenured assistant professor's annual report and accompanying documents. Each untenured faculty is reviewed by three tenured faculty, who jointly write a single evaluation, based on the faculty member's annual report and accompanying documents. Members of a joint evaluation team may not be spouses or involved in a romantic relationship with one another, nor may they review spouses or romantic partners. In succeeding years, the chair should ensure that, insofar as possible, all tenured faculty review each other in rotation.

The joint evaluation team and department chair will evaluate faculty members on leave (e.g. family, medical, research reassignment, sponsored, unpaid) just as other members of the department for any portion of the period under review not related to the leave. For the portion related to the leave, evaluation will be based on a paragraph appended to their annual evaluations summarizing activities and accomplishments directly related to the terms of the leave.

Departmental members who have administrative release will append to their annual evaluations a paragraph summarizing their outstanding administrative activities and accomplishments.

For the department chair, the senior member of the Steering Committee randomly selects three tenured faculty members who submit a joint evaluation directly to the dean. (This evaluation of the chair as a faculty member is in addition to the annual online evaluation in which all full-time faculty participate.)

Peer reviewers provide a candid evaluation of each faculty member's performance, applying the criteria listed below. All faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching and service; those of professorial rank are also evaluated in the area of scholarship. Faculty performance in each area will be rated as "outstanding," "above expectations," "at expectations," "below expectations," or "deficient."

The chair considers the evaluatee's annual report and accompanying documents as well as the peer reviews in writing his/her evaluation. The chair exercises discretion in reporting erratic reviews by faculty. The faculty member receives a copy of the chair's evaluation and may choose to receive a copy of the joint peer review with the names removed. At the faculty member's specific request, the chair will provide the names comprising the review committee. The chair will conclude each junior faculty member's evaluation with a summary of their progress toward reappointment or tenure and promotion and subsequently provide each senior faculty member with that summary. All evaluations are retained as part of the faculty member's personnel file. Each faculty member may meet with the chair to discuss the evaluation and has the right to append a written response. The chair forwards copies of the chair's evaluation and any response to the dean.

Obligations of Peer Reviewers

Peer reviewers are expected to apply all evaluative criteria rigorously and conscientiously and to provide a cogently developed rationale for the evaluation. Annually, immediately prior to any reviews of annual reports by individuals or their joint evaluation teams, the tenured faculty will meet to discuss department methods and expectations for the evaluations.

Criteria and Expectations

All faculty are expected to teach effectively and to make significant contributions to the department, the university, or the profession. All faculty of professorial rank are expected to remain actively engaged in scholarship; members of the graduate faculty are expected to demonstrate their commitment to scholarship and research through publication in refereed venues.

Peer reviewers and the department chair will apply the following criteria in evaluating the professional performance of full-time faculty during the annual review.

I. Teaching:

Each annual report is accompanied by a portfolio of teaching materials. Included are peer observations (if applicable), syllabi, sample writing assignments, sample examinations, and student course evaluations (IDEA scores). Equally important are various measures of commitment to educating students both inside and outside the classroom: development of new courses, revision of existing courses to accommodate current professional knowledge, guest lectures in other classes, student conferences, thesis work, and directed independent study. No faculty member is expected to do all these things; however, all faculty members are expected to do more than merely meet their classes and provide routine advising.

To be rated “outstanding,” a faculty member should meet most of the following criteria:

- Syllabi, examinations, and assignments that demonstrate the highest standards (rigor, range, and depth of coverage) as well as adherence to departmental guidelines and expectations regarding writing assignments and research projects
- Significant contribution to honors projects, MA theses/exams, or other mentoring activities (such as nominating and mentoring students for university or national awards or providing student service learning opportunities)
- Development of new courses or directed independent studies or renovations of existing courses
- Teaching initiatives such as online instruction, international studies, honors courses, learning communities, or other activities
- Participation in teaching workshops, teacher mentoring, or other such organized activities
- Recognition in the form of teaching awards or significant impact citations
- Excellent peer observation reports (when applicable)
- IDEA scores reflecting student perception of effective teaching and classroom management

To be rated “above expectations,” a faculty member should meet many of the criteria listed above.

To be rated “at expectations,” a faculty member should meet all of the following criteria:

- Well-organized syllabi, assignments, and examinations that reflect pedagogy in line with professional trends and departmental guidelines and expectations regarding student assignments and research projects

- Contributions to mentoring students outside the classroom (advising, thesis committee membership, honors committee work, student club advising, intern supervision, or DIS supervision)
- Satisfactory peer observation reports (when applicable)
- IDEA scores reflecting student perception of effective teaching and classroom management

To be rated “below expectations,” a faculty member is deficient in one of the four criteria for an “at expectations” rating.

To be rated “deficient,” a faculty member is either deficient in the criteria for an “at expectations” rating or fails to comply with the norms of professionally ethical conduct.

II. Research and Scholarship:

Scholarly achievements include published books, articles, chapters, review essays, book reviews, and other professional writing; papers at academic conferences and invited public lectures; and successful grant applications. The quality of these achievements is determined by their impact and originality and by the prestige of the venue in which they are made public. Only faculty of professorial rank are expected to engage in research and scholarship.

A. Research-Active Faculty

Research-active faculty, whose normal teaching load is nine semester hours, must maintain research-active status as defined by CAS policy—that is, in a rolling five-year period, through the publication of “two articles in a discipline-appropriate peer-reviewed journal; or one peer-reviewed article and the development of one peer-reviewed funded grant whose results are widely disseminated; or a monograph.” (All references to published texts assume their acceptance in refereed or professionally recognized venues.)

To be rated “outstanding,” a research-active faculty member must publish a book or two peer-reviewed scholarly articles or book chapters plus an additional scholarly achievement.

To be rated “above expectations,” a research-active faculty member must publish one peer-reviewed scholarly article or book chapter or secure a major external grant.

To be rated “at expectations,” a research-active faculty member must demonstrate professional activity in some of the following ways:

- Publish some scholarly writing
- Show a letter of acceptance or proof that an article is under review
- Secure an external or institutional research grant
- Sign a book contract
- Edit or coedit a scholarly journal
- Manuscript review for a scholarly journal or press
- Deliver a paper or organize a session at a conference
- Provide evidence of a research project in progress (such as sample pages, etc.)

To be rated “below expectations,” a graduate faculty member demonstrates only limited involvement in the kinds of activities that contribute to an “at expectations” rating.

To be rated “deficient,” a research-active faculty member meets none of the six criteria for an “at expectations” rating and fails to present a realistic agenda for renewing qualifications for graduate-faculty status within the next two years or before the expiration of his or her current graduate faculty appointment, whichever comes first.

B. Non-Research-Active Faculty

Senior faculty who do not hold graduate faculty status are assigned a twelve-semester-hour teaching load. Although expectations in research and scholarship are commensurately reduced, these faculty should remain professionally alert and active in demonstrable ways.

To be rated “outstanding,” a non-research-active faculty member must meet any one of the following criteria:

- Publish the equivalent of a substantial article
- Secure an external grant
- Sign a book contract

To be rated “above expectations,” a non-research-active faculty member must meet any one of the following criteria:

- Deliver a paper relative to his/her field at a conference
- Secure an institutional grant
- Publish some scholarly writing
- Demonstrate professional involvement in more than one of the ways listed for an “at expectations” rating

To be rated “at expectations,” a non-research-active faculty member must demonstrate professional involvement in some way, as suggested by the following:

- Provide evidence of research in progress (such as sample pages or a letter showing an article is under review, etc.)
- Provide evidence of research grant application
- Engage in scholarly initiatives that find application in curricular change, syllabi, on-line instruction, international teaching, or similar venues

To be rated “below expectations,” a non-research-active faculty member demonstrates only limited involvement in the kinds of activities that contribute to an “at expectations” rating.

To be rated “deficient,” a non-research-active faculty member meets none of the criteria for an “at expectations” rating.

III. Service:

Service is demonstrated through committee membership along with a variety of other means. Merely routine or pro forma service, however, is insufficient. Service that contributes to the departmental and/or university mission is expected, and faculty are evaluated according to the initiative, effort, effectiveness, and reliability of their contributions. Service that benefits the community (when academically relevant) or the profession is equally valued and meritorious. Although all faculty are expected to contribute to the work of the department, expectations for service vary according to rank, with less expected of assistant

professors, who are busy establishing a record of excellence in teaching and a scholarly agenda, and more expected of tenured faculty, whose experience and leadership should guide others.

For each activity included in this section of the annual report, the summary paragraph should include a brief narrative detailing the kind of work done in the past year for the benefit of faculty who may not be familiar with that activity. For departmental service, the committee assignment document sent out by the chair at the beginning of each academic year serves as a baseline of expectations, and peer evaluators should take into account the significance of the service and the expectations for rank in forming their evaluations. Departmental service beyond that assigned should be identified as such in the narrative summary.

To be rated “outstanding,” a faculty member must either contribute in many of the activities for an “at expectations” rating or demonstrate exceptional commitment to more than one of them.

To be rated “above expectations,” a faculty member must contribute in several of the ways listed below or demonstrate exceptional commitment to any one of them.

To be rated “at expectations,” a faculty member must contribute in some of the following ways:

- Satisfactory completion of assigned departmental service
- Assigned mentoring of TAs or faculty
- Membership in a work-intensive departmental, college, or university committee
- Membership in Faculty Senate or Faculty Assembly
- Involvement in institutional self-study
- Leadership in an administrative role without reduced teaching load
- Administrative appointment in a professional society
- Leadership in student organizations or activities
- Conscientious attendance at or participation in departmental, college, or university events
- Professionally related community service

To be rated “below expectations,” a faculty member will have contributed in only a few of the ways listed above.

To be rated “deficient,” a faculty member will have contributed in virtually none of the ways listed above.

Last updated: January 27, 2011

2. Peer Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty

created Feb. 2010

Period of Review

Part-time faculty are reviewed annually for their professional performance during the academic year. Annual evaluations provide faculty with feedback about their performance and are consulted when recommending assignment to future courses.

Evaluation Procedure

Because classroom observations are one of the principal means of evaluating teaching, part-time lecturers are observed for six semesters by members of the full-time faculty. After this initial observation period, part-time lecturers are observed a minimum of once each year by at least two members of the full-time faculty. (See Classroom Observation policy.) If a lecturer is teaching online, a faculty member assigned by the chair will be enrolled in the class to evaluate materials and online interaction.

