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Teaching Areas

The Department of Literature and Philosophy teaches courses in the following areas:

A. B.A. in English

B. M.A. in English

C. B.A. in Philosophy

D. General Program: the Core World Literature survey courses (2111 and 2112); Humanities courses; Religious Studies 2130

E. Minor Programs within the department: Religious Studies and Irish Studies

F. Other Minor Programs, including African-American Studies, American Studies, Comparative Literature, Film Studies, International Studies, and Women’s and Gender Studies
Faculty Hiring

The department hires faculty to meet particular areas of need within its programs. The chair, in consultation with and upon the advice of program area committees, determines hiring descriptions for these positions. The chair of the search committee, in consultation with the chair of the department, will also distribute a draft of the job search description via e-mail to the department and solicit feedback from faculty before posting it to national media, such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the *MLA Job Information List*. All tenure-track positions are advertised on a national basis, with serious efforts made toward hiring through affirmative action. Such positions offer to the faculty hired into them the expectation of regular teaching assignments within the advertised areas consistent with growth and development by the faculty member.

The department chair will appoint from the other members of the department the chair of the search committee and at least three other members. All faculty members are urged to meet all job candidates and attend their presentations. After all campus visits are complete, faculty will turn in written evaluations of each candidate, including rating them “acceptable” or “unacceptable” and ranking them from most preferred to least. These evaluations will be sent to the search committee, who will tally the rankings and, in a meeting, report to the department on the vote tally and the written evaluations, including the committee’s own recommendation. The department will vote to rank the candidates in order of preference, and this information, along with the faculty’s and the committee’s comments, will be forwarded to the dean.
Annual Faculty Evaluations

See Appendix A: CLASS Policy 300: Faculty Evaluations

See Appendix A-1: CLASS Faculty Evaluation Form

See Appendix A-2: CLASS Faculty Report of Activities Form

Faculty within the department are evaluated annually by the department chair. The evaluation process follows below:

1. During the fall semester, the department chair solicits from members of the department data on their teaching, their service to the institution, and their scholarship since the last annual evaluation.

2. Using this information, together with any other materials the faculty member wishes to submit, the chair evaluates the performance of each member of the department relative to the performance of all other members of the department. The chair completes a CLASS Faculty Evaluation Form (Appendix A-1) for each faculty member.

3. The chair gives the faculty member a written copy of the evaluation before meeting with the faculty member to discuss it.

4. All full-time faculty, including limited-term faculty, will be evaluated by the chair annually. All part-time faculty will be evaluated at the end of every semester that they teach.

5. The categories for evaluation are:

   Teaching
   Research/Creativity
   Service
   Administrative
   Overall

6. Faculty members are scored in the categories above according to the following scale:

   Extraordinarily exceeds stated expectations
   Exceeds stated expectations
   Fully meets stated expectations
   Partially meets stated expectations
   Does not meet stated expectations

The Annual Evaluation becomes the basis for the chair’s recommendation of merit salary increases (when such monies are available).
Evaluating Faculty: Teaching (adopted Fall 2014)

We as a department recognize that effective teaching takes many different forms, and we affirm this diversity in styles of instruction. We believe that the practice of teaching is best evaluated holistically, not exclusively numerically, by looking at an overall picture of performance.

Teaching that Fully Meets Stated Expectations

The instructor is expected to:

- Be an engaged and committed teacher, dedicated to student learning, well prepared, and well informed.
- Practice professional integrity in dealings with students.
- Design and teach each course so that it reflects the description in the Course Catalog.
- In courses for which the department has established assignments, include these in the course. See “ENGL Course-Specific Information,” below.
- Meet with his or her classes regularly and for the entire class period.
- Provide each class with a syllabus in the first week of classes that meets the standards set forth in this Manual, including clearly stated course objectives. See “Expectations for Instruction in the Department,” below.
- Adhere to the syllabus or, if the syllabus must be altered, provide students with this information and a rationale for the change as soon as possible.
- Return graded work in a timely manner, and return major assignments before the next similar assignment is due.
- Report grades (early alert and final) by the deadline.
- Administer Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) in all classes, as specified in this Manual.*
- Be reasonably available to students, which includes
  a) holding regular posted office hours (generally 1 office hour per 3-hour single section course per semester, which can include online office hours), and
  b) responding to student communications.

