



UNC CHARLOTTE

Office of Academic Affairs

9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.5717 f/ 704.687.1457 www.uncc.edu

February 20, 2019

Dr. Richard Leeman
Faculty President
UNC Charlotte

Dear Rich,

In accordance with the procedure concerning the establishment and naming of departments, I am forwarding a request from the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences to establish the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies (WRDS).

The justification for the department establishment is attached. I ask that it be considered for faculty approval at the next Faculty Executive Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

Joan F. Lorden
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Attachment

cc: Nancy Gutierrez, Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Matt Wyse, Faculty Governance Assistant





UNC CHARLOTTE

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Office of the Dean

9301 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
T 704.687.0088 F 704.687.0089 www.clas.uncc.edu

February 19, 2019

Provost Joan Lorden
Office of Academic Affairs
UNC Charlotte

Dear Provost Lorden:

I request departmental status for the University Writing Program (UWP), as well as a name change: the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies (WRDS). Professor Joan Mullin, the Executive Director of UWP, has written a justification for this status change, which I attach.

I strongly recommend this structural change, as it will better support the undergraduate mission (the university writing requirement, the newly established minor, and the proposed major), further develop a research program, and enhance interdisciplinary opportunities across the campus. Resource implications, as you can see, are not substantial.

Please let me know if you require more information. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy A. Gutierrez



UNC CHARLOTTE
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

University Writing Program

9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704-687-1903 f/ 704-687-1408 <http://writing.uncc.edu/>

To: Nancy Gutierrez, Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

From: Joan Mullin, Executive Director

Date: January 17, 2019

RE: Request for Departmental Status

The University Writing Program (UWP) faculty request unit status and a name change to the Department of Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies (WRDS). This request follows six years of planning and development that has positioned the Program as a degree-granting unit. The unit already has the following in place: sufficient human and physical resources; qualified research and teaching faculty; bylaws and other governance documents; and organizational structure.

Sufficient Human and Physical Resources

In 2011, what came to be known as the University Writing Program (UWP) separated from the English Department as an independent unit that delivered the first-year writing requirement. At that time, adequate space and support staff were allocated for the twenty-nine lecturers and, on average, twenty-eight adjunct faculty and seven English Department teaching assistants who taught first-year writing. Following the College of Liberal Arts 2015-20 Strategic Plan, the unit measured effectiveness and resources and began planning for departmental status on multiple levels. What followed was six years of collaborating with English, Communication Studies and other university departments and offices; changes to the first-year writing curriculum; the submission and passage of a minor in Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies (WRDS); campus approval of a WRDS major (now under review by the Board of Governors); faculty recruitment, professional development, and the hiring of tenure line faculty. The Conference on College Composition and Communication, the field's national organization, recognized UWP as a visionary program of quality in 2018, presenting it a Writing Program Excellence Award. The current UWP's twenty-five lecturers, three tenure-line faculty and two staff are now prepared for departmental status.

Instructional Quality and Capacity

The unit has the capacity, instructional quality, and scholarly activity of a department. The UWP can deliver the new and proposed degrees and First-Year Writing as well as contribute to teaching LBST 2301 (Critical Thinking and Communication) with few or no additional part-time instructors. The change to departmental status will shift two assistant professor lines from seventy-five percent responsibility in

the UWP to one hundred percent, joining the current tenure-line executive director as full time in WRDS. Of the 25 full time lecturers (and one shared appointment with English), seven have PhDs in media, digital studies, English or composition; three have other terminal degrees (MFAs); ten have MAs in English/writing; In two are ABD; one is half-way through her PhD in writing and digital studies and two others just applied to graduate school for PhDs in writing. These faculty also helped create the minor and proposed major, researching scholarship and degrees in writing studies, designing course syllabi and examining course descriptions and curriculum of other units on campus to avoid duplication. Lecturers continue to be active in SOTL, writing research and professional development, gaining acceptances to highly competitive conferences in the field, as well as campus invitations to present for the CTL, Atkins and Quality Matters. Two faculty are Master Reviewers for Quality Matters, having completed the rigorous course work and review to be qualified as mentors to university faculty seeking to certify their courses. Three other faculty have begun the coursework for QM certification.

The two, three-quarter time, tenure-line assistant professors have published scholarly articles in feminist, scientific, cultural and visual rhetorics, and they have research agendas and grant applications to support their pathway towards promotion and tenure. Lecturers, by their choice, are equally active in the field, knowing that writing studies produces robust scholarship that directly impacts not just what they teach, but how they teach. Most recently, a lecturer with a growing reputation and accompanying invitations to speak on comic studies, published *Between Pen and Pixel: Comics Materiality and the Book of the Future* (2018, Ohio State University Press); he has a second contract with the same press for his next book (in process). Another lecturer is co-editor of a forth-coming collection *Next Steps: New Directions for/in Writing about Writing* (in-press, Utah State University Press). They and other lecturers have peer-reviewed, published articles in competitive journals or chapters, as well as acceptances to others—and that is the count for only this academic year so far.

Other lecturers are respected poets, with consistent publication in highly regarded magazines and journals and recipients of prestigious awards. One lecturer is considered the must-read poet of North Carolina (*Our State* magazine). Another lecturer recently submitted his novel for review, and another was recently commissioned to create a play about a World War II battle that was thought to have wiped out all enlisted men from Ashboro. Performed this summer as a one-time celebration of the city, it is now in a performance cycle for next fall.