By March 31, each part-time faculty member submits an annual report that follows a prescribed format. Annual reports and accompanying documents are placed on file in the departmental office. Each annual report is accompanied by a portfolio of teaching materials. Included are peer observations, a syllabus for each course taught, representative writing assignments, representative examinations, SPOT summaries for each course, when available, and a paragraph in which the faculty member reflects on initiatives, if any, to improve teaching. The chair reviews these materials when writing the evaluation, and the faculty member has an opportunity to respond, if desired. Normally, for new part-time faculty, the chair will schedule a meeting to discuss the evaluation for the initial year of employment and may thereafter require meetings as needed.

Last updated: February 24, 2010

3. Annual Report Directions

Directions for Faculty

I. To complete your annual report:

1. Consult the department's policy on annual peer evaluation.
2. Complete the Annual Report on Professional Activities template. Follow the detailed instructions below when filling out the form.
3. Report professional activities from April 1 of the previous year through March 31 *only*. Publications and conference presentations since April 1 of the current year are listed as forthcoming on this year's report; they are reported as new next year.

II. Upload the following to the ENG SharePoint site or give copies for scanning to the English Department Administrative specialist (not to the chair) by the deadline:

1. A single copy of the completed annual report.
2. Attachments:
 1. A one-page summary of your annual report in three paragraphs labeled as Teaching, Research, and Service. Include information likely to be featured in the chair's annual evaluation. This is the place to provide context for readers who may be unfamiliar with your professional activities.
 2. A current curriculum vitae.
 3. All SPOT scores from previous spring, summer, fall. Submit *only* photocopies of pages with scores of questions 1–16 (not charts, etc.).
 4. Syllabi for all courses taught during the current *academic* year (summer, fall, spring).
 5. Representative assignments and exams. Select to suggest the range of activity and the rigor of assignments.
 6. When applicable, copies of peer observations of teaching.

7. Copies or offprints of publications.
8. Copies of letters of acceptance for forthcoming publications, if available.

Preparing Your Report

In addition to providing you with an occasion to survey and reflect upon your accomplishments, your report forms the basis for your annual evaluation and merit-pay recommendation by the chair.

Please observe the prescribed format with care as you assemble your report. If you follow the format, you earn the gratitude of your colleagues by saving them much time and aggravation.

Make sure your report is complete. While you may normally eschew self-puffery, it is important that you give yourself full credit for your activities and accomplishments. Of course, you should not misrepresent your role in any activity nor exaggerate its significance, but neither should you omit an item owing to an excess of personal modesty.

In most categories, **unelaborated factual information** is desired. Brief narrative statements may be added when they are useful in explaining the significance of an achievement that might not be evident to the uninformed chair or dean. Do not assume knowledge on the part of your readers. Avoid elliptical statements (e.g., "My CCC piece appeared in November"). Give full citations, avoid abbreviations (except as prescribed in MLA format), and provide all relevant information.

Items to be reported are professional activities that transpired during the reporting period from April 1 of last year through the last day of the current March and that were not reported as new in the previous year's Annual Report. Publications and presentations occurring after April 1 of the current year are listed as forthcoming this year and should be reported as new activities in next year's report.

Some activities might properly be listed under more than one category; for example, a guest lecture you gave in a sociology class might be listed under either "Other Teaching Activities" (category I.5) or "Service to the College" (III.2). List only in the category you think most appropriate in such cases.

Skip a category if it is not relevant to you or if you have nothing to report. Note that the large number of categories is given to jog your recollection and many pertain only to a few individuals.

Faculty are urged to maintain an ongoing file with all information and materials pertinent to the end-of-year report. It is highly recommended that at the time when you submit your annual report you create a new computer file with the outline of the report, to which you add data throughout the upcoming year whenever you have new items to report. A report template, already formatted, is available as a file for download in Word format. What follows is an example of an annual report with additional instructions.

Sample Annual Report on Professional Activities

Comments are printed in red. Sample entries for many items are shown.

I. TEACHING

1. Courses Taught For each summer session (if applicable) and semester, list courses taught. Include DIS courses here, with title and name of student. Example:

Summer I

- ENG 110 - Introduction to Literature: Literature of the Sea

Fall

- ENG 101 (2 sections) - College Writing and Reading I
- ENG 310 - Theory and Practice of Editing
- ENG 491 - Gender and Technical Writing, Jane Doe

Spring

- ENG 201 - College Writing and Reading II
- ENG 226 - World Literature since 1600
- ENG 561 - Topics in American Literature: The Novels of Toni Morrison

2. New Courses Taught List any of the above courses that are newly introduced courses or that you had never taught before.

1. Courses new to the department

- ENG 561 - The Novels of Toni Morrison

2. Courses new to you

- ENG 310 - Theory and Practice of Editing

3. Honors Committees List your role on any honors committee(s), with the name of the student, the department (if other than English), and the project topic. NB: list projects only once. Projects noted as "in progress" should NOT be listed as "completed" or even mentioned in the next year's annual report.

- Director, Jane Jones, "A Feminist Reading of *The Scarlet Letter*"
- Reader, Sam Smith, Biology, "Parasitic Micro-organisms in the Viscera of Seagulls"

4. Graduate Committees List your role (director or reader) on any graduate thesis committee(s), the student's name, and either the thesis title (if begun) or the general area of inquiry. Also list whether the thesis is "completed" or "in progress." NB: list projects only once. Projects noted as "in progress" should NOT be listed as "completed" or even mentioned in the next year's annual report.

- Director, Linda Larkin, "Middle English Vowel Lengthening"
- Reader, Paul Perot, topic: the French and German epistolary novel

5. Other Teaching Activities List innovative or noteworthy teaching initiatives in your own classes or curricular innovations; guest lectures that you gave in the classes of other faculty; participation in teaching workshops or other such organized activity; non-refereed publications that assist in course development or delivery; publications that contribute to student projects (for

example, introductions to student-designed pamphlets); and other mentoring of students outside of class.

- I created two hypermedia classroom presentations on Allen Ginsberg and Robert Lowell for ENG 375: American and British Poetry since 1945, incorporating text, animation, sound, and video.
- I attended a 15-hour hypermedia workshop from the Center for Teaching Excellence, September 9-12.
- I mentored Jane Doe, who applied for and received an Undergraduate Research Award.
- I served as mentor for Joe Roe, who served as a pro bono web site consultant for Pig Waste, Inc.
- I taught a course in document design at the University of Swansea, Wales.
- I wrote an introduction for a student-designed chapbook produced in ENG 306.

6. Pedagogical Grants List grants connected to teaching, such as course development grants.

7. Awards or Recognition for Teaching List any awards or recognition, including recognition by students (e.g., a "significant impact" recognition by a graduate: list each semester).

II. SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH

For categories 1.a and 1.b, list publications already in print only. For works that are in press or accepted for future publication or for those published after April 1 of this year, list them in category 2, "Forthcoming."

Treat the listings in categories 1-3 as if you were producing a Works Cited page. Within any category, list works in alphabetical, not chronological, order. Provide all standard information using MLA bibliographic (not footnote) format. Sample entries are given below; for further information about MLA conventions, consult the MLA Handbook.

1. Publications in Print

a. Refereed scholarly publications

- Brown, Ashley. *Ideology and the Classroom*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 201_.
- Brown, Ashley. "Modeling Theory and Composing Process Models." *Journal of Basic Writing* 44.1 (201_): 40-58.
- Brown, Ashley. "The Theme of Desire in The Talented Mr. Ripley, Novel and Film." *Essays on Patricia Highsmith*. Ed. Jonathan Critic. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 20___. 78-99.

b. Non-refereed

- Brown, Ashley. "Evaluation of Teaching: Quirks and Peccadilloes." *The Teacher's Web*. 20 Sept. 201_. <<http://teaching-R-us.org/brown.html>>.
- Brown, Ashley. "Juvenalia." *A Samuel Johnson Encyclopedia*. Ed. Jane Boswell. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 201_. 142-47.
- Brown, Ashley. "Laissez les bons temps rouler." Rev. of William Rushton, *Cajun Folk Rituals*. *Journal of Popular Culture* 12.3 (201_): 38-50.
- Brown, Ashley. "A Lost Review by Mark Twain" *Mark Twain Newsletter* 2 (201_): 5-10.

2. Forthcoming Publications and Conferences List any scholarly works which are in press, for which you have signed a contract, or for which you have a letter of acceptance for future publication. List also acceptances for upcoming conference presentations.

- Brown, Ashley. *Deconstructing Evaluation*. New York: Landfill, forthcoming.

3. Conference Activity Give full information, including the city and the specific date on which the paper was presented (not the inclusive dates of the conference). Write out conference names in full; do not use initials.

a. Presentations

- Brown, Ashley. "Peer Observation as Fact, Fabrication, and Fantasy." North American Society for Teacher Training. St. Johns, Newfoundland, 11 Oct. 201_.

b. Other conference activity List conference sessions you chaired; give session title, conference name, city, session date. List other conferences you attended (i.e., not as a presenter or session chair); give conference name, city, conference dates.

4. Grants List all grants applied for; for each give the grant amount, the application's status (funded, pending, not funded), the granting agency, and the purpose of the grant. Also include UNCW grants (e.g., Cahill grants, Summer Initiatives) in this category.

- \$24,000 (pending), American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship, for research about the genesis of the American Little Theater movement.

5. Awards or Recognition for Scholarly Work List any awards or recognition for research or scholarly achievements.

6. Other Scholarly Activity List initiatives to foster scholarship, such as study/reading groups organized or workshops presented on scholarly methods or tools. List participation in or attendance at such activities. List editorships of journals, manuscript reviews for academic and commercial presses, consultancies, ETS readings, refereeing for scholarly journals, guest lectures on other campuses, and other professional activity not listed elsewhere.