Teaching that Exceeds Stated Expectations

The instructor meets all of the expectations listed above and more. Evidence of exceptional dedication to student learning, exceptional success in engaging and teaching students, and/or exceptional commitment to excellence in one’s teaching may merit this rating.

Teaching that Extraordinarily Exceeds Stated Expectations

This rating is reserved for extraordinary achievements in teaching, such as winning a teaching award, or successfully developing entirely new classes or curricula. This rating could also be awarded for outstanding achievements in many aspects of one’s teaching, as demonstrated using several different kinds of evidence.

Teaching that Partially Meets Stated Expectations
The instructor meets most but not all of the expectations listed above.

**Teaching that Does Not Meet Stated Expectations**

Only in rare instances would this rating be given. It would be appropriate only in an extreme case of instructor irresponsibility—for example, failure to meet class regularly, failure to turn in final grades, demonstrable discrimination or harassment in dealings with students.

**The Annual Review Process**

**Fully Meets Expectations**

In order to demonstrate teaching that fully meets expectations, all faculty will provide the chair with a list of courses taught and all syllabi from the previous year. The chair will review the SRI and the material provided by the faculty. The student comments, as opposed to the numerical ratings, will receive the most weight in any consideration of the SRI.*

For the annual review, all faculty are welcome but not required to supply the chair with a teaching portfolio containing some of the materials below. Junior faculty (those who have not yet been tenured and promoted) are strongly advised to provide a teaching portfolio annually. This will help them prepare for the pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion process.

**Exceeds Expectations** and **Extraordinarily Exceeds Expectations**

What follows is a list of possible ways to document evidence of superior teaching. This list is not exhaustive; other forms of evidence are welcome. Faculty who are interested in demonstrating teaching that “exceeds” or “extraordinarily exceeds expectations” will provide the chair with a teaching portfolio containing some of the items from this list at the time of the annual review.

- A narrative that shows a commitment to self-improvement by carefully reflecting on the year’s teaching
- Peer evaluations that attest to the instructor’s outstanding classroom teaching
- Documented student comments praising exceptionally good teaching (for example, in written comments on the SRI, direct written communication with the chair, letters to the instructor, etc.)
- Very high numbers on the SRI across a variety of courses and over time, which attest to the instructor’s outstanding teaching*
- Examples of sets of graded student work (exams, drafts, papers, etc.) that demonstrate above-average or extraordinary dedication to the student learning process
- Successful direction of student research, including directing theses and serving on thesis committees, and directing undergraduate student work of various kinds
- Evidence of professionally-relevant mentoring, including effective mentoring and supervision of graduate students
- Demonstrated commitment to enhancing one’s teaching, such as attending a pedagogy workshop or conference
• Above-average or extraordinary dedication to enriching students’ learning by providing students with discipline-relevant extracurricular opportunities, field trips, service learning, other activities outside of class time
• Examples of creative uses of technology that improve student learning
• Examples of successful innovation, such as designing a new course, putting an existing course online, or developing new approaches or assignments in an existing course
• Winning a grant for development in teaching
• Winning and/or being nominated for a teaching award

*All statements in this document about the use of Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) are purposely vague in recognition of the fact that the University is in the process of revising or perhaps adopting a new form of student evaluations. When a new form and process are in place, we will revisit questions about how the student evaluations should be used.*
Evaluating Faculty: Research/Creativity

Expectations for Research / Evaluating Research in the Department of Literature and Philosophy

We expect tenured and tenure-track faculty to produce peer-reviewed scholarship and/or creative work. We value consistent and sustained production of such work, as well as other scholarly and creative activities, such as presenting at conferences, writing book reviews, and seeking extramural grants. We recognize that scholarly and creative productivity is best assessed over the long term, by evaluating the trajectory of a faculty member’s work. But the annual review by definition assesses one particular year of a person’s career. This policy gives guidelines for evaluating one year’s work, while recognizing the importance of productivity over the long term.

