

Department

of

English

BYLAWS

December 2018

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Bylaws of the Department of English promote and sustain a formative learning and research environment based on reciprocity, recognition, and responsibility. The principles and processes of shared governance articulated in this document establish expectations and standards of professional contribution and conduct to which we will hold each other responsible. Our commitment to formative feedback frames our responsibilities to each other as an investment in individual, programmatic, and collective success and, thus, understands the individual's, the program's, and the Department's well-being as intertwined. We intend to cultivate practices of critical self- and collective reflection as we aspire toward equity, justice, and excellence across all arenas of our shared professional life. Faculty at all ranks have a role in this effort, with responsibility accumulating as we move up the faculty ranks. Expectations for mentoring, service, and leadership increase with seniority. In structuring our shared departmental life, these Bylaws develop and put into practice our commitment to research, teaching, service, and outreach as contributions to the greater public good.

1. THE FACULTY

1.1 Composition of the Faculty

- 1.1.1. The regular faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons in the Department who have been appointed under the rules of tenure and who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or as further defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.
- 1.1.2. The fixed-term faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, but not appointed under the rules of tenure, as defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.
- 1.1.3. The academic specialist faculty of the Department of English shall consist of all persons holding the rank of academic specialist, academic specialist-continuing, or senior academic specialist, but not appointed under the rules of tenure, or as further defined in the Bylaws for Academic Governance-Michigan State University.
- 1.1.4. Honorary faculty shall be those persons designated as visiting professor or professor emeritus.

1.2 Voting Faculty

- 1.2.1. The voting faculty in Department, College, and University matters shall consist of all regular faculty (in 1.1.1.), fixed-term faculty (in 1.1.2.) who hold current positions and have served under a full-time basis in the university with a majority appointment in the Department for at least three consecutive years, and academic specialist faculty (in 1.1.3) who have served under on a full-time basis in the university with an appointment in the Department for at least three consecutive years.
 - 1.2.1.1. The voting faculty of the Department shall be constituted as stated in Bylaw 1.2.1., with the exception of those instances in which the faculty is voting on changes in the Bylaws related to the whole of section 3.2.3. "The Salary Committee". In these instances, the voting faculty shall consist of those tenured and tenure-system faculty who are affected by the Salary Committee

Bylaws, that is, English Department faculty on the departmental "salary list" who are reviewed for merit by the Salary Committee and the Chairperson. Any changes in section 3.2.3. shall meet the requirement stated in Bylaw 7.3.1., requiring a majority of voting faculty on the salary list to make changes in the Bylaws.

- 1.2.2. A faculty member jointly appointed in two or more units may vote only once in a given College or University election.
- 1.2.3. A faculty member jointly appointed in two or more units may vote on English Department matters.
- 1.2.4. Only regular faculty members of the Department of English may be elected to an academic governance body as the department's representative.

1.3 Governance Responsibility of the Faculty

1.3.1. Faculty Meetings

- 1.3.1.1. The faculty of the Department shall meet at least once during each semester. Additional meetings of the Department may also be called by the Department Chairperson, or upon petition of 25% of the regular and temporary faculty (in 1.1.1. and 1.1.2).
- 1.3.1.2. The Chairperson or Chairperson's designee shall generally attend all faculty meetings and Policy Committee meetings.
- 1.3.1.3. The Chairperson should whenever possible provide an agenda at least four days in advance of a faculty meeting, and include on that agenda notification of any elections to be held.
- 1.3.1.4. A quorum is necessary for the conduct of official business at an officially constituted meeting of the Department. A quorum shall be defined as fifty percent of the voting faculty. A quorum for all officially constituted committees of the Department shall be defined as a simple majority of the voting members of the committees.
- 1.3.1.5. Conduct of all Department faculty meetings shall be governed by revised Robert's Rules of Order (Revised).
- 1.3.2. Faculty members shall have the right to submit matters for the consideration of the Chairperson, the Policy Committee, or faculty.
- 1.3.3. The faculty shall have the right to review the actions of the Chairperson, the Policy Committee, the Graduate Committee, and the standing Departmental committees, individual personnel matters excepted, and to advise the Chairperson and the Policy Committee on matters pertaining to the general direction and welfare of the Department.