III. SERVICE

1. Service to Department List any of the following that are applicable:

1. Departmental administrative offices or assignments
2. Service on departmental committees
3. Assigned departmental tasks
4. Assigned mentoring/consulting for graduate teaching assistants or faculty
5. Leadership/presentation in departmental study groups, forums, or workshops
6. Advising of departmentally sponsored student clubs, publications, or activities
7. Other service to the department

2. Service to the College of Arts and Sciences List any of the following that are applicable:

1. Service on College-level standing committees or ad hoc committees (e.g., to draft interdisciplinary minors)
2. Service to other departments in the College (e.g., on hiring committees or honors committees)
3. General College advising
4. Other service to the College

3. Service to the University List any of the following that are applicable:

1. Service on University committees and boards (list offices, special duties, if any). You may state "anonymous service on an awards committee," if applicable, but do not name the committee.
2. Service on Faculty Senate
3. Representing UNCW outside the campus (e.g., Faculty Assembly delegate)
4. Leadership/service in interdisciplinary or university-wide study groups, colloquia, book clubs, or panels (e.g., Feminist Colloquium, Women's History Month Committee)
5. Service to departments not in Arts & Sciences (i.e., the professional schools or Library)
6. Other University service (e.g., advising for panels, boards, or university-sponsored student clubs, publications, or activities)

4. Service to Professional Organizations List any of the following that are applicable. Give full names of organizations, not initials.

1. Offices in professional organizations or nominations to office
2. Appointment as journal referee or editorial board member
3. Other service to professional organizations

5. Professional Service to the Community Under categories a-g, list service related to your role as an academic--i.e., activities in which you represented the department or university, or which enhanced community-university relations, or in which you made use of your academic expertise or scholarly interests to enhance the quality of community life.

1. Organization of or participation in workshops or conferences for area teachers, writers, etc.
2. Public lectures, presentations on community panels, leading of discussions, addresses to local clubs and associations
3. Presentations in area schools or other academic institutions
4. Appearances/interviews on local media (radio, television, newspaper)
5. Teaching Elderhostel or continuing-education courses
6. Service on community boards and committees
7. Other academically related community service (e.g., judging of contests, advising of groups)

Last updated: Jan. 27, 2011

4. Classroom Observation

Classroom observations by peers are an important means of assessing and documenting instructional effectiveness and complement student evaluation. Observers should meet with faculty being observed prior to the observation to discuss the nature of the course and the goals for the class being observed. Observers should also consult relevant teaching material in order to evaluate the context of the class

(syllabi, assignments, readings, and so forth) and should refer to those materials in the observation report. Those teaching online classes will arrange for scheduled observers to be members of the course so that their course materials and methods may be evaluated.

All faculty may request peer observations during any semester, and they may also be observed at the discretion of the chair. Observations are required in the following instances:

- Tenure-track faculty are observed once each semester by a senior colleague until tenured.
- Faculty seeking promotion to full professor are observed by at least two colleagues of higher academic rank prior to application for promotion.
- Tenured faculty are observed by at least two colleagues prior to post-tenure review (a minimum of twice every five years).
- Full-time lecturers are observed during the first six semesters of appointment by colleagues of professorial rank; part-time lecturers are observed for six semesters by members of the full-time faculty. After this initial observation period, full- and part-time lecturers are observed a minimum of twice every five years.

The chair selects observers, from which point faculty being observed are responsible for arranging observations of their own classes. Dates of visits must be established at the start of the semester, and observations must occur at least two weeks before final exams begin. Failure to arrange observations provides grounds for denial of reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Lecturers who do not arrange observations may not be rehired.

Observers fill out an on-line classroom observation report form; when possible, the form should be filled out on the same day as the observation. A copy of each observation report is submitted to the chair; another is given to the observee. This copy should be retained for inclusion in annual reports and applications for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. See also Writing Classroom Observation Reports (.ppt)

revised Fall 2016

5. Graduate-Faculty Status

Procedure

A faculty member seeking instatement or renewal of graduate-faculty status must complete a form, available from the department office, and submit it to the chair. The chair convenes the committee appointed to review graduate-faculty status. The chair communicates the committee's recommendation to the Graduate School, which makes a determination on the faculty member's status.

Criteria

In addition to the university-wide criteria [[click here](#) for a link to the criteria section of the Graduate Bylaws], the English Department sets the following specific criteria for graduate-faculty status:

Scholarly activity in English may assume any of the following forms: published books or book chapters; published journal articles; book reviews/review articles, research reference entries; manuscript reviews; editing of journals; grant awards; participation in workshops and competitive seminars; consultant; conference presentations; public lectures; and other publications, in traditional or electronic formats.

- The scholarly record of individual faculty over a five-year period must include publication, resulting from peer review, of at least one book, or two substantial articles or book chapters, or equivalent works, at a nationally recognized level.
- In addition, the scholarly record should include participation in other scholarly activities such as those enumerated above and active participation in the graduate program.
- Faculty may also meet criterion number one with written acceptances of two substantial articles by a journal editor, with written acceptance of two book chapters by a publisher, with written acceptances by journal editor of one article and written acceptance by a publisher of one book chapter, or with written acceptance of a book manuscript by a publisher. The two articles, two book chapters, combination of article and chapter, or the book need not actually be in print at the time of application for renewal of graduate faculty status for the faculty member to remain on the graduate faculty.
- Items listed as forthcoming or in print in one graduate faculty status review cycle cannot be listed in a subsequent review cycle.

[Revision approved 11/30/07 by the Graduate Council]
Last updated: February 24, 2010

6. Emeritus Status

In keeping with the UNCW Faculty Handbook, the Department of English acknowledges that Emeritus status "is an honor accorded to retired faculty in recognition of their distinguished and sustained service to the university."

Eligible faculty are those retired members of the Department of English who were tenured at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor for a minimum of eight years at UNCW.

All recommendations for emeritus appointments must originate within the department. After receiving a recommendation, the chairperson will convene the faculty and following a consultation with and the approval of those assembled faculty members, the chairperson will relay the faculty's recommendation to the CAS dean, with a recommendation that reflects the members' vote.

Emeritus faculty are (1) invited to formal convocations and general faculty events; (2) listed in the Undergraduate Catalogue and University Telephone Directory; (3) accorded library privileges, e-mail, free ID cards, and free parking, if requested; and (4) admitted to athletic and cultural events at faculty rates. Emeritus faculty are not eligible to hold office or to vote in faculty elections.

Emeritus faculty are not eligible to hold office or to vote in faculty elections or other departmental business. Faculty on phased retirement retain their professorial rank and are not eligible for emeritus status until their participation in the program is completed.

(Note: Much of the language of this policy is taken directly from the UNCW Faculty Handbook.)
[adopted January 16, 2015]

7. Post-Tenure Review

In most cases, tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review every five years. Faculty members should consult the timetable to see when particular individuals are slated for review. Faculty members are also

urged to consult the UNCW policy on Post-Tenure Review, whose guidelines the Department of English shall follow, and which can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#):

Procedure

Faculty members under review complete the PTR form with attachments, outlining their professional activities for the prior five years. These reports are made available to senior faculty for review. Senior faculty complete the evaluation form for each colleague under review and submit it to the chair. In certain cases, the chair may convene the senior faculty for additional consultation. The chair reviews the reports and faculty evaluations and writes the chair's evaluation. The chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation, The faculty member and chair sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the faculty member. The chair forwards a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the evaluation, and the faculty member's response, if any, to the dean.

The Faculty Member's Report

Faculty in the Department of English who undergo post-tenure review submit the PTR form with required attachments, providing an unelaborated, unadorned listing of professional activities, limited to the period under review (in most cases, the prior five years), as follows.

- Courses taught, listed in numerical, not chronological order
- Graduate and honors theses directed or read
- Mentorship of students in academic matters, such as for fellowships, collaborative research, or other independent work
- Internships and DIS supervision
- Innovations in teaching, such as engaging students in applied learning activities
- Curricular and course development and revisions
- Professional development activities (self/others)
- Scholarly Publications
- Scholarly presentations
- Service Activities: University, College, Departmental, Professional, Community
- Awards/Grants (teaching, research, service)
- The goals established by the faculty member and a brief statement of progress toward achieving the goals.

Attachments: chair's evaluations for the previous five years, peer evaluations of teaching, representative syllabi and assignments, copies of publications. The chair attaches a summary of student teaching evaluations provided by Institutional Research.

Outcomes

According to the *Faculty Handbook*, the purpose of PTR is "to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance that meets or exceeds expectations" and to provide "for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty whose performance is judged to be below expectations." As the *Faculty Handbook* explains,

"Each faculty member reviewed for post-tenure review shall be given an assessment that is in one of the following three categories: *exceeds expectations*, *meets expectations*, or *does not meet expectations*."

Criteria for *meeting expectations* are professional competence and conscientious discharge of duties in relation to the goals/plan established at the beginning of the review period, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair/school director. Performance below these criteria *does not meet expectations*.

Criteria for *exceeds expectations* are sustained excellence in the teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service portfolio; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty in the unit and the university.”

Criteria for Evaluations

A faculty member in the Department of English is expected to be professionally competent, conscientious in the discharge of teaching, and demonstrably engaged in scholarship and other duties given departmental distribution of workload, and to have made efforts to improve performance. A faculty member should meet departmental expectations for solid teaching as evidenced by syllabi that show awareness of current theory and practice and that reflect departmental guidelines and requirements. A faculty member should demonstrate engagement in scholarship and show a record of service appropriate to the faculty member's assignment of duties. A faculty member whose annual reviews have indicated satisfactory performance or better during the period under review shall normally be expected to receive a satisfactory evaluation or better under PTR. A rating of “meets expectations” is the expected rating for almost all departmental faculty members under review.

- **Teaching:** the faculty member should meet the standard set by other faculty in the English department by demonstrating what is expected of all faculty: solid teaching, appropriate syllabi, and engaging and challenging assignments.
- **Research:** the faculty member should show a record of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications that meets the standard set in relation to the faculty members' workload assignment. For *research active faculty*, publications, for the period under review, should meet the standard set by CAS for research-active status (“two articles in a discipline-appropriate peer-reviewed journal, or one peer-reviewed article and the development of one peer-reviewed funded grant whose results are widely disseminated; or a monograph” in the preceding five years), and should also have done some (but not necessarily all) of the following: book reviews/review articles, research reference entries, manuscript reviews, editing of journals, grant awards, participation in workshops and competitive seminars, conference presentations and other conference participation. *Non-research-active faculty* should show signs of scholarly activity appropriate to their status, such as conference participation, works in progress, or workshops in grant writing or scholarly publishing.
- **Service:** the faculty member should, for the period under review, show a service record that meets the standard set by most colleagues in the department. Such service will be expected to include contributions to the department beyond that defined by the job itself (undergraduate advising, observation of colleagues' teaching, letters of recommendation for students, and participation in departmental functions, meetings, hiring, etc.). Such service can include committee work on various departmental, college, and/or university committees, serving as a reader for scholarly journals or presses, work as an external reviewer for tenure, etc., as well as service to the community.