The following policy states that a faculty member can meet expectations in a given year by engaging in scholarly and creative activities such as those found in Categories B and C of our Department Manual. But pre-tenure faculty must publish peer-reviewed work in order to be tenured and promoted; therefore, they cannot meet expectations after their first year in the tenure track unless they show evidence that they are writing and submitting their work with an aim toward publication in peer-reviewed venues. By the third year in the tenure track, a faculty member should have produced work in Category A—that is, he or she should have such work forthcoming or in print—in order fully to meet expectations.

Research / Creativity that Fully Meets Stated Expectations

A faculty member can meet expectations for the year by showing evidence of ongoing scholarly or creative activity. For example, presenting work at a conference, or applying for an external grant in support of one’s research, or having work forthcoming (that is, completed and accepted for publication by a press or journal), or having work under consideration by a journal or press: any of these would meet expectations in research for a given year. Any of the activities in Category B and C in the Department Manual meet expectations for the year. Evidence of work in progress alone can fully meet expectations for one year, but not in subsequent years.

Research / Creativity that Exceeds Expectations

A faculty member has exceeded expectations for the year when a substantial peer-reviewed article, book chapter, or equivalent creative work, such as those specified in Category A of our Manual, is published, along with some of the activities listed in Categories B and C. Winning a substantial research-related external grant, in conjunction with other scholarly and creative activities, also exceeds expectations. Publishing two substantial peer-reviewed articles also exceeds expectations. A faculty member who shows evidence of work forthcoming (meaning completed, accepted, and in press) that would earn him or her an “Extraordinarily Exceeds Expectations” has exceeded expectations for the year. If a faculty member wins a significant award or honor for his or her scholarly or creative work, this might also serve as evidence of exceeding expectations.

Research / Creativity that Extraordinarily Exceeds Expectations

A faculty member has extraordinarily exceeded expectations for the year when he or she publishes a peer-reviewed book of the kind specified in Category A (monograph, edited book, discipline-related textbook, book-length translation, or critical edition). Publishing three or more substantial peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or equivalent creative works, such as those specified in Category A of our Department Manual, also extraordinarily exceeds expectations. Winning a substantial research-related external grant, along with two or more substantial peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or
equivalent creative works, such as those specified in Category A of our Department Manual, also extraordinarily exceeds expectations. We expect that a faculty member who extraordinarily exceeds expectations will also be making contributions of the kind found in Categories B and C in our Manual.

Research / Creativity that Partially Meets Expectations
If there is no scholarly or creative activity as in Categories A, B, or C in our Department Manual, and the faculty member shows evidence of work in progress, but he or she showed only work in progress the preceding year, he or she has partially met expectations for research for this year. If this is still the case in the following year, work in progress alone will not be enough to partially meet expectations.

Research / Creativity that Does Not Meet Expectations
If there has been no scholarly or creative activity as in Categories A, B, or C in our Department Manual, and no evidence of work in progress, the faculty member has not met expectations. If there is evidence of work in progress, but the faculty member showed only work in progress in the two preceding years, he or she has not met expectations for the current year.

The Annual Review Process
The faculty member provides the chair with a list of scholarly and/or creative work for the previous year. The list includes work that was published, work that was accepted for publication but has not yet appeared, work submitted and under review, work in progress, editorial work, book reviews, papers presented at conferences, lectures, and any other instances of scholarly and creative activity. Any grants received or grant applications in progress should also appear on this list, as should honors or awards for scholarly or creative work.

The status of the work must be clearly indicated: whether it was published, or was accepted and is forthcoming, or is undergoing revisions, or is under review. The venue and date for presentations should be provided. For published works, a complete bibliographic entry should be included, with date of publication, publisher and/or journal title, and page numbers.

