

Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review
Department of English, UNC Greensboro
Approved by English Department Faculty April 3, 2013

Except as specifically provided in this English Department document, annual and post-tenure reviews of English Department faculty follow the procedures in the College of Arts and Sciences "Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review" (approved October 23, 2012), which in turn follows those in the University's "Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty" (approved May 23, 2012), including any subsequent amendments to the College and University documents. The provisions below are drawn in large part from the English Department's "Instrument of Governance" (approved October 8, 2008) and "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching" (approved March 14, 2012). Subsequent revisions of these English Department policy documents should be reflected, if necessary, in revisions to this Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review.

I. Annual review of tenure-track, tenured, and Academic Professional faculty

The Instrument of Governance establishes a standing committee, the "Evaluation Committee," which "advises the Head on annual evaluation of faculty performance" (see sec. 6 for details). Long-standing practice has included a small group of non-tenure-track lecturers with significant administrative as well as teaching duties, informally termed "continuing lecturers," among those faculty whose annual performance is reviewed by this Committee, as well as by the department head. As of the 2013-14 academic year, it is anticipated that these lecturer positions will be reclassified as Academic Professional (AP) positions (see the English Department's "Academic Professional Guidelines and Procedures," approved October 31, 2012 for further details). The annual review of all English Department AP faculty will be carried out by the department head in consultation with the Evaluation Committee.

Tenure-track, tenured, and Academic Professional faculty will report their annual accomplishments according to a procedure and in a form specified by the College (currently through the Sedona reporting system, but subject to change as the College decides). As detailed in the Instrument of Governance, the department's Evaluation Committee and the department head will review the annual activity reports so submitted and, after consultation, submit their separate Summary Evaluations of the faculty member's performance as "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" through the CAS Annual Review Report Form. The Evaluation Committee's evaluation will be entered in the CAS Form in that Form's sec. B, "Peers' Summary Evaluation," and a senior member of the Evaluation Committee will sign for "Faculty Members Charged with Peer Review." Further procedural details of the reporting of these findings are provided in the CAS "Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review," sec. I.F.

Annual reviews of tenure-track faculty do not cumulatively predict or constitute the department's decision on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: an overall "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" rating for single years, even taken in sum, cannot and should not substitute for thorough consideration of an Assistant Professor's entire record at the point of the tenure decision. However, the criteria articulated in

"Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the Department of English" (approved April 2012) are the basis for the department head's commentary on progress toward tenure and promotion in an annual evaluative narrative.

II. Annual review of non-tenure-track full-time and part-time lecturers

"Lecturers" is defined for this document as faculty whose responsibilities are limited to teaching. As provided in the CAS "Policy," sec. I.C, lecturers' annual reviews may be "based solely on a teaching evaluation conducted according to the department's teaching evaluation policy." The English Department's "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching" sets a schedule for lecturers' evaluation by peer observation, every other year of full-time teaching and less often for part-time (see the Guidelines for details). Peer observations are assigned in a yearly memo from the department head and are to be submitted to the Associate Head of the department according to the schedule established in that memo.

In those years when returning full-time lecturers or part-time lecturers are not evaluated by peer observation, they will write a brief report of their year's teaching, to specifications established by the department's Associate Head and approved by the department head, to be submitted according to a schedule agreed upon by the Associate Head and head.

The Associate Head will review all peer observations and submitted reports, and make a recommendation to the department head as to the evaluation of these faculty as "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory." The department head will review the reports and recommendations, together with the Associate Head's recommendations. The Associate Head and department head will then submit their separate Summary Evaluations in the CAS Annual Review Report Form, with the Associate Head submitting that evaluation as the "Peers' Summary Evaluation" and signing for "Faculty Members Charged with Peer Review." Further procedural detail for reporting lecturer evaluations will also follow the CAS "Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review," sec. I.F.

III. Post-Tenure Review

The English Department's Instrument of Governance accords with the CAS "Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review," so that English Department Post-Tenure Review procedures need little additional description in this document. The ad hoc Post-Tenure Review Committee appointed by the department head acts as the "Faculty Members Charged with Post-Tenure Review" in the CAS "Post-Tenure Review Report Form," and the chair of that Committee signs for "Faculty Members Charged with Peer Review." Further procedural details of the submission of these reviews are detailed in the CAS "Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review," sec. II.H.