2. THE STUDENTS

2.1. Student Constituency of the Department

- 2.1.1. The student constituency of the Department for the purpose of selecting student representatives to the Department, College, and the University committees, or for any other appropriate purpose, shall be all undergraduate students who have declared with the Registrar a major or major preference in English and all graduate degree and non-degree candidates in English.
- 2.1.2. The Chairperson and Associate Chairpersons shall encourage the formation of an organization of English graduate students and an organization of English undergraduate students each year; these organizations have the right to select their respective representatives to Department committees, using procedures determined by their members.

2.2. Student Participation in Academic Governance

- 2.2.1. The undergraduate student constituency of the Department shall select a representative to the Undergraduate and Student Engagement Committees and the graduate student constituency of the Department shall select a representative for Policy, the Graduate, Student Engagement, and Equity Committees. Student participation in the Department academic governance bodies shall in all cases be in the same mode as faculty participation, except as reserved. The matters reserved to the faculty are:
 - 2.2.1.1. Policy concerning salary, leaves, insurance, retirement, and fringe benefits of faculty.
 - 2.2.1.2. Decisions concerning the appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or dismissal of individual faculty members.
 - 2.2.1.3. Evidence from students regarding the teaching performance of faculty shall be considered in decisions concerning the above matters.
- 2.2.2.2. The Department will solicit input from undergraduate and graduate students on hiring, fields, and appointments.

3. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

3.1. Chairperson of the Department

- 3.1.1. The chief department officer of the Department is the Chairperson.
- 3.1.2. The Chairperson is responsible for educational, research, and service programs of the Department. This responsibility includes budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction, taking into account the advisory procedures of the Department.
- 3.1.3. The voting faculty of the Department shall have shared responsibility with the Dean to determine procedures for advising the Dean on the selection of the Department Chairperson.
- 3.1.4. Faculty and students of the Department shall advise or consult with the Dean in the appointment of the Chairperson.
- 3.1.5. The selection of assistant and associate administrators to be nominated to the Provost shall be the responsibility of the Chairperson, who shall receive the views of the faculty and students through the academic governance system or other appropriate means.
- 3.1.6. The Chairperson of the Department shall be subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years.
 - 3.1.6.1. The Department faculty shall have shared responsibility with the Dean to determine procedures for the review of the Chairperson.
 - 3.1.6.2. There is no limit, other than the limit imposed by the University rules on retirement from administrative positions, on the number of times an individual may continue in the position of Chairperson.
 - 3.1.6.3. At any time during the term of office, the appointment of a Chairperson, as Chairperson, may be terminated either by resignation or by action of the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the President and the Provost.
- 3.1.7. The Chairperson shall assist, encourage, and participate in academic governance as part of his or her administrative responsibility. The Chairperson shall:
 - 3.1.7.1. Provide for the dissemination of information and exchange of views regarding Department policy by faculty and students, through the academic governance system as well as other appropriate channels.
 - 3.1.7.2. Call meetings of the faculty at least once per semester with a prepared agenda submitted to the faculty at least four days beforehand (whenever possible) or upon petition of 25% of the faculty in residence.

- 3.1.7.3. call meetings of the Policy Committee at least once per month with a prepared agenda submitted to the faculty at least four days beforehand (whenever possible), or upon petition of three or more Policy Committee members, or upon petition of 25% of the faculty in residence. Notice of a Policy Committee meeting shall be given to the faculty at least four days before that meeting, except in the case of emergencies.
- 3.1.7.4. Act as Chairperson, with power to break tie votes, of meetings of the faculty and of the Policy Committee.
- 3.1.7.5. Appoint in the spring, after consultation with the Policy Committee, standing and other committees of the faculty.
- 3.1.7.6. Appoint, after consultation with the Policy Committee, the administrative officers of the Department. Associate Chair Graduate Studies; Associate Chair Undergrad Studies; Coordinator, English Education; Director, Film Studies; Director, Creative Writing; and Coordinator, Literary Studies.
- 3.1.7.7. Confer with the Policy Committee and faculty on matters concerning departmental policies.

3.2. Department Academic Governance

3.2.1. Principles and Expectations for Committee Work

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

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

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

3.2.2. The Policy Committee

- 3.2.2.1. The Policy Committee members elected by the faculty shall be five members of the faculty (as defined in 1.2.1.). The Committee shall have one elected faculty member from the untenured ranks, providing that there is at least one advanced untenured faculty member eligible and willing to serve. No more than one faculty member from the untenured ranks shall serve on the Committee. The term of

office for elected faculty members shall be one year for advanced untenured faculty, and two years for tenured faculty; no elected faculty member shall be eligible to serve for two consecutive terms. In order to provide continuity between Policy Committees of consecutive years, the two-year terms of tenured faculty members shall be staggered. The position reserved for advanced untenured faculty shall be the first to be filled. The remaining positions shall be filled by elections at large.