Community engagement is high on our list in our proposed curriculum for the major, though several lecturers already connect their courses to the community. Students in FYW courses have worked with middle-school and high school students on researching university life or creating Holocaust studies' resources. Last year's Southern Foodways symposium highlighted the Latinx community. We will be scheduling courses at Center City with classes on the rhetorics of such topics as graffiti, architecture, and flâneurie (strolling). Our approved WRDS 4330 Reading, Writing and Archiving Charlotte complements our proposed major's internships.

Bylaws, Policies and Organizational Structure

Preparing for potential department status, our current bylaws reflect those of departments, with the exception of added content regarding tenure and promotion. We have gathered research on the usual qualifications for tenure and promotion in departments of writing and begun drafting the guidelines; we will tap department chairs and faculty at UNC Charlotte to provide feedback on completed drafts. Likewise, we have spent two years creating a policies and procedures manual for the unit so that we no longer rely on memory or assumption. A similar manual exists for our staff, where workloads have been assigned to reflect those that would be usual for departments. Standing committees that mirror departmental committees have been in place for some time. In addition, a faculty member has been researching and networking with advisors and attending meetings on advising processes, with end of spring semester (2019) as a target for drafting our process.

Faculty have an on-campus presence much more aligned with a department that acts as a curricular and assessment resource than as a program. Maintaining informational and networking ties on campus, faculty are already a presence at meetings key to departmental maintenance and growth (e.g., SSWG, UCFC, Academic Affairs Chair meetings; Peer Leader Action Group). Our commitment to similar groups on campus concerned with diversity and equity influence our curriculum and even our staff: one is a mentor in UNC Charlotte's Writing Mentor initiative. UWP faculty have also been key to mentoring CTC faculty during LBST 2301's pilot stage and remain actively involved in teaching the course and in CTC faculty development groups. Two of our faculty participated in the College of Computing and Informatics curriculum revision committee, and we have received a SOTL grant with the Office of Assessment (and presented results at AAC&U with OA staff).

Summary

In short: we have the current tenure-line and full-time faculty to fulfill our general education commitments and deliver a degree (with a major in the approval process): staff are in place to support our transition to a department; by-laws along with policies and procedures are already keyed towards departmental status; the necessary language for tenure-line faculty is in draft stage as are advising processes; committees and practices to complete departmental work are in place.

While the unit contributes to the mission of the institution in multiple ways, it would benefit from departmental status: tenure line faculty would have their full commitments to one unit; grants and awards now limited to departmental faculty would be available; the UWP would otherwise be performing all of the activities of a department without the appropriate categorization.

WRITING, RHETORIC AND DIGITAL STUDIES

FACULTY

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

Section One: Faculty Performance Evaluation Purposes, Expectations and General Guidelines for Evaluation

I. Purposes of Performance Evaluation

Faculty performance evaluation will be conducted to assist faculty in achieving professional goals, to ensure that faculty make meaningful contributions to the instructional, scholarly, and service missions of the Department, and to make decisions regarding Reappointment, Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and Promotion, salary improvement, and faculty workload. Should this document differ from current procedures in the College or University, the department will defer to the College or University procedures.

II. General Performance Expectations

- A.** All Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies (WRDS) faculty, full time and adjunct, are expected to make a meaningful contribution to the instructional mission of the Department. Because the most fundamental goal of the Department is to provide quality instruction, teaching performance will be an important element of all faculty performance evaluations, with research responsibilities of equal importance in the conferral of Permanent Tenure, and Promotion.

- B.** All tenure-track and tenured WRDS faculty are expected to engage in on-going scholarly activities. WRDS faculty are encouraged to develop and pursue those scholarly activities commensurate with their primary teaching areas, general areas of interest, and research specializations. The Department recognizes that engaging in scholarly activity is integral to maintaining intellectual vigor, promoting growth as instructors, and furthering the discipline. The Department recognizes that meaningful scholarly activity can be conducted for many purposes, take a variety of forms and employ a diverse range of methodological and investigative procedures.

- C.** All full time WRDS faculty are expected to contribute to the service mission of the Department in accordance with the expectations of their rank. WRDS faculty are encouraged to engage in those service activities which draw upon their professional expertise and contribute to the development, and/or operation of the Department, College, University and the discipline. WRDS faculty are also encouraged to engage in those professional service activities which enhance connections between the community and the University, and contribute to the furtherance of the various constituencies served by the University.

- D.** All WRDS faculty are expected to fulfill those specific duties which they are assigned as

conditions of their initial or continued employment.

III. General Guidelines for Performance Evaluation

- A. In evaluating teaching, evaluation will be determined in the case of each individual based upon consideration of student evaluations, peer evaluations, course material and other relevant information.
- B. All scholarly activity will be evaluated both in terms of its scope and quality and in ways consistent with the nature of the activity being evaluated. Although scholarly activity can come in many forms, all scholarly activity must be available for substantive review, including peer review and/or public review, depending on the nature of the activity. Peer review is defined as the review of scholarship *prior to* and as a *condition of* publication or presentation. Public review is defined as the review of scholarship *after* presentation or publication, such as book reviews or evaluation of the work in another scholarly work. Faculty must also describe their contribution to collaborative works. The appropriate level and nature of external funding in support of faculty scholarship will vary depending upon the area of specialization as well as the individual faculty member's scholarship within that area. The Department recognizes that the opportunities for, types of and funding amounts available vary greatly depending upon the individual faculty member's area of expertise, even within the field's sub-disciplines. Evidence that the work is of high quality and is part of the candidate's ongoing agenda as well as a clear trajectory for scholarly and creative activities is important. External reviewers will be used to supplement assessment of scholarly activity prior to tenure and promotion decisions.
- C. All service activity for WRDS faculty will be evaluated both in terms of its scope and quality. Successful service means the candidate has a record of demonstrable, sustained and significant contributions to the Department, College and University, community and profession, as appropriate to the level of review. All service activities must be available for substantive review and be professionally based (related to the faculty members training, expertise, or experience).
- D. The ability of faculty to fulfill specific duties and responsibilities stipulated in their initial letter of appointment or in subsequent letters of reappointment shall be considered during the review process. Assessment of faculty performance shall be based upon relevant information consistent with the nature of the duty and expectations specified.