For work that is forthcoming, the faculty member provides evidence of the work’s acceptance. For work in progress, the faculty member turns in a narrative that describes the project and what has been accomplished so far. In the second year that a faculty member lists work in progress, he or she must provide a draft of the work as part of the annual review process.
Evaluating Faculty: Service

As a department, we expect tenured and tenure-track faculty to participate in service. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers have service obligations as well. We recognize that service is best assessed over the long term and can performed in a diversity of ways. Service may occur as service to the department, service to the college, service to the university, service to the profession, or service to the community that relates to the profession. This policy provides guidelines for evaluating work annually, while recognizing the importance of service over the long term for a member of the department.

The following list divides service activities into categories A, B, and C. These categories are meant to represent the amount of effort required, with category A representing the most demanding service commitments and category C representing those activities that, though important, are not as significantly demanding. This is not an exhaustive list, but it does give information regarding how other kinds of similar activities are to be considered.

**Category A service includes activities like the following:**

Chair of a college or university level committee

Chair of a search committee

Faculty senate moderator or officer

Graduate director

Officer of a national academic professional organization

Editor of a journal

Lead organizer of a conference for participants outside of the Georgia Southern community

Director of a study abroad trip

Director of a Center

Author of an Assessment Report

**Category B service includes activities such as:**

Chair of one of the five main department committees (English Major, General Program, Graduate Program, Philosophy, and Religious Studies)

Member of a college or university level committee
Member of a search committee
Faculty senate member
Editorial Board member
Reviewer of book project for publication
Organizer of campus symposium or speaker requiring a budget
Recruiter for study abroad trip
External reviewer for promotion and/or tenure at another institution
Recording Secretary for the department
Personnel Committee Chair
Web master for the department
Teacher of a QEP designated class

Category C service includes activities like:
Chair of department committees other than the English Major Program, General Program, Graduate Program, Philosophy, and Religious Studies committees
Membership in other department committees
Alternate for faculty senate
Alternate for college level committees
Member of a professional organization requiring duties
Web or social media for a professional academic organization
Reviewer of an article for publication
Organizer of campus speaker without a budget
Organizer of conference on campus without a budget
Advisor for a student group
Community service connected to academic discipline
Moderator of a conference panel
Member of accreditation committees at Georgia Southern
Attending events like Parents’ Weekend, Conversations with Professors, Move-in Day, Open House, and Major Fair
Service that Fully Meets Stated Expectations

A faculty member has fully met expectations when one has:

• Regularly attended department meetings (or provided a reasonable excuse to the Chair).
• Been a member and attended meetings of one of the five major department committees (English Major Program, General Program, Graduate Program, Philosophy, or Religious Studies).
• Participated in and regularly attended at least one area C or above activity.
• Completed tasks and met administrative deadlines on a regular basis.
• Attended at least one graduation ceremony or honors day per academic year.

In general, participation in service is expected to increase as one rises in rank.

Service that Exceeds Expectations

In addition to successfully meeting expectations requirements as stated above, a faculty member is eligible for consideration for exceeding expectations when participating in at least one area B activity or multiple area C level activities. The faculty member should also submit a narrative that describes the quality and amount of service work and how it exceeds expectations for that year.

Service that Extraordinarily Exceed Expectations

In addition to successfully achieving meeting expectations as stated above, a faculty member may be considered to have extraordinarily exceeded expectations by participating in at least one category A activity, or multiple instances of B and C activities. Again, the narrative should describe the quality and amount of service work and how the effort for the year is extraordinary.

Service that Partially Meets Expectations

A faculty member who partially meets service expectations will meet most, but not all, of the listed requirements for meeting expectations.

Service that Does Not Meet Stated Expectations

This designation will be given rarely. The designation would be appropriate in extreme cases of irresponsibility or in failing to positively contribute to the basic service requirements of the department.
The Annual Review Process

To meet expectations, the department member will provide a list to the Chair of the service activities from the previous year that establish that one has met expectations.