3.2.2.2. Election of the Policy Committee

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

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

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

3.2.2.3. Composition of the Policy Committee

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

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

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

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

3.2.2.4. Responsibilities of the Policy Committee

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

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

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

3.2.3. The Graduate Committee

3.2.3.1. Constitution of the Graduate Committee

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

3.2.3.2. Responsibilities of the Graduate Committee

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

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

3.2.4. The Undergraduate Committee

3.2.4.1. Constitution of the Undergraduate Committee

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

3.2.4.2. Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Committee

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

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

3.2.5. The Salary and Awards Committee

3.2.5.1. Selection and Composition of the Salary Committee

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

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

The Chairperson of the Department shall appoint a chairperson of the Salary and Awards Committee from among the five tenure-system faculty.

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

3.2.5.2. Responsibilities of the Salary Committee

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

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

3.2.5.3. Procedures of the Salary Committee

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

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

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

In order to be considered for merit salary adjustments, faculty must submit the following supporting materials: 1) a current, annotated curriculum vitae, 2) a departmental cover form, 3) a narrative describing how accomplishments during the review period fit into future goals (see template), 4) evidence to substantiate teaching, service, and outreach activities. Faculty shall provide full documentation of all professional activities. If a faculty member fails to submit the all or any of the above materials to the Salary Committee, the Salary Committee shall not consider him/her for a merit salary adjustment. (paragraph formerly 3.2.4.3.4.)

Using the forms of evidence discussed in 4.2.1.3., members of the Salary Committee shall make a qualitative rating of highest merit, high merit, merit, or insufficient evidence for each individual in each of the following categories of evaluation: research and professional activity, teaching, service. In evaluating each individual's record, members of the Salary Committee shall keep in mind that outreach is a professional activity valued by the University that cuts across the categories of research and professional activity, teaching, and service. (Outreach involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with the University and unit missions). In the case of ratings for teaching and service during a leave, materials submitted for those categories from the most recent two years not spent on leave shall be used as a basis for evaluation. (paragraph formerly 3.2.4.3.5.)

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

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

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

The recommendations of the Salary Committee shall assist the Chairperson in determining the quantitative scale, based on the annual control figure,

that corresponds to the Committee's qualitative ratings. This scale represents the percentage increase each faculty person receives.

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

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

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

3.2.5.4. Evidence of Meritorious Performance

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

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

3.2.6. The Speakers Committee

3.2.6.1. Composition of the Speakers Committee

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

3.2.6.2. Responsibilities of the Speakers Committee

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

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

3.2.7.1. Composition of the SEOE Committee

3.2.7.1.1. The committee shall be comprised of two faculty members, the

Department advisor, one elected undergraduate student, and one elected graduate student.

3.2.7.2. Responsibilities of the SEOE Committee

3.2.7.2.1. The SEEO Committee is responsible for enhancing the undergraduate and graduate student experience, advising on the Department's study abroad programs, coordinating engaged learning and co-curricular opportunities for students, and leading the Department in a range of public outreach efforts, including pursuing connections with local schools and institutions. The committee will work collaborative our student groups, including Sigma Tau Delta, the Students of Color group, the NCTE chapter, and the Film Club, among others.

3.2.8. Equity and Justice Committee (proposal forthcoming)

3.2.8.1. Composition of the Equity and Justice Committee

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

3.2.8.2. Responsibilities of the Equity and Justice Committee

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

3.2.9. Ad Hoc Committees

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

3.2.10. Program Committees

3.2.10.1. These are committees comprised of faculty who teach in various Department programs: Creative Writing, Film Studies, English Education, and Literary Studies. Program committees will meet as required during the year, let by Program Directors.

4. TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY

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

- 4.1.1. Tenure-track appointments to the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor normally are made consistent with the current provisions of the Michigan State University Tenure System as specified in the Faculty Handbook.
- 4.1.2. Non-tenure track appointments to the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or academic specialist normally are made consistent with the current designations and provisions of Appointment as specified in the current Union of Non-Tenured Faculty contract.
- 4.1.3. The Chairperson shall provide the terms and conditions of employment in writing to the faculty member at the time of appointment. These terms should include: the time period covered by the appointment; salary provision; the general expectations in regard to the professional responsibilities of the person being appointed; conditions as indicated in the Michigan State University Faculty and Academic Staff Handbooks other than the appointee's performance of their responsibilities that may make a further appointment inadvisable.

4.2. Evaluation of Faculty

4.2.1. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Appointments

4.2.1.1. Annual Evaluation

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

4.2.1.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

4.2.1.2.1. In making recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, the Chairperson with the advice of the Policy Committee, is responsible for ensuring the quality of the Department with respect to its teaching function, its inner vitality, and its stature in the profession. The criteria and procedures outlined below are intended to ensure quality, to promote fair and flexible judgments, and to provide recognition for the diversity of talents that are essential to a strong department. Recommendations of jointly appointed or assigned faculty are also subject to these criteria and procedures to the extent outlined in individual MoUs.

4.2.1.2.2. Requirements for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. The requirements for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are significant publication (in print or other recognized media), effective teaching, and responsible public and/or professional service. Candidates must meet all three criteria. However, since the University is committed to research, and since the goals of good teaching and responsible professional service are furthered by individual research, special consideration will be given to the candidate's publication and other forms of research and creative productivity. Reappointment. The candidate for reappointment must show definite promise of being able to meet the requirements for promotion. Reappointment does not, however, constitute a commitment by the Department to eventual promotion and tenure. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. The candidate must clearly demonstrate effective teaching, a willingness to participate in the activities of the Department, and, most important, excellence or the promise of

excellence in professional publication (in print or other recognized media). Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have produced a record of new publication. At minimum these publications should include a book and/or significant number of scholarly or creative works as described in 4.2.1.2.1. Moreover, the candidate must be an accomplished teacher, with a record of participation and leadership in the activities of the Department and of the profession at large.

4.2.1.2.3. Procedure for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

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

4.2.1.2.3.2. Identification of Candidates for Promotion and Tenure.

Assistant Professors normally undergo Promotion and Tenure review in their sixth year. Faculty should consult the University Faculty Handbook for possible alterations in this customary timeline. Associate Professors interested in undergoing review for promotion to Professor should alert the Chair to their interest in the fall semester prior to this review at the latest. The Chair will confer with Policy Committee, considering previous Salary Committee recommendations. In identifying potential candidates for promotion/tenure, attention will be paid to (1) the length of service in each rank at MSU or peer institutions, (2) scholarly and/or creative productivity, (3) teaching record, and (4) service.

4.2.1.2.3.3. Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

4.2.1.2.3.4. Candidate's Responsibilities. In the Spring, the candidate will be asked to submit to the Policy Committee a minimum of three Department of English faculty members (all above their rank) from which the Policy Committee will select at least one to serve on the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate will be asked to submit to their Promotion and Tenure Committee a list of five to six potential

external evaluators. The committee will then create a list of five to six additional potential external evaluators and provide both lists to the Chairperson, who will determine the final list of external evaluators to be contacted. The letters of evaluation should be received no later than mid-October. Letters from at least four (preferably five) external evaluators are required, and each evaluator will be offered the opportunity to see the candidate's complete file. The candidate is to prepare a complete file that minimally includes: 1) Form D (section IV to be filled out by the candidate); 2) an up-to-date curriculum vitae with complete bibliographical information (title, place of publication, date, page numbers); 3) a reflective essay about accomplishments over the reporting period (5 page maximum); 4) copies of all published work and work accepted for publication, and, at the candidate's discretion, work in progress; 5) teaching evaluations (SIRS forms or the departmentally approved equivalents) and a teaching portfolio (see the document entitled "The Teaching Portfolio Required of Candidates for Promotion"); 6) other evidence of professional achievement (e.g., unsolicited letters, citations, reviews of published work, etc.); 7) evidence of professional service (Department or University committee assignments, consultants, liaison work, editorial service, offices in professional organizations, administrative service to the Department, College, or University).

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

4.2.1.3.1 Research and Professional Activity

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.1.3. The following subsections include examples of materials or activities by which research and creative

activity shall be evaluated, in descending order of importance. Faculty can make arguments for the relative importance of other activities particular to their case.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.1.4. Collaborative work is to be valued as a

legitimate form of inquiry and production and as co-equal with single authorship.