Section Two: Annual Performance Evaluations by the Chair of the Department

I. Nature of the Evaluation

The performance of every WRDS faculty member will be evaluated annually by the Chair in consultation with the Department Review Committee (DRC) which performs their own evaluation of materials prior to that consultation. Annual evaluations of full time faculty will always include an assessment of teaching, scholarly, professional service activities and other assigned duties per the faculty member's rank and contract. Annual evaluations of adjunct faculty will always include an assessment of teaching.

Annual evaluations by the Chair provide an on-going indicator to faculty about their performance, strengths, weaknesses, progress toward reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and annual recommendations about salary and assignment of workload. The evaluation period is the calendar year (e.g., Spring 2019, Summer 2019, and Fall 2019).

II. Process

- A. All full time faculty will complete the WRDS Annual Evaluation form downloaded from The Department's evaluation Canvas site. Faculty will upload their completed form by January 15 each year; if that date falls on the weekend, the forms are due the following Monday by 5:00 p.m.
- B. The DRC will access the documents to review faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarly activity, professional service, and other assigned responsibilities consistent with their appointments. The committee will provide evidence from the submitted materials to support their determination of "meets," "exceeds" or "does not meet" expectations. When asked, for the purposes of salary raises, the DRC will suggest rankings to the Chair. The evaluation process will be consistent with the general and specific guidelines for evaluating faculty performance contained in the other sections of this document.
- C. In consultation with the DRC, the Chair will write an annual evaluation. Faculty will receive annual evaluations by no later than the end of each academic year (May 1).
- D. Faculty will sign that evaluation to acknowledge receipt. The written annual evaluation will become a part of each faculty member's personnel file.
- E. Any faculty member may request to meet with the Chair to discuss their annual evaluation. In addition, should a faculty member wish to clarify, explain, or challenge any portion of the written evaluation, he/she may prepare a written response to the annual evaluation which will be included in that faculty member's personnel file.
- F. In addition to the written evaluation, non-tenured tenure-track faculty may have an annual performance conference with the Chair. The purpose of the performance conference is to assist the faculty member in understanding performance expectations, to discuss the faculty member's short and long-term instructional and professional goals,

to identify ways the faculty member might improve her/his performance in instructional, professional and service activities, and to discuss any issue related to performance, expectations, or evaluation that the faculty member deems important.

Section Three: Annual Performance Evaluation by the Department Review Committee

I. Nature of the Evaluation

In the years for which salary adjustments are available, salary reviews and recommendations will be made by the Chair, in consultation with the DRC, following the guidelines provided by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the University, consistent with the general and specific guidelines for evaluating faculty performance contained in the other sections of this document.

II. Process

- A.** Following the guidelines provided by Academic Affairs, the Chair, in consultation with the DRC, will review salaries and develop a plan to rank faculty as required by College and University guidelines. When developing the plan, the Chair and DRC will use the WRDS Annual Evaluation form submitted as well as the annual evaluation that was written based on that report and the student and peer evaluations of teaching and any other materials that have been submitted and are pertinent.
- B.** Based on the consultation with the DRC, the Chair will draft salary recommendations for all full-time faculty members in the department.
- C.** The Chair will meet with the DRC to discuss the salary recommendation drafts.
- D.** Based on consultation with the DRC, the Chair will formulate the department's final salary recommendations.

Section Four: Performance Evaluation by the Department Review Committee

I. Nature of the Evaluation

The Review Committee formulates recommendations regarding reappointment, conferral of tenure, and promotion, advises the Chair of the Department about faculty workload, and works with the Chair of the Department to formulate professional development plans, as necessary, to help WRDS faculty enhance their performance. The Review Committee bases its evaluation and

recommendations upon an assessment of each faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarly activity, professional service, and other assigned duties, according to their appointment. All recommendations regarding reappointment, conferral of permanent tenure, and promotion shall be based upon the specific criteria listed in Sections Five, Six, and Seven of this document.

II. Preamble of the Department Review Committee

The goal of the Review Committee is to arrive at a thorough, fair, and professional judgment about the performance of each WRDS faculty member. The Departmental Review Committee shall seek to evaluate the scope and quality of each faculty member's accomplishments by carefully and thoughtfully considering the available data and shall seek to render judgments consistent with the procedures governing review of WRDS faculty contained in this document or its successor, and shall at all times abide by the procedures governing personnel reviews established by the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as those established for the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. The Departmental Review Committee shall conduct all of its proceedings in a professional manner, and each member of the committee shall do her/his utmost to respect the confidentiality of the proceedings and the privacy of the candidate.