This policy was revised by the department in Fall 2016.

8. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

Candidates for RTP should consult and be guided by the university's RTP guidelines and procedures published in the [Faculty Handbook](#). In addition, the following are departmental policies and procedures.

The Probationary Period

The probationary years leading to the tenure decision are an important period, during which the probationary faculty member establishes a record of teaching, research, and service and during which the senior faculty get to know the probationary faculty member as a colleague. The English Department has a considerable investment in each faculty member and seeks to guide the faculty member's development through its mentoring program, annual peer evaluations, and annual evaluations by the chair.

Chair's Annual Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

The *Faculty Handbook* states:

“The outcome of a reappointment or tenure decision should not be a surprise to either the department or the candidate. Department chairpersons are obligated to provide probationary faculty, at the time of hiring, with clear, written indications of the criteria necessary for achieving tenure and promotion. As part of the annual evaluation process, the chairperson must give each tenure-track faculty member a candid written assessment of that person's progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion, as well as practical guidelines for meeting those requirements. The department's senior faculty play a central role in the mentoring of probationary faculty, and the chairperson is required annually to provide the senior faculty with a summary of the assessments that the chairperson has given to tenure-track faculty of their progress toward tenure and promotion. When the faculty member is subsequently considered for tenure and promotion, the chairperson's recommendation should normally be consistent with the assessments the faculty member has received in annual evaluations. When the chairperson's recommendation differs from those prior assessments, the chairperson shall explain what circumstances have arisen to cause the discrepancy.”

Candidates should be aware that the interpretations and recommendations of the senior faculty and the chair are not binding on those involved in the approval process beyond the department.

Length of Probationary Service

The *Faculty Handbook* states:

“A faculty member hired as an assistant professor must complete at least two years of probationary service before being considered for tenure. No other minimum time requirement for service at any level has been established. The decision shall be based entirely on the cumulative achievement of the faculty member. For faculty who spent a portion of their career at institutions other than UNCW, their research/scholarship/artistic activities and service to the profession must be considered when applying for RTP. Faculty members must continue to demonstrate an ongoing record of achievement at UNCW in these areas. It is to be emphasized that employment for a given time period at a particular level does not in and of itself imply automatic promotion and tenure. In fact, every consideration for advancement or tenure must involve analysis of the individual's complete record of achievement.”

A faculty member who is considering whether to apply for tenure before a decision is mandatory should seek guidance from the department chair and senior mentors. When a probationary faculty member does apply for tenure prior to the mandatory time, the senior faculty shall in their deliberations determine whether they have had sufficient time to know the applicant as a faculty member and colleague and, if so, whether the applicant has fully met the criteria for tenure and promotion. If the senior faculty determine that the department and the candidate would benefit from an additional period of probation, they will decline to recommend for tenure but without prejudice for subsequent consideration.

RTP Application

A candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure shall submit an RTP application file by a deadline set by the chair and in the [format specified in the Faculty Handbook](#). The chair shall assign one or more members of the senior faculty to review the application for proper format and effective presentation and to provide the candidate with recommendations for editing and revision. The candidate shall submit the revised application by a deadline set by the chair, and the application file will be made available for review by the senior faculty.

Definition of Senior Faculty

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that the department's assembled senior faculty make RTP recommendations to the department chair. For reappointment of assistant professors and for all tenure recommendations, the English Department defines senior faculty as all tenured faculty in the department. For promotion recommendations, senior faculty is defined as all tenured faculty holding at least the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion. That is, tenured associate and full professors recommend regarding promotion to associate professor, and tenured full professors recommend regarding promotion to full professor.

External Review of Candidates

The Department of English does not require external review of candidates for tenure and promotion decisions. External reviews are never used for recommendations for reappointment. External review may be authorized for tenure and promotion decisions when the candidate requests it or when it is determined by a majority of the senior faculty that they lack adequate expertise to evaluate a candidate's scholarship. In the former instance, the candidate must submit a formal written request to the chair during the semester prior to applying for tenure, promotion, or both. In the latter instance, members of the senior faculty must adhere to one of the following procedures:

- During deliberations on the reappointment of a candidate, the assembled senior faculty may, by majority vote, authorize external review of the candidate during the subsequent evaluation for tenure and promotion.
- Senior faculty members may also indicate a preference for external review in their annual evaluation of a junior faculty member; if a majority of senior faculty so indicate, external review shall be authorized during evaluation for tenure and promotion.
- A committee evaluating an associate professor during the annual review process may recommend external evaluation during subsequent consideration for promotion to full professor. If so, the chair shall convene the senior faculty (in this case, the department's tenured full professors), who shall determine by majority vote whether to authorize external review.

In those cases in which external review is requested, whether by the candidate or by the senior faculty, the solicitation and use of external reviewers shall adhere to the following guidelines:

- The chair shall, in a timely manner consistent with evaluation deadlines, appoint a committee of senior faculty to oversee the process.
- The committee shall solicit two external reviews, and at least one review shall be solicited from a list of potential reviewers provided by the candidate.
- The committee shall provide external reviewers with the candidate's CV, with information provided by the candidate relating to his or her scholarship and research, and with copies of the candidate's publications. Reviewers shall be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship as well as the candidate's contribution to the field. Reviewers shall not be asked to make a recommendation on tenure or promotion.

- The department chair will also make clear to external reviewers, the senior faculty, and the candidate what the role of the external reviewers will be.

The *Faculty Handbook* states:

“The anonymity of reviewers is essential in assuring candid reviews, and reviewers shall be asked to submit a cover letter identifying themselves, their affiliation, and any personal or professional connection to the candidate. Reviews are to be submitted as attachments to the cover letter and should contain no information identifying the reviewers. Senior faculty and others making decisions on the candidacy shall have access to both the reviewers' identities and evaluations, but only the content of the reviews shall be made available to the candidate.”

The *Faculty Handbook* further states, "In its deliberations the senior faculty shall consider such reviews as one among many forms of documentation providing information on the candidacy. In cases where external reviews are not required, the absence of such reviews shall not be considered a detriment in any way to the candidacy."

Criteria

Recommendations of the senior faculty and of the chair shall be in accordance with the criteria set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. Criteria specific to reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RPT) in the English Department are as follows:

Candidates for reappointment to the rank of assistant professor, promotion to associate professor with tenure, or promotion to professor must, in the view of the senior faculty, demonstrate evidence of consistently high levels of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service to advance through ranks. In general, candidates should demonstrate progress toward establishing a professional reputation with a level of visibility beyond the UNCW campus, especially for promotion to professor. As stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, “teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for reappointment, promotion and tenure.” However, it is important to note that excellence in one domain does not necessarily mitigate deficiencies in other domains, nor does meeting minimum standards guarantee a positive RTP decision. To make decisions about RTP recommendations, the senior faculty evaluates data provided by the candidate, the department chairperson, and optional external reviews for promotion to professor. It is also helpful to discuss one’s readiness for promotion to full professor with one or more professors prior to putting oneself up for promotion.

TEACHING

Teaching responsibilities are primary criteria for RPT in the English Department. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness are based upon a candidate’s course instruction, advising duties, formal mentoring of students and/or campus groups, curriculum development, and teaching-related community outreach.

The following will be considered evaluative of teaching as it pertains to RTP. Minimum expectations for each level of the professorate follow:

- Reappointment: activities from a minimum of 4 bullet points
- Assistant professor to associate professor: activities from a minimum of 5 bullet points
- Associate professor to professor: activities from a minimum of 6 bullet points

Note: Bolded items must be included for stated review level.

- **Syllabi, examinations, and assignments that demonstrate professional competence (rigor, range, and depth of coverage) as well as adherence to departmental guidelines and expectations regarding writing assignments and research projects**
- **Peer observation reports reflecting a historical pattern of positive evaluation**
- **IDEA scores reflecting student perception of effective teaching and classroom management**
- Contribution to honors projects, MA theses/exams, or other mentoring activities (such as nominating and mentoring students for university or national awards or providing student service learning opportunities)
- Development of new courses or directed independent studies or renovations of existing courses
- Teaching initiatives such as international studies, honors courses, learning communities, or other activities
- Participation in teaching workshops, teacher mentoring, or other such organized activities
- Leading or facilitating a university-wide workshop or activity that promotes excellence in teaching or mentoring
- Engaging in teaching-related community outreach as a representative of UNCW
- Recognition in the form of teaching awards or significant impact citations
- Grant proposals for teaching submitted and/or funded.
- Other evidence of teaching excellence performed by the candidate

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarly achievements include published books, articles, book chapters, review essays, book reviews, and other professional writing; papers at academic conferences and invited public lectures; and successful grant applications. The quality of these achievements is determined by their impact and originality and by the prestige of the venue in which they are made public. Each artifact presented is specific to the review period in which it occurred and does not carry over to subsequent review periods. The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged within the context of the discipline and show continuous productivity related to workload.

For reappointment and for tenure, articles/book chapters/books that are accepted but not yet published count; for promotion to professor, publications must be published.

The following will be considered evaluative of research and scholarship as it pertains to RTP. Minimum expectations for each level of the professorate follow:

- Reappointment: activities from a minimum of 3 bullet points
- Assistant professor to associate professor: activities from a minimum of 4 bullet points
- Associate professor to professor: activities from a minimum of 5 bullet points

Note: Bolded items must be included for stated review level.

- **Peer-reviewed refereed journal articles (in print or in press).**
 - Evidence of at least 1 peer-reviewed journal article/book chapter under consideration while at UNCW (**reappointment only**).