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.1.6.2. Curated gallery or film festival exhibits or screenings

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

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.2. Teaching

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

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

4.2.1.3.2.1.1. Course syllabi and assignments;

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.2.1.7. Teaching statement of no longer than 2 pages that contextualizes teaching accomplishments for the year as well as SIRS or teaching evaluations. This may include: a statement of teaching philosophy; the range of courses taught across the Department's mission, including courses for non-majors, large IAH classes, or courses in other units in which one teaches; strategies for improvement in teaching; evidence of effective instruction; innovation in assignments, methods, or course conception; updating of courses frequently taught or development of new courses (whether within existing course numbers or by putting forward new courses for the catalog); feedback taken from students and how you changed the course in response; any other supporting materials showing evidence of teaching adaptability; demonstrations of promoting graduate

student progress or responsiveness to graduate students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.2.3.3. Organizing or contributing to departmental workshops on pedagogy.

4.2.1.3.2.3.4. Conducting peer teaching evaluations.

4.2.1.3.2.3.5. Conducting peer teaching evaluations.

4.2.1.3.2.3.6. Engaging in curricular or co-curricular development beyond service on

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

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

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

4.2.1.3.3. Service

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

4.2.1.3.3.2. In evaluating each person's contributions in the merit area of service, the Salary Committee shall consider the amount of time devoted to service activities by the individual and the value of the person's service activities to the department, college, university, and profession. The Committee shall take as evidence of exceptional service any award given by the college, the university, or an external agency.

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

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

4.2.1.3.4. Outreach

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

to research, teaching, and service. Outreach activities should be considered as part of the candidate's over-all record.

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

4.2.2.1. Annual Evaluation of UNTF faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty should receive annual evaluations as according to the Union of Non-Tenure Faculty (UNTF) contract. This evaluation will typically be completed by the end of the summer, before the official start of the new academic year. The Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies will typically evaluate non-tenure-track faculty according to a standard form provided by the UNTF. Typically, non-tenure-track faculty will be evaluated entirely based on teaching, but the percentages of the overall score attributable to different categories of responsibility (such as research, teaching, service, etc.) should be designated on the evaluation form. At the end of the academic year, non-tenure-track faculty should be asked to submit syllabi, student evaluations (such as SIRS) and other optional material which demonstrates effectiveness of teaching to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Chair will then score each faculty member according to the rubric of the form and provide comments in support of the scores. The Associate Chair should then send the evaluations to the non-tenure-track faculty members and allow them to meet in person to discuss the evaluations. Once agreement has been reached about the evaluations, the forms should be signed by the Associate Chair and the non-tenure-track faculty member. The forms will be kept by the department in a file for the non-tenure-track faculty member and may be used to decide if that faculty member is given a future assignment in the department. If the non-tenure-track faculty member does not agree with the evaluation of the Associate Chair, they may appeal to the Chair of the department for reconsideration of the evaluation.

4.2.2.2. UNTF Fixed Term Designation B Guidelines

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

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

1. Reclassification to Designation B is predicated on exemplary instructional performance in UNTF bargaining unit assigned teaching duties. Individuals who believe they have established a clear record of sustained, outstanding achievements in teaching must assemble a compendium of materials that documents teaching excellence and submit such documentation to the unit head or designee. “Form B: Recommendation for Designation B Appointment in the Union of

non-Tenure Track Faculty” must be used to apply for Designation B consideration. "Eligibility criteria and timelines are found in the UNTF contract:

<http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/contracts/UNTFContract.pdf>

FAQS and forms are found at:

http://www.hr.msu.edu/hiring/facultyhiring/DesignationB_FAQ.htm"

2. Where unit administrators utilize a review committee for advice in making a recommendation to the Provost (through appropriate subordinate administrators), the unit review committee should be provided with guidelines and directed to determine objectively the level of accomplishment and excellence in UNTF related teaching duties.

3. Recommendations of the review committee are forwarded to the appropriate academic unit administrator. The faculty or academic staff member should be provided an opportunity to meet with the review committee prior to it making a recommendation to the unit administrator. Where there is no review committee, the faculty or academic staff member shall be provided an opportunity to meet with the unit administrator before a recommendation is provided to the next level of review. The recommendation of the academic unit administrator is forwarded for subsequent review and action by the relevant major academic unit administrator (usually the dean) and by the Office of the Provost. After review by the Office of the Provost, the UNTF represented fixed term faculty or academic staff member will be notified of the final decision on appointment to Designation B.