III. Review Schedule

WRDS faculty will be notified and reviewed for Reappointment, Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and Promotion according to the schedule prescribed for all faculty at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

- A. All faculty must be reviewed by the Departmental Review Committee each year.
- B. Untenured Assistant Professors will undergo a third year review. Lecturers will be reviewed according to Department, College and University Guidelines as per Section 6 below. Tenured Associate Professors and Full Professors will be reviewed at least once every five years.
- C. Materials for all reviews should be submitted according to guidelines on the WRDS Review Canvas site. Annual review materials are due January 15. Should that day fall on a weekend, materials are due the first Monday after that date, by 5:00 p.m. Materials necessary for comprehensive review are on The Department Canvas site and must be uploaded at the latest by September 1 in order to meet deadlines set by the university.
- D. All faculty seeking reappointment and/or promotion are encouraged to consult with colleagues regarding the preparation of their files, including the format of the curriculum vitae, the content of the personal statement, and the selection as well as ordering of their materials.
- E. Per College policy, all faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion will assemble a representative portfolio of publications and other scholarly materials to send out for evaluation

by recognized scholars in the candidate's field.

- F. The candidate should submit the names of at least three scholars who work in the specific field(s) of study represented by the candidate's work and can provide an assessment of the candidate's work. Usually excluded from this list are those who would have an obvious conflict of interest, such as dissertation committee members and co-authors, past or present. The Chair, in consultation with the DRC, will select at least one of the reviewers proposed by the candidate, and will select additional reviewers from nominations provided by Department faculty or outside consultants in related areas of expertise.
- G. An untenured professor who wishes to come up for review for conferral of tenure prior to the time when such reviews are mandated by College or University guidelines needs to seek the Provost's permission. Faculty members who request such reviews should be a minimum of six years out from conferral of their terminal degree and should also notify both the Chair of the Departmental Review Committee and the Chair of the Department of their decision in writing in a timely manner.
- H. The tenure "clock" may occasionally be accelerated or temporarily halted under special circumstances per university policy.

IV. Annual Review Process for Faculty

- A. Faculty will submit in a timely manner a review file according to the annual review deadline established by the department.
- B. For annual review, the DRC shall prepare a written summary of its assessment of each faculty member which it reviews. If a faculty member's performance does not meet expectations, during an annual evaluation, a development plan will be put in place.
- C. Such assessments will normally address the following: the strengths of the faculty member, particular areas of weakness, the composition and presentation of the faculty member's review file and, as appropriate, any suggestions or comments the committee feels would enhance the ability of the faculty member to improve his or her performance in the various instructional, scholarly, or service activities in which he or she engages.
- D. The DRC prepares a statement of its recommendation to the Department Chair. In consultation with the DRC recommendations, the Chair of the Department will formulate a formal recommendation regarding the annual performance as meets, exceeds or does not meet expectations.
- E. Faculty whose annual performance does not meet expectations will be assigned a faculty mentor for the following year. The mentor will be chosen by the DRC in consultation with the chair, with the expectation that the mentoring will follow a plan outlined by the chair, faculty member and mentor with the goal of improving. Lack of improvement will have cumulative effects as outlined

in College and University appointment, tenure and promotion policies.

V. Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Members of the Review Committee

- A. It is always the responsibility of the faculty member being reviewed to submit to the Departmental Review Committee in a timely manner his or her review file and further to insure that the review file is developed in accordance with The Department's guidelines.
- B. Should the Departmental Review Committee determine the need to obtain additional information or materials from a faculty member in order to render a thorough, fair, and professional judgment about the performance of that faculty member, they may submit such a request in writing to the faculty member.
- C. Faculty have the responsibility to respond in a timely manner to written requests from the Review Committee for additional materials.
- D. Any WRDS faculty member can request to meet with the Departmental Review Committee to discuss any formal recommendation or assessment rendered by the Departmental Review Committee about that faculty member's performance.
- E. All WRDS faculty have the right to expect that the Review Committee will conduct its deliberations in an impartial manner, arrive at reasoned judgments based upon thorough and thoughtful assessment of the available data, and respect the confidentiality of the deliberation process and the faculty member's review file.

VI. Duties of the Departmental Review Committee Chair

Each year the DRC shall elect a Chair from among them, who shall call all scheduled meetings of the committee, notify all faculty to be reviewed of the date for submission of review materials, reserve space for committee meetings, establish the agenda for committee meetings, initiate the agenda items for committee discussion, resolve procedural disputes, call all required votes, record and report as required the results of all votes, prepare a written draft which summarizes the committee's assessment of each faculty member reviewed, submit that draft to the committee for editing and final approval, prepare the final draft of all written recommendations and assessments, to provide the final written assessments and recommendations to the Department Chair, and other such responsibilities necessary to insure that the departmental review process occurs in a conscientious, effective, efficient, and professional manner.

VII. Relationship With the Department Chair

The Departmental Review Committee is advisory to the Chair of the Department and its formal recommendations are not binding upon the Chair of the Department. The Chair of the Department can be present at regularly scheduled meetings of the Department Review Committee as an observer if so requested by the Chair of the Review Committee. If requested by

the Chair of the Review Committee, the Chair of the Department may provide explanatory information which the committee believes to be useful in reaching a fair, thorough, and professional judgment about the performance of any WRDS faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, professional service, or other assigned duties.

The Chair of the Department shall not be a voting member of the Department Review Committee.

- B. The Chair of the Department shall not attempt in any way to alter the decision-making process of the Department Review Committee, to circumscribe the personnel review procedures prescribed by the Department, College, or University, nor to influence individually or collectively the deliberation or voting of members of the Departmental Review Committee.
- C. In the event that the Chair of the Department does not concur with the recommendation made by the Review Committee, the Chair of the Department can request to meet with the DRC to discuss the case.