- A minimum of 4 peer-reviewed journal articles or 1 peer-reviewed book-length monograph or its equivalent while at UNCW (**assistant professor to associate professor only**).
- A minimum of 6 peer-reviewed journal articles/book chapters, or a combination of articles and book-length monograph(s) that demonstrate on-going involvement in research and scholarship (**associate professor to professor only**).
- **Peer-reviewed papers or other presentations presented at professional meetings.**
Performance below these minimum expectations may be considered if (a) substantial external grant activity is evidenced or (b) the minimum expectations for peer-reviewed journal articles/book chapters are substantially exceeded.
 - A minimum of 2 peer-reviewed conference papers or presentations accepted or delivered while at UNCW (**reappointment only**).
 - A minimum of 4 peer-reviewed papers or presentations accepted or delivered while at UNCW (**assistant professor to associate professor only**).
 - A minimum of 6 papers or presentations delivered while at UNCW (**associate professor to professor only**).
- **Grant Proposals**
 - Internal grant funded or external grant proposal submitted
- Foster student research projects that culminate in a local (university/civic) or state / regional/national presentation.
- Organize a professional research symposium or conference
- Invited lecture(s) to an external audience
- Editor for a scholarly publication
- Editor for peer research, publication, or presentation or exhibition
- Other evidence of research or scholarly activity (more than one activity may be counted as separate instances)

SERVICE

Service responsibilities of faculty are defined as formal and informal professional activities on behalf of the faculty member's department, college, university, profession, and the community at large. Most of the faculty member's early service contributions will be at the department level. During subsequent years, the faculty member should strive to make service contributions to the college and university as a whole, and eventually to the profession and to the community at large.

The following will be considered evaluative of service as it pertains to RPT. Minimum expectations for each level of the professorate follow:

- Reappointment: activities from a minimum of 1 bullet points
- Assistant professor to associate professor: activities from a minimum of 3 bullet points
- Associate professor to professor: activities from a minimum of 5 bullet points

Note: Bolded items must be included for stated review level.

- **A history of active service to the English Department, as demonstrated by participation on a departmental committee or other assignment (required for all levels).**
- **A history of active service to UNCW, as demonstrated by participation on a CAS or UNCW committee(s) or other assignment (required for associate to professor; optional for assistant professor to associate professor and reappointment)**
- **A history of active service to one's professional discipline in such a way as to be recognized as having a positive reputation within her/his professional field (required for associate professor to professor; optional for assistant professor to associate professor and reappointment)**
- Participation on a state, regional, or national committee (strongly encouraged for promotion to professor)
- Committee leadership roles outside of ENG (strongly encouraged for promotion to professor)
- Administrative activities on behalf of professional organizations, such as service as an editorial board member, as an officer in a scholarly organization, or in some other official capacity (strongly encouraged for promotion to professor)
- Service as reviewer for multiple peer-reviewed manuscripts or monographs
- Service as grant reviewer for professional organizations
- Service as tenure reviewer for an external department
- Service as a mentor to a junior faculty member (strongly encouraged for promotion to professor)
- Involvement in the community in activities related to an area of professional expertise
- At least two presentations to community groups that utilize professional expertise
- Faculty advisor to student organizations
- Other evidence of professional, college, or university-related service

Adopted April 2017

Recommendation of the Senior Faculty

After senior faculty members have reviewed the application files of the RTP candidates, the department chair shall convene the senior faculty to deliberate and make recommendations. For tenure and promotion decisions, the senior faculty will first consider any applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and then consider any applications for promotion to full professor. Only full professors will remain for consideration of promotions to full professor. The *Faculty Handbook* states:

“Neither the faculty member nor any person related to or having a romantic relationship with the faculty member may deliberate or recommend on an RTP action. Other persons may also recuse themselves if they believe their relationship with the faculty member prevents them from fair and objective consideration of the application.”

Before each candidate is discussed, the chair shall circulate a simple statement to be signed by those assembled affirming that they were present for deliberations regarding that candidate. The chair will then invite a candid discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, first in the area of teaching, then in research, and finally in service. When discussion concludes, each faculty member will in turn cast an advisory ballot on whether the candidate should be recommended for the action being applied for. The chair will record and announce the numerical vote for, against, and abstaining but will not record how individuals voted. At this time, the chair may choose to indicate whether his or her recommendation will

accord with the majority recommendation of the senior faculty. In cases where the chair's recommendation differs, the procedure, as outlined by the *Faculty Handbook*, is as follows:

“At least five business days prior to forwarding the candidate's dossier to the dean, the chairperson must notify the senior faculty, by either written or electronic means, whether the recommendation is for or against the action. The chairperson's recommendation, which becomes part of the RTP application, is a personnel document. As such, the chairperson provides his/her recommendation to the candidate and forwards it or the application to the next levels of review.

If a majority of the department's senior faculty disagree with the recommendation of the chairperson, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation. Only one such recommendation from senior faculty may be submitted, and it must be signed by a majority of the department's senior faculty.

The chairperson's recommendation and a separate senior-faculty recommendation, if any, are forwarded to the dean as part of the faculty member's RTP dossier.”

Confidentiality

Confidentiality and mutual respect are essential for fostering frank and candid discussion. Moreover, evaluation of an RTP candidate constitutes a confidential personnel action, and faculty present during deliberations are prohibited by law and by ethical canons from revealing any part of those deliberations to any persons not authorized to deliberate on that action.

Last updated: Fall 2016

9. Appointment and Reappointment of Lecturers and Appointment to Senior Lecturer Status

The English Department's policy on the appointment and reappointment of lecturers and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer status conforms to the guidelines specified in the UNCW Faculty Handbook (effective August 1, 2007) and as amended by the Senate on October 7, 2014.

Appointment and Reappointment of Lecturers Teaching on a One-Year Contract

The initial term of appointment for a lecturer shall be one year. Before the end of the lecturer's first year, the department chair and the dean, after reviewing the evidence provided by the annual lecturer evaluation process and taking into consideration the department's curriculum needs, shall determine whether the lecturer is to be 1) reappointed or 2) not reappointed.

Lecturers hired on a one-year contract are observed and reviewed twice a semester during the first three years of appointment.

Lecturers hired on a one-year contract are expected to provide the following review materials in their annual evaluation reports: 1) representative teaching materials such as course syllabi, assignment descriptions, study guides, and other items pertinent to the instructor's pedagogy, professional development, or service; 2) teaching observation reports and IDEA summary pages for all courses taught over the previous Fall, Summer, and Spring terms; lecturers hired on an initial one-year contract are expected to submit annual departmental evaluation forms.

Appointment to an Initial Three-Year Contract

After a lecturer has been appointed at least twice to a one-year contract, the lecturer is eligible to apply for an initial three-year contract, though he or she may choose to remain on a one-year contract. Any eligible lecturer who chooses to apply for an initial three-year contract should notify the chair of this intention at the beginning of the spring term, at which point the chair will consult the assembled senior faculty, who, in addition to the annual review dossiers from the previous two years, will review the lecturer's annual evaluation report for the current year. The chair shall then recommend to the dean that the lecturer be 1) appointed to a three-year contract or 2) reappointed to a one-year contract. The department chairperson may subsequently reappoint a person as a lecturer on a one- or three-year contract indefinitely and without further consultation dependent upon the needs of the academic unit and the availability of the position.

Promotion to the Rank of Senior Lecturer

Once a lecturer nears completion of an initial three-year contract, he or she is eligible to apply for a second three-year contract and promotion to senior lecturer status. Promotion to senior lecturer status is based on the department's desire to recognize superior performance and service to the department. Should an eligible lecturer decide to apply for promotion to senior lecturer status, the department chair convenes the senior faculty to discuss the candidate's qualifications to determine whether the lecturer be appointed to a second-three year contract and promoted to senior lecturer status. Senior lecturers receive three-year contracts. Such a designation does not guarantee further reappointment. While the typical timetable outlined above requires six years of service at UNCW prior to promotion to Senior Lecturer, a lecturer with previous professional experience and outstanding performance and service at UNCW may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer two years from their date of hire.

No faculty member related to or having a romantic relationship with the lecturer under consideration may deliberate or recommend on the contract appointment decision. Other faculty members may also recuse themselves if they believe their relationship with the lecturer under consideration prevents them from fair and objective consideration of the candidate's application.

In consideration of the lecturer's requested promotion to senior lecturer status, the chair shall invite a candid discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, first in the area of teaching, then in the area of service. When discussion concludes, each faculty member will in turn cast an advisory ballot on whether the candidate should be recommended for appointment to a second three-year contract and promotion to senior lecturer status. The chair will record and announce the numerical vote for, against, and abstaining but will not record how individuals voted. The chair will then indicate whether his or her recommendation will accord with the majority recommendation of the senior faculty.

If the chair indicates that his or her recommendation will not accord with the majority recommendation, the chair shall leave the room, during which time the assembled faculty will determine if a majority of those assembled wish to submit a dissenting evaluation to the dean.

Confidentiality and mutual respect are essential for fostering frank and candid discussion. Moreover, evaluation of any lecturer applying for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer constitutes a confidential personnel action, and faculty present during deliberations are prohibited by law and by ethical canons from revealing any part of those deliberations to any persons not authorized to deliberate on that action.

If, following the review process, a lecturer is not recommended for appointment to a second three-year contract and promotion to senior lecturer status, the chair, acting upon input from senior faculty and in consultation with the CAS dean, shall determine if the individual is to be reappointed to a one-year contract or released.

A lecturer completing a first three-year contract may decline to apply for senior lecturer status and may request, instead, to remain a lecturer on a subsequent three-year contract or return to a one-year contract.

Last updated: February 20, 2015

III. Hiring

1. Hiring Procedure: Professorial-Rank Faculty

In addition to complying with all university and College procedures, the Department of English observes the following procedures in hiring professorial-rank faculty:

1. The department determines by vote the area in which to hire a new professorial-rank faculty member and seeks approval from the dean to recruit. Upon receiving authorization, the department chair, in consultation with the Steering Committee, appoints a hiring committee and names a committee chair.
2. The hiring committee drafts an advertisement, which the department chair circulates to the department for review. Typically, the advertisement does not state a deadline for application but includes the statement "Screening begins [date] and continues until the position is filled." With approval from the dean, the department chair places the ad.
3. The hiring committee, having established criteria, reviews applications and selects semi-finalists for interviews, typically at MLA. After approval is received from the HR, the committee chair contacts the candidates to arrange semi-final interviews. The department chair, in consultation with the hiring committee, appoints an interview team, which normally includes the hiring committee chair.
4. After the interviews, the hiring committee selects finalists for campus visits, in consultation with the interview team and the department chair. The department chair seeks approval from the dean for the visits.
5. The hiring committee chair invites candidates to campus and, in consultation with the department chair, makes all arrangements for the visits. The committee chair oversees all aspects of the visits.
6. Each visit includes a teaching demonstration, a presentation/interview with the department, and a reception. All professorial-rank faculty are expected, at a minimum, to be present at each interview and reception. As part of the permanent faculty of the department, lecturers' input is welcomed and they are invited to take part in the interviews and receptions.
7. Following the visit of the last candidate, professorial-rank faculty meet in executive session to determine the order in which candidates shall be offered the position. Lecturers are invited to attend and take part in discussion as well. If prior departmental approval is given, certain other faculty may be present for initial discussion but may not remain for balloting. The meeting is chaired by the department chair. A discussion of the candidate who visited first takes place, followed by a discussion of the second candidate, and so on. It is suggested that individual faculty speak no more than twice during discussion of any one candidate. All discussions of candidates during the meeting as well as all votes and proceedings are strictly confidential and may not be disclosed or discussed with others outside the meeting.
8. Following discussion, voting takes place. Only professorial-rank faculty who have attended all interviews and/or teaching demonstrations may vote. Ballots are not signed. On the initial ballot, each voting faculty member lists one name, the voter's first preference among the candidates.
9. An eligible faculty member who cannot attend the meeting may, prior to the meeting, tender to the department chair an absentee ballot on which the candidates are listed in order of preference. In all votes, the relative order of preference among candidates on an absentee ballot shall be consulted to determine the absent faculty member's vote.