Procedures

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

Document. CAL units will appoint a Designation B review committee for fixed-term faculty members requesting reappointment under Designation B.

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

Appointment in the Union of non-tenure Track Faculty must be used to apply for Designation B.

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

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

Criteria

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

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

Materials that must be assembled as evidence include:

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

Materials that may be assembled as evidence include:

- Participation in high-impact co-curricular activities
- Self-crafted and self-administered student evaluation instruments
- Honors Options and other extensions of teaching responsibilities
- Undergraduate and graduate committee service

- Teacher research or scholarship of teaching and learning activities
- Teaching awards

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

Specifically the teaching narrative:

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

Links for Classroom Observation:

<http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/guidelines/>
http://www.usu.edu/teachingacademy/teaching_coaches/docs/Evaluating_Teaching_through_Peer_Classroom_Observation.pdf

Helpful links:

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

[Form B: Recommendation for Designation B Appointment in the Union of non- Tenure Track Faculty \(MS Word\)](#)

[UNTF Designation B Appointments Frequently Asked Questions](#)

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

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

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

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

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

2. The **procedures** that the College of Arts & Letters and its affiliated units will use for reviewing the promotion of fixed term faculty are as follows.
 1. Each year, during the required annual performance review, unit administrators should discuss with eligible fixed term faculty the criteria for promotion in rank, the faculty member's progress toward promotion, and discuss whether he or she wishes to seek promotion in the coming academic year. The administrator shall provide a written copy of this review to the faculty member.
 2. If the faculty member elects to seek promotion, the unit administrator will prepare a description of the candidate's assignment including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research, teaching, and/or service/outreach. This description will form part of the promotion review portfolio and will be distributed to all individuals of the unit's review committee who evaluate the candidate's materials. At least one fixed term faculty member should be included in the review of the candidate at the unit level. The College suggests that the fixed term faculty member of the unit review committee hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor rank if such an individual is available; if not, the College suggests a fixed term faculty member who has attained Designation B status instead or an academic specialist with continuing status.
 3. If teaching is a primary activity in the candidate's assignment, the College suggests that the unit assemble a Teaching Review Committee by having the unit chair work with the candidate to assemble a committee consisting of at least one tenure-system faculty member, one fixed term faculty member, and one other faculty member of any rank. If the candidate teaches online or hybrid courses, then at least one member of the committee should have experience in teaching online or hybrid courses as well in order to help with the evaluation of these courses.

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

- Meet with the individual to discuss course syllabi, assignments, philosophy of teaching, and methodologies and strategies. Prior to this meeting, the individual will provide the Teaching Review Committee with a teaching portfolio (as described in item 2.d.iii. of this document).
- Set two agreed-upon dates during one (preferably the fall) semester for classroom visitations when at least two of the three committee members can be present; the candidate can request additional visitations if they so desire.
- Meet with the candidate after the classroom visitations are completed for discussion, questions, clarifications, and feedback.
- Write a committee report focusing on:

- Organization and presentation of concepts, skills, and reading and discussion materials;
 - Interaction with students; and
 - Effective and productive use of class period in relation to instructional objectives.
- Submit a draft of the report to the candidate, who shall have the opportunity to respond to it in person or in writing, in order to make relevant comments regarding points of substance, emphasis, or neglect.
 - Submit a revised and final report to the unit promotion review committee. Teaching review committees should restrict their reports to the substance of the teaching and instruction according to the areas identified above and to the course and instructional materials made available to them. Committee members should also recognize a diversity of instructional methodologies and strategies that can be used to reach common curricular goals.
4. In preparing materials for the review portfolio, the candidate is required to provide information or documents related to the activities that are part of his or her assignment, using the Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action form (Form D, as implemented in the CAL RPT guidelines) as a guide. MSU guidelines specify that these materials must include:
- i. A current curriculum vitae.
 - ii. A reflective essay about accomplishments during the reporting period (5 pages maximum), detailing the leadership activities undertaken in the areas where they have duties (teaching, research, and/or service/outreach). If, for instance, teaching is an assigned duty, this would include a reflective teaching statement, showing ongoing development of effective instructional practices.
 - iii. A representative sample of the candidate's best work that corresponds to the candidate's assignment. The candidate should reference these in their above narrative to provide context.