VIII. Annual Evaluation of the Chair of the Department

- A. The Review Committee shall evaluate the Chair of the Department on an annual basis based upon both criteria associated with holding academic rank as well as criteria associated with the administrative duties of the Chair.
- B. By April 1 of each year, the Chair shall submit to the Review Committee and Dean, an annual report, based on that year's goals as established each year between the Chair and the Dean.
- C. The DRC will design a survey, based on the goals and report, and send it to the faculty in order to collect feedback on the Chair by April 15.
- D. The Review Committee will prepare a written evaluation of the Chair which will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences by May 1. The Dean, in turn, uses the report to create the College's annual evaluation of the Chair and forwards it to the Chair of the DRC for dissemination to the faculty.

Section Five: Criteria for Reappointment, Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and Promotion of Professorial Rank Faculty

I. Reappointment of Tenure-Line Faculty Members

For reappointment as assistant professor, a candidate is expected to make demonstrable progress in developing a trajectory and record of high-quality research that culminates in peer-reviewed publications consistent with the field; engage in effective teaching; and perform

appropriate service activities.

II. Special Committees to Recommend Promotion to Tenured Rank

- A. For the purposes of evaluating an Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Professor for promotion to Full Professor, all professors at or above rank in the Department who are not seated on the Departmental Review Committee shall constitute a special committee which will evaluate the review file of the Assistant or Associate Professor applying for promotion. The special committee shall provide a written report advising both the Chair of the Department and the Department Review Committee on each file reviewed. The report issued by the committee of Full Professors is advisory both to the Chair of the Department and the Department Review Committee and become a component of the review file.
- B. In the event that there are no permanent faculty tenured in the Department, then permanently tenured faculty members from other departments may be selected, according to a procedure approved by the department faculty, as voting members only, to constitute the committee following 5.3 under University Departmental Review Committees policies (<https://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.13#s53>).

III. Reappointment and Promotion to an Assistant Professor

In order for a WRDS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor to be reappointed at that rank, the faculty member must:

- A. Demonstrate effective teaching.
- B. Show evidence of high quality scholarly activity and promise of continuing development.
- C. Make an appropriate service contribution.
- D. Show promise of satisfying criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Conferral of Permanent Tenure.

IV. Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Conferral of Permanent Tenure

In order for a WRDS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, and receive conferral of permanent tenure, the faculty member must:

- A. Demonstrate teaching effectiveness.
- B. Have a continuous and distinctive record of scholarly accomplishments including

peer-review and public-review publications, and an appropriate level of external funding.

- C. Have made a satisfactory service contribution.
- D. Show tangible promise of achieving distinction in teaching or scholarship.

V. Promotion to Associate Professor Prior to Conferral of Permanent Tenure

In order for a WRDS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor to be promoted to Associate Professor prior to a tenure decision which is mandated by the Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, that faculty member must satisfy each of the criteria indicated for "Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Conferral of Permanent Tenure" and be clearly outstanding in teaching, professional activity, or service. These decisions are normally referred to as "early promotion" and as such are reserved for those few individuals who demonstrate outstanding achievements early in their careers at UNC Charlotte.

IV. Promotion to Full Professor

In order for a WRDS faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor to be promoted to the rank of Full Professor, that faculty member must:

- A. Demonstrated growth in and cumulative record of teaching effectiveness since promotion to associate professor.
- B. Have a record of substantial scholarship including peer-review and public-review publications, an appropriate level of external funding and evidence of scholarly growth since promotion to associate professor.
- C. Have made important service contributions to the Department, College, University, and community/discipline.
- D. Have achieved national or international recognition in teaching or scholarship.
- E. Have performed in a role of leadership in the Department, College, University, community, or discipline.

V. Benchmarks for Teaching, Research and Service

A. Teaching

Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies values praxis, the interconnectedness of research and

teaching, and definitions of teaching that include and go beyond the classroom. Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will present evidence of their teaching and its effectiveness with

- i. A statement of their teaching philosophy and general classroom practice, incorporated in the personal statement, that demonstrates the links among teaching, research and service as applicable;
- ii. Syllabi, links to LMS examples, assignments and other course materials that demonstrate the qualities described in their teaching statement, and, if applicable, show additional evidence of teaching effectiveness;
- iii. In the case of probationary faculty, all student course evaluations, both written and numerical; in the case of tenured faculty, all student course evaluations since the last mandatory review;
- iv. Peer observations and evaluations as required by the Department and the State of North Carolina.
- v. Teaching performed beyond the traditional classroom should also be documented and described in the teaching statement; this includes but is not limited to development of new programs, courses, or teaching methods, including curriculum development grants; tutor training; designing and conducting faculty development activities; pedagogically-oriented consulting work; supervision of independent studies, directed readings; supervision of internships; direction of and participation in graduate theses committees and examination committees; academic advising; teaching honors/ awards.
- vi. Effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated by but is not limited to the following benchmarks: teaching is clearly informed by current and valued scholarship of research and teaching in the field; student learning objectives: clearly consistent with the Department's and the courses'; organized presentation of course materials that are mindful of access and universal design; evident scaffolding of assignments, as appropriate, and clear guidelines for completion; formative as well as summative assessments that support student learning; a record of performance at or near the Department's norms, according to written student evaluations and peer evaluations; a record of performance at or near the Department's means, according to student evaluations; an articulate philosophy of teaching.

B. Research Activity

The Department recognizes that research and writing in Writing Studies may include theoretical,

digital, pedagogical, critical, historical, editorial activities and may even be related to areas of administration. Within the field there are scholarly productions (print and digital) about writing program administration/ administrators (WPA), but a productive and viable writing program or writing center is only as good as the WPA's continual research that informs the program's curriculum, assessment and faculty development.

In keeping with the practices of the University and reappointment, promotion and tenure in Writing Studies, refereed publications and a trajectory/history (as appropriate to rank) of contributions to knowledge in the field that are acknowledged as such by outside experts, are primary. However, the candidate's record of all scholarly activity is also weighed.