For a ranking of exceeds expectations or extraordinarily exceeds expectations, a less-than-500 word narrative is required to give context to the service. It is understood that committee work and other kinds of service commitments can vary from year to year in terms of their demands. On some occasions, it is possible to advocate for a higher ranking of an activity that is normally listed as B or C, if the narrative articulates a convincing rationale. The Chair may also consider the role of compensation for the service, either in funding or course releases, as well the rank of the individual when evaluating the merited service.
First- and Third-Year Evaluations

See Appendix B: CLASS Policy 310: Pre-Tenure Review of Probationary Faculty

Procedure to be followed by the department in conducting the first-year evaluation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty

In the first year of the new faculty member's appointment,

1. Before the end of February, two peer visits will be made, one of these by the department Chair and the other consisting of a two-person committee, one chosen by the Chair, one by the faculty member being evaluated. The visiting faculty members will write an official report of each visit and discuss the report with the new faculty member.

2. The department Chair solicits written recommendations from faculty concerning the faculty member's retention.

Procedure to be followed by the department in conducting the third-year evaluation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty

In the spring of the third year,

1. The faculty member submits a brief statement concerning his or her work at Georgia Southern University. Materials should include scholarship, service, and teaching in addition to vita, syllabi of all courses taught, student evaluations for every class, a sheaf of representative graded essays and marked tests, and copies of the final grade sheets.

2. The tenured faculty and Chair of the department meet to discuss the merits of the candidate. Confidentiality will be respected.

3. Within five working days, tenured faculty will submit written comments to the Chair.

4. The Chair meets with the candidate to inform him or her of the recommendation.

5. The Chair will inform the tenured faculty about his recommendation by email.

6. The Chair then forwards his or her recommendation to the Dean.

Successful completion of the third-year review calls for evidence of progress toward meeting tenure requirements (see next page).
Promotion and Tenure

See Appendix C: CLASS Policy 320: Promotion and Tenure

Academic tenure is an arrangement under which faculty appointments, after successful completion of a probationary period, are continued until resignation or retirement. Tenured faculty members are subject to dismissal only for adequate cause, unavoidable termination on account of genuine and demonstrable exigency, or elimination or reduction of an institutional program. The probationary period is that period of professional service during which a faculty member does not hold tenure and is carefully and systematically observed by colleagues for the purpose of evaluation of professional qualifications and performance. At the end of this period, the faculty member is reviewed and either receives tenure or is not reappointed. To be eligible for tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, a faculty member normally must hold the rank of associate professor or professor or be promoted to the rank of associate professor when tenure is awarded. As the requirements for promotion to associate professor are the same requirements for receiving tenure, promotion to associate professor and tenure will typically be considered and awarded or denied at the same time. In ordinary circumstances (i.e., tenure-track, rank of assistant professor, no probationary credit), faculty members will be considered for tenure during their sixth year of tenure-track service. Faculty who can demonstrate clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation may choose, however, to apply for tenure in their fifth year.

Newly-appointed faculty with prior full-time service may be credited with up to three years of probationary service as per the tenure policy outlined in Section 209 in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook. Such faculty shall be notified in writing at the time of appointment as to how many years of probationary service credit are being given and therefore how long the reduced probationary period of service shall be. A faculty member who has been granted probationary credit will be considered for tenure according to the reduced period of service, unless the faculty member notifies the dean in writing by September 1 of the year in which the faculty member is first eligible for tenure that he or she has chosen not to use the probationary credit granted. If a faculty member elects not to use the probationary credit granted, then he or she will not be considered for tenure until the sixth year of service at Georgia Southern University.

Faculty members who apply and are not recommended for tenure in the minimum time of five years or who use probationary credit and are not recommended in the minimum time may apply for tenure only once more.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Faculty members hired into the tenure track shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the College and departmental promotion and tenure criteria in effect at the time their employment begins. For all subsequent promotions, faculty members shall be responsible for meeting the College and departmental promotion criteria in effect at the time of their application for promotion. (See Appendix B-1: CLASS Policy 321: Amendments to Promotion and Tenure Policies).