10. If one candidate receives a majority of votes among those casting ballots, that candidate shall be offered the position, upon approval from the dean. If no candidate receives a majority, the candidate receiving the fewest votes is eliminated, and a second vote takes place. However, if two or more candidates are tied with the fewest votes, a preliminary vote is taken to determine which candidate is eliminated, followed by another vote among the remaining candidates.
11. If one of the remaining candidates receives a majority of votes among ballots cast, that candidate shall be offered the position, upon approval from the dean. If more than three candidates visited the campus, the previous step may need to be repeated until one candidate attains a majority. If, at the end, no candidate attains a majority because the department is evenly split between the final two candidates, a vote among eligible voting members of the hiring committee breaks the tie.
12. After a candidate is selected to be offered the position, the department votes on whether the second-place candidate should be offered the position if the first candidate declines the offer. Likewise, it votes on whether the third-place candidate should be offered the position if the other candidates both decline.
13. The department chair, upon approval from the dean, contacts the candidate to make the offer.

The above procedures may be modified by departmental vote for specific searches if circumstances warrant.

[rev. Oct. 22, 2010]

2. Hiring Procedure: Full-Time Lecturers

Lectureships are one-year appointments, which are renewable, given satisfactory performance and available resources. Duties are primarily instructional, involving a four-course load. Appropriately qualified lecturers may teach upper-division courses that cannot be adequately staffed by faculty of professorial rank.

Full-time lecturers shall receive the same consideration and enjoy the same departmental rights as pre-tenured and tenured faculty. They submit annual reports to the Chair, which are reviewed by three randomly-selected members of the senior faculty, but are evaluated only in the areas of teaching and service. A continuing lecturer shall share in the range of responsibilities normally assigned to pre-tenured and tenured faculty and may vote on all policy issues brought before the department. Exceptions to the above are noted below:

- Although continuing lecturers are subject to the same mode of annual evaluation as other faculty, they will not participate in the assessment of other permanent faculty.
- Involvement in personnel matters concerning professorial-rank faculty shall be restricted to tenure-track and tenured faculty. However, all continuing faculty are encouraged to voice their opinions on all departmental issues.

The Department of English complies with all University and College policies that govern the hiring of full-time lecturers. Under normal circumstances, the Chair and Steering Committee, considering the department's instructional needs, draft an advertisement for publication in the local newspaper and/or other appropriate venues and submit it to the faculty for approval. The Chair will appoint a screening committee from within the full-time members of the department. After all applications have been examined, the Chair and the Steering Committee interview three or more qualified candidates and offer a recommendation to the Dean.

In addition to complying with all university and College procedures, the Department of English observes the following procedures in hiring full-time lecturers:

1. Upon receiving authorization from the dean to recruit, the department chair, in consultation with the Steering Committee, appoints a hiring committee and names a committee chair.
2. The hiring committee drafts an advertisement, which the department chair circulates to the department for review. Typically, the advertisement does not state a deadline for application but includes the statement "Screening begins [date] and continues until the position is filled." With approval from the dean, the department chair places the ad.
3. The hiring committee, having established criteria, reviews applications and selects semi-finalists for telephone interviews. After approval is received from HR, the committee chair contacts the candidates to arrange the telephone interviews, which are conducted by the hiring committee.
4. After the interviews, the hiring committee selects finalists for campus visits, in consultation with the department chair. The department chair seeks approval from the dean for the visits.
5. The hiring committee chair invites candidates to campus and, in consultation with the department chair, makes all arrangements for the visits. The committee chair oversees all aspects of the visits.
6. Each visit includes a teaching demonstration, a presentation/interview with the department, and possibly a reception. (If all of the finalists have experience teaching in the department as part-time instructors and are people with whom the majority of the full-time faculty are familiar, receptions and dinners will be eliminated. Such decisions will be put to a vote of the faculty before the campus visits are scheduled.) All full-time faculty are expected, at a minimum, to be present at two of the three events (interview, teaching demonstration, and reception).
7. Following the visit of the last candidate, all full-time faculty meet in executive session to determine the order in which candidates shall be offered the position. The meeting is chaired by the department chair. A discussion of the candidate who visited first takes place, followed by a discussion of the second candidate, and so on. It is suggested that individual faculty speak no more than twice during discussion of any one candidate. All discussions of candidates during the meeting as well as all votes and proceedings are strictly confidential and may not be disclosed or discussed with others outside the meeting.
8. Following discussion, voting takes place. Only faculty who have attended all interviews and/or teaching demonstrations may vote. Ballots are not signed. On the initial ballot, each voting faculty member lists one name, the voter's first preference among the candidates.
9. An eligible faculty member who cannot attend the meeting may, prior to the meeting, tender to the department chair an absentee ballot on which the candidates are listed in order of preference. In all votes, the relative order of preference among candidates on an absentee ballot shall be consulted to determine the absent faculty member's vote.
10. If one candidate receives a majority of votes among those casting ballots, that candidate shall be offered the position, upon approval from the dean. If no candidate receives a majority, the candidate receiving the fewest votes is eliminated, and a second vote takes place. However, if two or more candidates are tied with the fewest votes, a preliminary vote is taken to determine which candidate is eliminated, followed by another vote among the remaining candidates.
11. If one of the remaining candidates receives a majority of votes among ballots cast, that candidate shall be offered the position, upon approval from the dean. If more than three candidates visited the campus, the previous step may need to be repeated until one candidate attains a majority. If, at the end, no candidate attains a majority because the department is evenly split between the final two candidates, a vote among eligible voting members of the hiring committee breaks the tie.
12. After a candidate is selected to be offered the position, the department votes on whether the second-place candidate should be offered the position if the first candidate declines the offer. Likewise, it votes on whether the third-place candidate should be offered the position if the other candidates both decline.
13. The department chair, upon approval from the dean, contacts the candidate to make the offer.

The above procedures may be modified by departmental vote for specific searches if circumstances warrant.

[rev. March 2013]

IV. Mentoring

1. Faculty Development & Mentoring Committee : Mentoring in the English Department

The purpose of the English Department's Faculty Development and Mentoring Committee (FDMC) is to help faculty members achieve professional success and foster departmental citizenship and community. The FDMC assists new faculty members as they orient themselves to the department and the profession, providing a broad range of mentoring advice including the preparation of teaching materials and, if applicable, the RPT dossier. The committee also offers advice and resources on effective mentoring of new faculty (lecturers and tenure-track), emphasizing that successful mentoring is based on mutual relationships that encourage network building and foster interdisciplinary connections.

A. General Mentoring

The chair and members of the FDMC will approach all new faculty members during the first year to offer solicited professional advice. Each new faculty member will be assigned a "point person" to help with navigating the department, the university, and its policies. During the new faculty member's first year, he or she should also seek advice from FDMC members and from other colleagues inside and outside of the department.

- New faculty should ask their mentors how they might propose and develop new undergraduate and/or graduate courses, honors courses, and learning communities, as well as how they might incorporate new technologies into their teaching.
- Senior faculty in the mentoring relationship should be generous in sharing syllabi and other teaching materials to help new faculty understand the abilities of students, appropriate workload and types of assignments, grading, the differences between lower-level, upper-level, and graduate courses.
- Mentors should also discuss
 - teaching workshops through the Center for Teaching Excellence and financial support for these projects through Cahill Grants and Summer Initiatives.
 - the preparation of the annual report
 - classroom observations
 - the workings of Randall Library: how to set up course reserves, design research components of their writing assignments, arrange library instruction for their classes, etc.

B. Mentoring of Tenure-Track Faculty

No two ways of mentoring are exactly alike; it is up to the faculty members involved to work out the dynamics of their mentoring relationships. Ideal mentoring relationships are based on mutual respect.

- During the tenure track faculty member's first year, members of the FDMC, along with other colleagues, may suggest ways that tenure-track faculty can launch scholarly careers at UNCW.
- Early in the first semester of employment, mentors should go over the annual report format with new tenure-track faculty, especially its relation to earning tenure.
- Mentoring of tenure-track faculty might include collaborating on research projects, sharing of drafts in progress, co-authoring of essays, alerting one another to conferences and publishing opportunities in each other's areas of scholarly interest, and visiting one another's classes.
- By the beginning of the third year of the initial appointment, the department chair should consult with the tenure-track faculty member to establish a more formal mentoring relationship with one or more faculty members within the department.
- Tenure-track faculty should consult with at least one mentor about how to develop the dossier for tenure. At least one faculty mentor appointed by the chair should be able to speak in detail about the dossier at the tenure decision meeting.

Additional Suggestions for Productive and Supportive Mentoring

- "Mutual Mentoring" <http://uncw.edu/cte/resources/MutualMentoring.html>
- *Inside Higher Ed* articles <http://www.insidehighered.com/users/kerry-ann-rockquemore>

Last updated: Sept. 27, 2013

2. TA Mentoring Program

First-Year Composition & Teaching Assistants

Our mentoring program is designed on the principle that teaching within a community of teachers is better than teaching in isolation. To foster our community of teachers, we encourage each other to construct sound teaching practices that provide our undergraduate students with a consistent and fair education in composition (see the goals for our courses). Our mentoring program is intended to:

- support, prepare, and train our new teaching assistants who will teach composition courses.
- provide knowledge and a degree of comfort in the basics of classroom management, ethics, fairness, time management, and course preparation.
- promote a community of teachers who are concerned with teaching, writing, research, and student success.