- i. A "refereed" publication is one whose acceptance is the result of editorial or other peer review in a competitive venue. Such publications may include: books or textbooks, authored, co-authored, edited, or translated, with academic, literary, or professional presses, in print, electronic or visual media; journal articles, interviews, book reviews, and review essays (print or online); chapters, essays, or articles in reference texts, proceedings, collections, and anthologies; digital, multimodal or other technologically created exhibitions; production of computer software, databases, platforms for scholarly production or similar digital tools that contribute to knowledge production in the field;
- ii. Other scholarly or creative activities that impact the Department/field include but are not limited to: juried papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences; invited addresses, keynotes, or papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences; production of computer software, databases, platforms for scholarly production or similar digital tools that contribute to knowledge production in the field; reports and materials derived from consulting activities in universities, schools, government agencies, business, or industry; grant proposals for basic or applied research, curriculum development, or professional service; editorial work that is shown to have an impact knowledge production in the field (explain the productions reach and the labor of the candidate in the production); administrative work that has a scholarly component affecting the curricular and/or teaching mission of the Department, College or University; non-refereed publications, including interviews, book reviews, review essays, occasional essays, and grant-related, governmental, professional reports, installations, creative works.
- iii. The candidate is responsible for distinguishing between refereed and non-refereed publications on the curriculum vitae, and for explaining the nature of non-traditional published or professional work in the personal statement.
- iv. The DRC's judgment regarding the quality of scholarship depends on a variety of benchmarks in the discipline of Writing Studies and in the past practice of the University:
 - a. A candidate's publications should describe a history of sustained productivity over time. All publications, including those completed at other institutions, are counted in the

review, but there is an expectation that the candidate will have published substantial work at this institution, consistent with the benchmark of sustained productivity.

- b. The academic book, while a conventional measure of academic accomplishment, is not a prerequisite for achieving tenure or promotion, and in some fields of Writing Studies might constitute an inappropriate expectation. A reasonable equivalent of the academic book is a group of substantial articles equivalent to the research and productivity consistent with the effort of preparing a book; digital-born productions or technologies equivalent to the research and productivity consistent with the effort of preparing a book.
- c. Substantial awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant- proposal writing, constitute important scholarly credentials and should be accurately documented on the curriculum vitae and described in the personal statement. Unsuccessful grant proposals should be included in the curriculum vitae.
- d. Publication awards and prizes from presses, journals, or professional associations, along with other forms of recognition, such as reprinted articles should be listed on the curriculum vitae and, as appropriate, explained in the personal statement.
- e. Invitations to present papers or keynote addresses, or to conduct workshops, or to read or demonstrate works at prestigious national or international gatherings should be noted and their significance explained in the personal statement
- f. The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

C. Service

Service activities contribute to the governance of the University, the support of the profession, and the flourishing of a positive and productive community. At a minimum, WRDS faculty are expected to attend Department meetings and serve on a standing committee or its equivalent as appointed or assigned. Probationary faculty will initially have less expected service than scholarship, writing, and teaching, service constitutes a significant measure of the professional engagement and stature of faculty, including those seeking promotion to full professor and undergoing five year reviews.

- i. Probationary faculty are expected to assume meaningful but not burdensome service duties is elected or appointed committee assignments in the Department or, less typically, the College or University. Probationary faculty should exercise reasonable discretion in accepting professional

or community service responsibilities that might negatively affect productivity in research and writing or effectiveness in teaching. Tenured faculty are expected to share the routine responsibilities of departmental administration and governance, to take leadership roles in the Department, College and University, and to perform in those professional or community service capacities for which their interests, expertise, and experience may qualify them.

ii. Examples of university, professional, and community service activities include but are not limited to:

- a. Academic Service Activities: serving on governing bodies, committees and taskforces; chairing Departmental, College, or University committees; creating, chairing, or serving on ad hoc committees; administering or creating Departmental, College, or University programs.
- b. Professional Service Activities: serving on committees and/or holding office in local, regional, national, or international professional associations; reading manuscripts/submissions for publication (e.g., open access journals, book publishers; professional association, publication or resource website or database management; performing tenure/promotion reviews; providing expertise to other committees or units.
- c. Community Service Activities: consulting, related to professional expertise, with educational institutions, government agencies, business, or industry; service or volunteer work related to professional expertise, in civic, cultural, educational or other community organizations; performances, readings, presentations or exhibitions related to professional expertise to civic, cultural, educational, other community organizations; judging competitions.

Section Six: Appointment, Reappointment, and Performance Evaluation Process for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

I. Nature of the Position

Lectureships are non-tenure track faculty positions. At minimum, a Lecturer must hold an M.A. in Writing Studies, English or a similar discipline. Appointees must show evidence of teaching effectiveness, have knowledge of current writing theories that inform pedagogies, and have the ability to use technologies as they apply to the teaching & learning of writing. The workload of a Lecturer is four courses each semester (forty hours/10 hours per course) or its equivalent; active participation in Departmental governance, and demonstrated participation in professional engagement related to their work in the Department, (e.g., conference/workshop attendance; peer classroom observation; mentoring of graduate students, teachers or tutors; administration; research, publication, curricular development and other activities). No appointment, and no series of appointments, as a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer constitutes the granting of permanent tenure, which may be granted only upon formal action by the Board of

Governors of the University of North Carolina.