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

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

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

- Examples of student papers and projects.
 - Evidence of effective formative and summative commentary on student papers and projects.
 - Letters of commendation written by colleagues or peers.
 - Reflective statements or learning narratives written by students.
 - Honors or awards.
 - Evidence of course and curriculum development.
 - Evidence of participation in professional development workshops, seminars, and/or activities.
 - Evidence of teacher-research.
 - Evidence of work in the instruction and mentoring of other teachers as well as program and TA coordination.
 - Evidence of outreach, including outreach instruction, which might include credit-bearing courses offered off-campus; noncredit-bearing seminars, workshops, conferences, exhibits, and performances related to teaching.
 - Evidence of instructional materials and activities particular to online or distance education; such materials should be reviewed in the media for which they were intended.
- iv. Evidence of excellence in performing assigned duties, e.g., significance, impact, and innovation of instructional activities, research/creative activities, professional development, curriculum development, program coordination, or administrative activities.
 5. In all cases, four review letters must be included and can come from within the College or University. Whenever possible these letters should come from outside of the unit. If research/creative activity is an assigned duty, at least one or more letters (depending on percentage of workload) external to MSU must be obtained evaluating said activity in accord with the CAL tenure-system RPT guidelines. In other cases, if the faculty member has worked with other partners external to the unit, whether in teaching, service, or outreach, a letter should come from one of those MSU or community or equivalent partners. A letter might also come from an officer or member of a scholarly pedagogical organization where the faculty member has been especially active. All letters must come from individuals who hold a rank above the candidate's current rank. The candidate is not informed of those individuals who provide letters of evaluation. (See also Confidentiality of Letters of Reference for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Recommendations" in the *Faculty Handbook*.)
 6. Units should review the promotion materials submitted by fixed term faculty candidates in the same manner in which they review tenure system promotion candidates, focusing only on their assigned duty categories. If a unit does not have an existing tenure review system, then the supervisor should consult with the Associate Dean for Personnel, Administration, and Undergraduate Education.
 7. **Unit administrators are encouraged to include these reviews in the regular RPT timelines of the unit. Promotion recommendations for fixed-term faculty must be sent to the CAL Dean by January 15 of a given year, submitting Form D and supporting materials (those relevant for the assigned duties as described in the CAL RPT guidelines), and must include copies of the**

written annual reviews of the candidate (see item 2a in this document) during the reporting period. This recommendation should provide an analysis of the candidate's performance in their assigned duties, as well as the leadership activities in which they have been involved.

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

4.2.2.4. Annual Review of Academic Specialists

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

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

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

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

4.2.2.4.3. A current curriculum vitae.

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

4.2.2.5. Reappointment and Promotion of Academic Specialists

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. FACULTY HIRING PROCEDURES

- 5.1. Search procedures shall follow guidelines provided by Academic Human Resources in the Academic Hiring Manual as well as by the College of Arts & Letters regarding faculty searches. The MSU Faculty Search Toolkit devised by the ADAPP-ADVANCE grant shall also be followed.
- 5.2. Requesting Positions
 - 5.2.1. The Department will follow University and College of Arts & Letters procedure for requesting academic positions. Under normal circumstances, the Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, submits a proposal for faculty searches for the upcoming academic year as part of the Fall Planning/Spring Budget Request processes in the College of Arts & Letters.
 - 5.2.2. The Dean of the College of Arts & Letters normally notifies the Department Chairperson about approved faculty searches in the summer or early fall following the Spring Budget Request.
- 5.3. Search Committee Composition & Procedures
 - 5.3.1. After receiving approval for a search, the Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, is responsible for determining the final composition of an ad hoc search committee.
 - 5.3.2. A tenure-system search committee will be comprised of a chair and normally four additional members from among the departmental voting members, or others at the Chairperson's discretion. When possible, a member of the Policy Committee will be a member of the search committee. Also, when possible, a graduate student in the Department will also serve on the committee as a consulting, non-voting member. A fixed-term search committee may be smaller in composition.
 - 5.3.2.1. It is highly desirable, but not required, that a search committee will be

comprised of members with broad expertise in the areas of the search as well as members who represent the Department as broadly and diversely as possible, including women faculty and faculty of color.