Selecting Mentors

In consultation with the Chair, the Writing Coordinator recommends faculty suited for mentoring teaching assistants (or adjunct, part-time, or new hires as needed). This service is important to the department and program and should be noted in annual reports. Candidates for mentoring should have an excellent teaching record, be full-time faculty members, be willing to take on the duty of mentoring, should have taught ENG 100, 101, 200, or 201 in the past two years, be willing to use and follow our textbook policy, and be scheduled to teach a composition course during the semester mentoring occurs. Typically, first year MA students work with a teacher of ENG 100 or 101 in the fall and ENG 200 or 201 in the spring. In the event that there are more mentors than teaching assistants, full-time, tenure-line faculty will receive teaching assistants first. Those not selected to mentor teaching assistants may be asked to mentor part-time or adjunct faculty, a duty also important to our program.

Expectations of Mentors

Teaching Assistants are usually assigned to a mentor shortly before the semester begins. Mentors should do a number of things to prepare the teaching assistant, noting that many teaching assistants have never taught a class before. Below is a list of what the teaching assistant should learn from the mentor.

- The teaching assistant should teach class multiple times.
- The teaching assistant should develop an ENG 101 syllabus.
- The teaching assistant should learn how to design assignments, present lectures, organize group work, and grade/evaluate essays and assignments.
- The teaching assistant should attend each class meeting.
- The teaching assistant should hold conferences with students.
- The mentor and teaching assistant should meet to discuss the course, pedagogical strategies, grading, developing assignments, etc. Typically these meetings occur directly after a class meets but meeting times should be determined by the mentor and the teaching assistant. It seems reasonable that the mentor and teaching assistant would meet at least once a week but no more than three times per week.
- The mentor and teaching assistant will submit a one-page evaluation of the mentoring experience at the end of the semester.

Things to Consider

While you may have your teaching assistant grade essays and teach classes, please remember that the first year of our graduate program is more time-consuming than the second year. Teaching Assistants are responsible for three courses (nine hours), working with a mentor (10 hours), working with a program coordinator (five–seven hours), and working in the writing center (three hours). They are busy adjusting to their new situation.

- A teaching assistant should not become the sole teacher of the course.
- A teaching assistant should not be asked to grade all assignments or essays for the course.
- Teaching assistants are asked to contribute 10 hours to learning how to teach composition courses; think about how much work or time the teaching assistant needs to complete requests or tasks.
- Teaching assistants should not be part of departmental politics.

Evaluation of First-Year Mentors and Teaching Assistants

At the end of the semester, the Writing Coordinator will ask for a one-page evaluation from the mentor concerning the performance of the teaching assistant. In addition, the Writing Coordinator and/or chair may request a meeting with the mentor to discuss the teaching assistant's progress and potential for teaching. Mentors are expected to evaluate the teaching assistants, indicating strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement (or those in need of improvement). The mentor should indicate in the evaluation whether or not s/he thinks the teaching assistant is ready to move to the next year of mentoring and teaching.

Likewise, the teaching assistant is asked to submit a one-page evaluation of the mentor. For example, the teaching assistant will be asked to describe what he or she learned in terms of grading, teaching, developing assignments, and to evaluate the experience as a whole. Briefly, teaching assistants should gain experience teaching class, grading essays and assignments, and learning about how to manage a classroom. The basics are important because, again, many first-year teaching assistants are also first-time teachers.

Responding to unusual situations

Sometimes it is necessary to take action during the course of a semester. For example, if a problem arises in the classroom, the Chair or Writing Coordinator may reassign an adjunct or part-time faculty member to another mentor. The Chair or the Writing Coordinator also may ask a mentor to visit the classroom of a part-time or adjunct faculty member. A current mentor may be asked to take on an additional mentee, or other full-time faculty may be asked to step in to fill this duty. We try to respond to each situation with the best resources available, so we ask that our mentors—the very best resources we have—remain flexible if we need to adjust mentoring arrangements.

Questions/Concerns

Should there be a problem of any kind between the mentor and teaching assistant, please notify the Writing Coordinator as early as possible in the semester so the issue can be resolved. With your help and the guidelines above, we can help our teaching assistants gain the confidence and competence they need to become successful teachers.

Evaluation of Second-Year Teaching Assistants

Second-year GTAs teach composition courses independently and are observed twice in the fall semester and twice in the spring semester by the Writing Coordinator and a member of the Composition Committee. If serious issues are discovered via classroom observations, the Writing Coordinator, Graduate Coordinator, and Chair will meet to discuss the appropriate course of action.

At the conclusion of the second year the Writing Coordinator will write a formal evaluation of each GTA and will meet with the GTA to discuss the evaluation as part of the on-going mentoring process. A copy of the evaluation is given to the GTA and placed in his or her personnel file. The evaluation will be based on the following components:

- Syllabi and representative assignments
- Classroom observations
- SPOTs, when available

Last updated: September 8, 2012

3. Travel and Research Support

The Department of English recognizes the importance of faculty professional development and encourages its full-time members to participate in relevant professional meetings and conferences. The chair of the department will allocate funding for such professional development with priority given to the following, ranked in order of decreasing priority:

- Service to the department and/or the university (such as interviewing job candidates)
- Scholarly presentations at professional meetings—e.g., delivering a paper
- Research- or publication-related costs
- Scholarly participation at professional meetings—e.g., chairing a session or serving as a commentator
- Service to the profession—e.g., serving as an elected officer or as a member of a committee
- Other professional development (e.g., attending seminars to develop teaching or service)

Faculty members should recognize that the department cannot be expected to fund all travel or research support requests fully. For travel, the usual procedure is to provide funds to cover airfare, hotel, and registration for at least one national conference per academic year (depending on the health of the department's budget). For research and professional development requests (i.e., access fees, copyright permissions, and so on), a detailed justification of expenses should be submitted to the chair for approval. In accordance with the priorities set by Academic Affairs, the Department of English recognizes the greater professional and financial needs of full-time, tenure-track junior faculty. However, the Department also recognizes the need for fairness and reasonableness in the allocation of travel funds, and faculty are therefore funded with the following priorities: (1) pre-tenured faculty; (2) tenured faculty; (3) lecturers. Faculty attending several conferences or professional meetings in one year, even with levels of participation with the highest priorities, should not expect funding for each conference or meeting. Faculty attending international conferences are encouraged to seek additional support from the Office of International Programs and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Chair will send out a call for travel and research support requests and will set funding priorities. Requests subsequent to that initial call will be met only if funds continue to be available.

[rev. Sept. 2012]

V. Teaching

1. Assignment to University Studies Courses

The Department of English is committed to providing the best possible education to students in its University Studies composition and literature courses. Because the department regards this obligation as no less central to its mission and no less important than its obligation to students in its graduate and upper-level undergraduate courses, the department takes pride in its longstanding commitment to having all faculty participate in teaching these courses. It has long been a departmental goal that in each academic year all professorial-rank faculty will teach one or more courses that fulfill the University Studies composition requirement. It is also a departmental goal to staff as many sections as possible of its Introduction to Literature courses with professorial-rank faculty. The department expects the chair to make every effort to meet these goals in the assignment of classes, insofar as scheduling needs and staffing availability permit. Although staffing exigencies may sometimes prevent these goals from being fully met, the department will strive to insure that professorial-rank faculty teach no fewer than one of the following courses each year*: ENG 100, 101, 103, 110, 111, 200, and 201, including no fewer than one University Studies composition course every two years*.

* In the case of a full-time faculty member who teaches fewer than six courses annually, "year" shall be interpreted to mean "six consecutive courses," and "two years" shall be interpreted to mean "twelve consecutive courses."

Last updated: March 2012

2. Standard Textbooks for University Studies Courses

Providing a standard textbook list will:

- Help establish a coherent programmatic identity and foster consistency among courses
- Help link University Studies Student Learning Outcomes with classroom practice
- Provide a scaffold for new instructors and sections staffed at late dates
- Make textbook ordering a more shared, cost-efficient endeavor (a provost and General Assembly initiative)
- Help prevent external entities from imposing uniform texts

The standard textbook policy applies to:

- Any instructor who has taught for UNCW's Composition Program for fewer than two semesters
 - Second-year Teaching Assistants may select a textbook from the standard list or one used by a mentor

Instructors who have taught for UNCW's Composition Program for two semesters or more may choose a book not on the standard list provided it suits course goals and corresponding University Studies Student Learning Outcomes (discussed in Course guidelines). All textbooks used in Composition courses are subject to approval by the Writing Coordinator.

Standard list by course:

English 100

Hirschberg, Stuart, and Terry Hirschberg. *Patterns Across Cultures*. 2nd ed. Florence, KY: Cengage Learning, 2014. Print.

Johnson, June. *Global Issues, Local Arguments: Readings for Writers*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2014. Print.

English 101

McQuade, Donald, and Christine McQuade. *Seeing and Writing 4*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. Print.

Roen, Duane, Gregory R. Glau, and Barry Maid. *The McGraw-Hill Guide: Writing for College, Writing for Life*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012. Print.

English 103

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers*. 9th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. Print.

Silverman, Jonathan, and Dean Rader. *The World Is a Text: Writing, Reading, and Thinking About Visual and Popular Culture*. 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Longman, 2014. Print.

English 110

Booth, Alison, and Kelly J. Mays. *The Norton Introduction to Literature*. Shorter 10th ed. New York: Norton, 2010. ISBN 978-0-393-93514-1

Charters, Ann, and Samuel Charters. *Literature and Its Writers*. 5th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. ISBN 978-0-312-55641-9

Meyer, Michael. *The Compact Bedford Introduction to Literature*. 9th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. 978-0-312-59434-3

English 111

Ramraj, Victor J. *Concert of Voices: An Anthology of World Writing in English*. 2nd ed. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2009. Print.

English 200

Austin, Michael. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd ed. NY: Norton, 2010. Print.

Jacobus, Lee A. *A World of Ideas: Essential Readings for College Writers*. 9th ed. NY: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2013. Print.

English 201

Graff, Gerald, Cathy Birkenstein, and Russel Durst. *They Say/I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2012. Print. **Paired with** Crusius, Timothy W., and Carolyn E. Channell. *The Aims of Argument*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2011. Print. **One of the texts should be a version with readings.**

Lunsford, Andrea, John J. Ruskiewicz, and Keith Walters. *Everything's an Argument with Readings*. 6th ed. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2012. Print.