II. Role of Lecturers

The WRDS program views Lecturers as important colleagues and is committed to maintaining a supportive and mutually beneficial relationship between Lecturers and faculty at the Professorial ranks. Lecturers in WRDS normally teach a four course load or an equivalent instructional or administrative load. As appropriate and possible, Lecturers teach in a wider range of courses within their specialty area.

III. Term of Appointment

Lecturer lines may either be “core” positions, in which case they are appointed for long-term instructional support (usually an initial three-year appointment) or “temporary” positions, in which case they are appointed for a short time, typically one year. All Lecturers are full-time members of the faculty with health and pension benefits, eligibility for salary increases, and have access to Departmental resources for their professional work.

- A. The workload of a Lecturer is four courses each semester (forty hours/10 hours per course) or its equivalent; active participation in Departmental governance, and demonstrated participation in professional engagement related to their work in the Department, (e.g., conference/workshop attendance; peer classroom observation; mentoring of graduate students, teachers or tutors; administration; research, publication, curricular development and other activities).
- B. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are expected to serve on standing committees, per Departmental governance documents. They are voting members on departmental committees except where State, University, or College policy precludes such participation (e.g. Lecturers in WRDS may not vote on Review Committee when there are official reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions for tenure-line members).

IV. Responsibilities

The primary responsibility of all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in WRDS, unless otherwise indicated in the initial letter of appointment, is to make a satisfactory contribution to the instructional mission of the program. In order to promote the scholarship of teaching and learning as necessary to quality instruction, the Department supports efforts by Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to engage in scholarly activities. However, unless specifically stated in the initial letter of appointment, Lecturers are not required to produce published research.

V. Evaluation Process

Evaluation processes previously outlined in Section Four above pertain to Lecturers; however, for clarity, those specific to Lecturers are outlined here.

- A. For both annual and comprehensive reviews, guidelines, reportage forms, and examples are located on the Department Canvas site. Materials should be uploaded to sub-folders marked LAR <current year under review> or Comprehensive review <current year under review> on the site; the link is sent to faculty early in fall of the calendar year under review. Review years are always calendars (not academic) years, as indicated in directions.
- B. Every year, both Core and Temporary Lecturers undergo an annual review process. Core Lecturers undergo a comprehensive review at the end of their three-year contract.
- C. Upon successful completion of a comprehensive review of those first three years, Core Lecturers may be appointed for another three years.
- D. At the end of the second three years, and the completion of a successful comprehensive review, Core Lecturers may be appointed for an additional five years; subsequent comprehensive reviews would then take place every five years of a successful comprehensive review and a five year contract would follow. Core Lecturers are eligible for additional contracts as long as their reappointment reviews are satisfactory.
- E. Materials submitted for comprehensive review in fall, will be preliminarily evaluated by the DRC, in order to give the committee time to thoroughly read and discuss materials submitted. At that point, comprehensive review materials will not yet contain that Fall's semester activity report or student evaluations. In January, when all faculty submit their annual reports, the DRC will first review the annual reports of those up for reappointment. Based on the now complete file that includes Fall semester, a letter concerning evaluation and reappointment will be written from the DRC to the chair. The chair will then write a separate evaluation. Both letters will be added to the applicant's portfolio. It is incumbent upon the chair to discuss the reappointment recommendation with the applicant. The College Office will review the reappointment materials and make a final determination.
- F. Should a yearly or comprehensive review not meet the expectations of the Department, the Lecturer will be assigned a faculty mentor for the following year. The mentor will be chosen by the DRC in consultation with the chair, with the expectation that the mentoring will follow a plan outlined by the chair, faculty member and mentor. Any faculty member must meet expectations in the annual review mentored year or be subject to non-reappointment. All contract renewals and appointments are always subject to College and University policies and procedures.
- G. At the conclusion of the annual review process, Lecturers will receive a letter representing both the chair's and the DRC's evaluation; at the end of a comprehensive review, Lecturers will receive a letter of evaluation form both the DRC and chair.

VI. Criteria for Reappointment of Lecturers

In order to be reappointed, a Lecturer in WRDS must:

- A. Demonstrate teaching competence as outlined in annual review guidelines.

- B. Demonstrate both the willingness and ability to teach courses commensurate with Departmental needs.
- C. Demonstrate a satisfactory level of accomplishment of service activities commensurate with needs of the Department.
- D. Meet any additional expectations specified in the initial letter of appointment, or in subsequent letters of reappointment.

VII. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The rank of Senior Lecturer is a unique (and not automatic) recognition for Lecturers who have distinguished themselves in their careers at UNC Charlotte. Senior Lecturers help to provide a stable core for leadership and curricular development in departments and the college. They help maintain a sense of continuity in programs, in the classroom, and through service. Senior Lecturers must meet the College (see CLAS website) and Department Criteria:

- A. To be eligible for Senior Lecturer, a candidate should have attained a Master's degree in her or his field of study with evidence of continued professional development, have a minimum of six years of full-time teaching experience at UNC Charlotte, and have demonstrated consistently excellent performance in instruction and other assigned responsibilities, beyond that expected for reappointment at the rank of Lecturer.
- B. Equally Important a Senior Lecturer should be distinguished by, but not limited to, a selection of the following:
 - i. Provide leadership within the program through administration, faculty development or other activities that fostered the development of faculty, curriculum or programmatic structure;
 - ii. Contribute to curricular development in the program/ College through leadership or participation in special initiatives;
 - iii. Demonstrate consistently excellent performance in instruction and other assigned responsibilities--*beyond* that expected for reappointment as a lecturer;
 - iv. Demonstrate engagement with professional development related to writing studies and/or teaching scholarship
 - v. Provide continuous service to the program through committee work, mentoring, administrative appointments, and professional development offerings
 - vi. Contribute to the understanding of "writing" and the role of the UWP beyond the borders of the UWP.
 - vii. Demonstrate both the willingness and ability to teach courses commensurate with Departmental needs.
 - viii. Demonstrate an excellent level of accomplishment of service activities commensurate with needs of the Department.