- 5.3.3. The Department Chairperson, with assistance from the College Faculty Excellence Advocate, will call the first search committee meeting to provide the committee its charge and to conduct an affirmative action session in which the committee selects its affirmative action representative. During this charge meeting, the Chairperson and search committee members establish search procedures, strategies, and timelines in line with University policy.
- 5.3.4. The search committee will draft the position description and submit it for approval to the Department Chairperson, who will review it with the Policy Committee. Once the Department Chairperson receives approval of the ad from units outside the Department, the Search Chair will work with the departmental administrative staff to post and advertise the position in consultation with the search committee.
- 5.3.5. Following College and University guidelines, the search committee will screen applicants following the procedures established previously by the committee and based on agreed upon selection criteria, including (1) programmatic need, (2) excellence of qualifications and credentials based on clearly delineated job-related criteria, (3) placement goals, and (4) diversity considerations.
- 5.3.6. The search committee will prepare a ranked list of candidates for preliminary interviews and/or final interviews for approval by the Department Chairperson, who will review the list based in terms of diversity requirements. Once approved internally, the candidate list will be forwarded to the Dean's office for review, following College and University guidelines.
- 5.3.7. Once external approvals have been secured, the search committee will arrange preliminary and/or campus interviews with the assistance of departmental administrative staff.
- 5.3.8. For campus interviews, formal meetings will normally be arranged with the policy and search committees, faculty through the job talk presentation, graduate students, the Department Chairperson, and the Dean/Associate Dean.
- 5.3.9. The search committee will collect departmental feedback on candidates and, upon review, will prepare a search committee report with a ranked list of finalists, which will be submitted with other required documents for approval to the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Policy Committee, and subsequently to the Dean.
- 5.3.10. Once approved, the Department Chairperson will be the liaison with the ranked finalist regarding terms of offer and negotiations.

6. GRIEVANCE AND HEARING PROCEDURES

- 6.1. The faculty grievance procedure shall accord with the "Faculty Grievance Policy" approved by the Board of Trustees on April 5, 1991 and revised on June 28, 2002, August 16, 2009, and December 18, 2015. [//hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/grievance_policy.html](http://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/grievance_policy.html).
- 6.2. The undergraduate student grievance procedure shall accord with the procedures detailed in the document titled "Students Rights and Responsibilities" <http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/student-rights-and-responsibilities-at-michigan-state-university>

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

7. BYLAWS

7.1. Initial Approval

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

7.2. Interpretation

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

7.3. Amendments

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

7.4. Review

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

Approved by Department 4/27/90

Amended by Department 5/6/92

Amended by mail ballot 11/29/93

Amended by mail ballot 5/10/94

Amended by mail ballot 12/7/95

Amended by mail ballot 1/24/96

Amended by mail ballot 2/19/97

Amended by mail ballot 4/1/99

Amended by mail ballot 1/28/00

Amended by mail ballot 2/4/00

Amended by mail ballot 5/1/00

Amended by Department ballot 9/9/09

Amended by vote in Department meeting, 12/11/15

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

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

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

1. What does "publication" mean? An article or book in print, between covers (approved by mail ballot 13 October 1995).
2. What does "new" mean? Did not play a substantial role in the candidate's previous promotion decision. Where there is doubt, the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for deciding whether the publication(s) in question is or is not "new" (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

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

3. What sort of "book" is meant here? A book authored by the candidate alone. The candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee will have to make the case for a co-authored book (or books). The candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for whether publications such as scholarly editions and scholarly tools (e.g., dictionaries, annotated bibliographies) should be counted as "a book." Edited or co-edited collections will normally not be counted as satisfying this minimum, but the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee can make the case for counting them in exceptional instances (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).
4. What does "substantial set" mean? Equivalent in aggregate as well as in scope and depth to an individually authored book (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).
5. What does "refereed" mean? Published as a result of a process that involves assessment by readers whose involvement the journal or press arranges or by the editor(s) of the journal or press (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).
6. How does one deal with "items" that are co-authored? As with books, the expectation is that the "items" will be written by the candidate alone. If they are not, the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the case for how they meet the minimum (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).
7. What does "at minimum" mean? "At minimum" means necessary but not sufficient. Meeting the minimum does not of itself establish that the candidate is entitled to promotion (approved by mail ballot 7 December 1995).

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

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

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

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

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

ITHE TEACHING PORTFOLIO REQUIRED
OF
CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION

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

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

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

5 February 1997