For questions please contact the Writing Coordinator.

Last updated: May 2014

3. Applied Learning Experience Requirement

The purpose of the applied learning requirement for the English major is to ensure that each graduate will take at least one course where he or she experiences the hands-on, practical application of the discipline as it is practiced by professionals in English Studies.

Goals:

1. Augment our Departmental Mission by providing opportunities for students to experience "literacy as a form of social praxis rather than merely as a system of instrumental proficiencies."
2. Offer opportunities for different learning styles than those typically elicited in the classroom.
3. Provide a range of life experiences typically not found in the classroom.
4. Give students the opportunity to engage professionally with expert faculty members.
5. Provide students with the opportunity to apply content knowledge encountered in the classroom.

Plan A: Short Term Implementation

Applied Learning Requirement: To satisfy the applied-learning requirement for the B.A. degree in English a student must successfully complete one of the following courses: ENG 204, 205, 311, 319, 491, 493, 495, 496, 498, 499; or EDN 402, 408, 409.

1. ENG 491: Directed Independent Study (3 credits) involving hands-on experience in English Studies
2. ENG 498: Internship (3 credits) at an approved site that provides experience in the profession.
3. ENG 499: Honors Project (6 credits) in English
4. EDN 402, 408, 409: Teacher Practicum (15 Credits)
5. ENG 493: English Studies Travel (1 credit) with concurrent enrollment in a companion course (3 credits)
6. ENG 204, 311, 319 with significant service learning component (3 credits)
7. ENG 205, 495, 496 with significant research experience under faculty supervision and/or direct involvement with a faculty member in a one-on-one mentoring situation. (3 credits)

Plan B: Implementation after Increased Resources

Applied Learning Requirement: Choose one of the above (see Plan A) or an upper-division course designated as an AL class (see Plan B). AL classes would have a student/teacher ratio of 10:1. Such courses would involve the following:

1. Expanded research experience under faculty supervision. (3 credits)
2. Creative project under faculty supervision (magazine or chapbook, as writing product for the course). (3 credits)
3. Expanded applied learning component under faculty supervision (in courses such as 355, 356, 373). (3 credits)
4. Interdisciplinary and/or ethnographic course work. (3 credits)
5. Expanded international and domestic travel with faculty supervision. (3 credits)

Procedures for Service Learning Projects

1. The contract will only need to be signed by the representative of the agency that is working with UNCW and not by the Dean.
2. The letter (with a completed Appendix A) would be sent out on UNCW letterhead, directed to the agency head that had agreed to host the project.
3. The course name etc may change, so change document accordingly.
4. The letter should be sent by the faculty member in charge of the course, signed by the agency representative and returned to that same faculty member.
5. The original of the returned signed letter will be kept for at least one year by the Department Head, while the faculty member will keep a copy.

Last updated: March 2012

4. Faculty Class Cancellation Procedure

A fundamental responsibility of all faculty members is to meet every class throughout a given term. On occasion, however, there can be professional reasons to miss class (e.g., attendance at a professional conference, workshop, seminar, or symposium).

Notification to the department chair to cancel a class session is not required if the cancellation results from such a professional obligation. If a faculty member is to miss more than a week of class for professional obligations during a semester, however, that faculty member is required to consult with the chair about arranging appropriate substitute instruction. Options for an absent faculty member include arranging for a substitute instructor, providing an applied learning activity for students during the class meeting, assignments to be completed on Blackboard, or making arrangements for an out-of-class workday for the students.

In the rare case of non-professional reasons for canceling a class, such as family emergencies or illness, the faculty member should notify students via email of alternative educational activities and also notify someone in the departmental office so that a note may be placed on the classroom door. In the event of absences for other reasons, the faculty member should contact and consult with the department chair.

Canceling a class preceding and in anticipation of a university holiday (such as Thanksgiving or Spring Break) is, of course, unsanctioned and should not be done.

Last updated: March 2012

5. Final Exams

By university policy, instructors in every course are expected to give a final exam during the scheduled exam period. For exceptions, see the following. Length of the exam is determined by the instructor, not to exceed three hours.

Writing Courses

Writing courses are frequently graded on a portfolio of work, and final exams may not be appropriate in these courses. Instructors teaching writing courses do not need special permission not to schedule final exams. In lieu of a final exam, many instructors make the scheduled exam period the deadline for submitting final portfolios or projects. It's best not to make the final paper due during the last week of classes since students are busy finishing work for other classes and usually don't have the time to devote to a final paper.

Literature and Other Non-Writing Courses

Instructors of all literature, linguistics, and other non-writing courses are expected to give an exam during the period designated in the university's Final Exam Schedule. A take-home exam may be given, but the deadline may not be prior to the scheduled final-exam period. Any exception requires prior approval by the chair.

Exams Given Prior to the Scheduled Date

Final exams may only be given during the scheduled period. Instructors specifically may not give tests or exams during the last five class days of the semester (the last three of a summer term). Any rescheduling to provide an early start to the vacation is unacceptable; for one thing, it can cause students to pressure or resent other instructors who do not make such an accommodation. Any exception requires prior approval by the chair.

Make-up Exams

According to the Faculty Handbook, "No makeup final examination will be given except for reasons of illness or other verified emergency. Students who are absent from a final examination for reasons acceptable to the instructor must take the makeup examination at the convenience of the instructor."

Last updated: March 2012

6. Grade of Incomplete

An instructor assigning a grade of "I" (Incomplete) must fill out a form (available on our sharepoint site) and have it signed by the chair. From the catalog: "All incomplete grades must be removed according to a deadline established by the instructor, but no later than the end of the next regular semester otherwise the "I" becomes "F" and cannot be changed. A student must not register for the class when attempting to remove a grade of Incomplete. No student will be allowed to graduate with an Incomplete grade on his/her academic record. Such grades that have not been resolved at the time of graduation will be converted to an "F." If a student meets graduation requirements, despite the "F," the appropriate degree will be awarded."

When to Give an Incomplete

The grade of "I" (Incomplete) may be assigned only if all of the following conditions pertain:

- The student is in good standing in the course and has completed all but a small portion of the requirements for the class.
- The student is prevented from completing the remaining requirements by unavoidable circumstances (not by neglect).
- The student can complete the remaining requirements by the end of the next regular semester without repeating the course.
- The instructor and student have discussed and agreed to the grade and conditions.

When Not to Give an Incomplete

An grade if "I" should not be given:

- if an otherwise "good" student inexplicably fails to show up for the final.
- if an otherwise "good" student fails to turn in a paper with no excuse.
- if the student is failing the course or needs to repeat it.

For these cases, the appropriate grade is F. If, later on, you find the student was incapacitated and legitimately unable to reach you, you can do a grade change. But F is the only appropriate grade when a student hasn't completed the work without being excused by you.

Last updated: March 2012

7. Office Hours

Every faculty member is required to be available to consult with students 2 hours per day (i.e., 10 hours per week) during the regular academic year. Requirements for part-time faculty will be determined according to the number of classes taught. An individual faculty member's office-hours policy will establish standards regarding a combination of formal, face-to-face office hours; meetings in other locations; and availability for electronic communications.

A schedule indicating the times available for formal office hours, meetings in other locations, and electronic communications must be posted on the faculty member's office door, listed on course syllabi, and provided to the departmental office at the beginning of each semester. Electronic communication addresses, URLs, and/or phone numbers should be listed on course syllabi and provided to the faculty member's departmental office. During the term of a summer session in which a faculty member teaches, office-hour expectations are half of those during the regular academic year. A faculty member's compliance with office-hours policies may be considered in peer and departmental evaluations of teaching.

[rev. March 2012]

8. SPOT Teaching Evaluations

Every instructor **must** give SPOT evaluations in every section during the last ten days of the semester (or the last five days of summer school). Exceptions are DIS and other courses with three or fewer students where the student's anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Instructors must follow the SPOT Guidelines in the Faculty Handbook for administering SPOTS. Faculty should take special note of the following:

- The instructor must not be present in the classroom during administration of the evaluations. An instructor who wishes a monitor to be present should ask another faculty or staff member to administer the evaluation.
- Instructors must have no contact whatever with the forms during or after evaluation. Someone other than the faculty member must be appointed to collect the completed forms and pencils and to return them to department office immediately after administration. For a night class, that person should slide the envelope with the forms under the department chair's door. Pencils should be placed in the instructor's mailbox.
- Evaluations should be given in regular class settings and not under atypical circumstances, such as at a class party. Instructors should avoid actions that could be seen as attempts to influence student opinion, such as passing out food or candy before evaluations.
- Students should specifically be encouraged to write written comments in the space provided. Written comments often provide the most useful feedback to instructors.

9. Credit for Thesis Supervision

Generally, each semester one member of the faculty is eligible to receive a one-course reduction in teaching based on the number of points earned through directing MA theses, supervising internships, directing honors theses, and supervising DISs. In order for a course release to be granted for a particular semester, the chair will determine that all instructional needs can be met and obtain the approval of the Dean's office.

This policy will take effect for awarding course releases for the academic year 2013-2014 and will not be retroactive in any of its provisions.

Points earned from each activity: CAS policy

<http://uncw.edu/cas/documents/CASPolicyandProcedureManual.pdf>

Direction of MA thesis: 1 point (1 CHE)

Supervision of internships: 3 contact hours per week in the field or in follow up seminar: 1 point (1 CHE)

Supervision of an honors thesis or DIS (graduate/undergraduate): 1 student credit hour = .20 points (.20 CHE) per student credit hour, which equals .60 points per three-hour experience.

Points for thesis work are only awarded after the student successfully completes, defends, and deposits the thesis. Points are not awarded for thesis work that is incomplete. Points will only be awarded for the supervision of internships that occur outside of the established departmental internship program.

Process for awarding course releases

Year-long scheduling takes place each December, at which time the chair will determine course releases to be awarded for the following academic year, taking into account scheduling needs. When possible, two faculty with the highest number of points as of the end of the Summer II semester will be awarded a one-course release for one of the two semesters during the following academic year.

For example, the two eligible faculty members with the highest number of points as of Summer II 2010 would receive a one-course reduction for one of the two semesters of the academic year 2011-2012.

After a faculty member receives a course release, her/his total number of points will be reduced by 10 points. If the faculty member with the highest number of points does not have 10 points, his/her total will be reduced to zero.

rev. spring 2013