Section Seven: Appointment, Reappointment, and Performance Evaluation Process for Adjunct Faculty

I. Nature of the Position

Adjunct faculty are non-tenure track faculty positions. Persons appointed as adjunct faculty must hold at least an M.A. degree in an appropriate area of study; have experience teaching face-to-face, using LMS, and in hybrid or online environments. They should also be current in current theoretically informed writing pedagogies.

II. Appointment Process

Appointment as an adjunct faculty member is for a semester term or less. Assuming satisfactory performance in meeting the specified evaluation criteria, adjunct faculty may be reappointed to subsequent semester terms.

III. Evaluation Process

The performance of each adjunct faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the First-Year Writing Director and/or Chair of the Department as the process is described in Section Two.

Section Eight: Tenured Faculty Performance Review

I. Purpose

The purpose of tenured faculty performance review is to provide for the periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members who have tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and service. The goals of such a review are to promote faculty development and productivity and provide ongoing accountability.

II. Applicability

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last cumulative review. A faculty member shall not be subject to a mandatory Tenured Faculty Performance Review more than once every five years. The schedule for reviews is established by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty members who are scheduled for their first fifth-year, mandatory review for promotion (following tenure) during the next academic year may choose to decline that review under provisions of the *Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures*. However, the faculty member who declines to be reviewed for promotion still will

be included in the pool of faculty members eligible to undergo Tenured Faculty Performance Review. Any departmental consideration for promotion five years after a faculty member receives tenure satisfies the faculty member's Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

III. Procedures

The department will utilize the procedures established by the College and the University in the Tenured Faculty Performance Review Policy. In general, those procedures require the following:

- A. That the faculty member to be reviewed be given notice of the review;
- B. That the faculty member submit a review file containing only copies of the last five annual evaluations prepared by the chairperson and a current curriculum vitae. A faculty member can include an optional statement describing her or his professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service;
- C. That the review be performed by the elected departmental Review Committee and that the committee will function according to normal operating guidelines established in the Department/College/University;
- D. That the Review Committee shall make a written assessment of the faculty member's performance including, where appropriate, recommendations to the Chair intended to enhance the faculty member's contribution to the Department and the University. The Review Committee's report is advisory to the Chair. The report shall include an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. The written assessment shall conclude with one of the following findings: "meets expectations," "exceeds expectations," "does not meet expectations."
 - i. The faculty member meets or exceeds expectations if their performance reviews for the past five years indicate a consistent pattern of expected performance and engagement or performance and engagement that exceeds expectations, as outlined in the Department evaluation process documents.
 - ii. The faculty member does not meet expectations if annual performance reviews over the preceding 5 years demonstrate substantial evidence of a persistent pattern of under-performance or disengagement such that the faculty member fails to make an acceptable contributions to the unit and the profession, as outlined in the Department evaluation process documents.
- E. That the chairperson shall provide the faculty member being reviewed a copy of both the Review Committee's report and the chair's recommendation. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to respond in writing. All written responses shall become part of the faculty member's personnel file.
- F. That if the Chairperson and DRC agree that the faculty member's performance is seriously

deficient, the Chair will meet with the faculty member to design a written development plan to improve the faculty member's performance in clearly identified areas over a specified period of time.

- i. Progress toward achieving the goals and timetables set out in the development plan will be reviewed in subsequent annual reviews by the chairperson, who will provide subsequent feedback to the faculty member (and the Dean as warranted).
- ii. At the end of the period specified in the developmental plan, the Chair in consultation with the DRC will review the performance of the faculty member and make one of the following recommendations: (a) the faculty member has improved her/his performance and no further action is necessary; (b) the faculty member's performance has improved but not to the expected level; (c) the faculty member's performance remains seriously deficient.
- iii. In the case of option b, the Chair may require an adjustment in the developmental plan or in the faculty member's workload in order to further enhance performance. In the case of c, the Chair may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Before any sanction is imposed, the Chair must consult with the DRC and the result of that consultation must be forwarded to the Dean.
- iv. In this as in all RPT processes, in cases where this document conflicts with current procedures in the College or University, the department will defer to University policy.

Section Nine: Statement of Conformity, Faculty Appeal and Supporting Documents

I. Statement of Conformity

The performance evaluation and review process and procedures described in this document are consistent with those prescribed in Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (June 1992), the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws (Amended February 1994), Guidelines Governing Peer Reviews of Teaching Within the College of Arts and Sciences (June 1994) and Description of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the College of Arts and Sciences (October 1991). If any portion or portions of this document are found to be in conflict with these or other prescribed University or College guidelines, the University or College Guidelines shall prevail.

II. Faculty Appeal

Any WRDS faculty who contend that the review of their performance by the Chair of the

Department, the Department Review Committee is based upon impermissible reasons including interference with the faculty member's academic freedom or personal discrimination may request a review of the decision by the Grievance Committee as described in Section IX of the University *Tenure Document* and the applicable guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences.

III. Supporting Documents

In preparing for performance evaluation and throughout the evaluation process, WRDS faculty, the Review Committee, and Chair of the Department will adhere to the guidelines established in the following documents (all available on the Department Review Canvas site), specifically, the *Project- WRDS Faculty Review Submissions* and *Project-WRDS Resource Site*,