The awarding of tenure and/or promotion in rank is a holistic determination based on the totality of a faculty member’s accomplishments. The primary criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences are effective teaching, the consistent and sustained production of
peer-reviewed scholarship and/or creative works, and a demonstrable record of service. Significant weight also will be given to seeking and obtaining extramural grants and contracts where feasible in the discipline; ongoing professional development will also be evaluated. Within these general guidelines established by the College, the department establishes these criteria for tenure and promotion:

For promotion and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor:

Except in cases of clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation, the candidate shall have served four years or more at the institution as an Assistant Professor and possess a demonstrated record of meaningful professional activity. This must include:

1. The appropriate terminal degree.
2. Evidence of effective teaching:

   Teaching is a major determinant in a successful application for promotion and tenure. Candidates are expected to show evidence of noteworthy accomplishment in teaching at various levels, according to their teaching assignments. Effective teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching activity typically involves teaching in the classroom; direction of research; and development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including, where appropriate, the development of online courses. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as annual self-evaluations, peer evaluations (done in the candidate’s first year and recommended again during the third year and at other times, if desired), student ratings of instruction, and examination of course syllabi and other course materials.

3. Scholarship:

   Consistent and sustained production of peer-reviewed scholarship is expected for tenure and promotion considerations. Faculty must show strong evidence of scholarly achievement through peer-reviewed publications and by other scholarly activities, as outlined in the categories below. Scholarly production will be evaluated holistically, both in terms of quantity and quality. To qualify for tenure and/or promotion, a candidate will produce scholarship of the type represented in category A. Additional scholarship represented by categories B and C will bolster a candidate’s portfolio, but cannot substitute for deficiencies in category-A type scholarship. For those coming to Georgia Southern with probationary credit, scholarly work done at previous institutions will be taken into account, but the applicant must present evidence of continued significant scholarship since joining this department.

Category A

   (Note: Must be original, published peer-reviewed materials. Published includes materials accepted for publication as verified by the appropriate letters from journals or presses. Materials submitted but not yet accepted will not be considered for this category; see Category C.)

   • Scholarly article or book chapter
   • Book
   • Edited book, such as a monograph or collection of articles, letters, or other documents
• Discipline-related textbook
• Book-length translation
• Critical edition
• Full-length or otherwise substantial discipline-related creative piece such as a novel, novella, play, or collection of creative non-fiction pieces
• Research-related grant award with substantial external funding

Category B
• Presentation of an original scholarly paper at a discipline-related conference (local, regional, national, international)
• Book review in a discipline-related journal
• Invited scholarly presentation to a group of academic peers
• Peer- or editorially-reviewed publication of briefer, discipline-related pieces such as poems, short stories, or creative non-fiction essays
• Major textbook revision
• Presentation of a discipline-related workshop to academic peers
• Peer-reviewed publication of a significantly revised/expanded previously published article
• Materials from Category A that are not peer-reviewed but that are recognized as high quality by departmental peers

Category C
• Invited, discipline-related presentation to the general public
• Submission of research-related external grant proposal
• Review of an article for a discipline-related journal
• Review for a publisher of a discipline-related text
• Submission for publication of work not yet counted in Categories A or B
• Less rigorous items from Category B

4. Service:

This may include departmental service such as committee work, developing and maintaining new programs, participating in departmental colloquia or workshops, advising students, serving on search committees, and website development. University service may include serving on the Faculty Senate or on university-wide committees; organizing conferences, speakers, or performances; and being faculty advisor to student organizations. Service to the profession may include holding office in regional or national associations, consultation, or website development and maintenance.
For promotion and/or tenure at the rank of professor:

Except in cases of clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation, the candidate shall have served five or more years at the institution as an Associate Professor and possess a record of distinguished professional activity. This must include:

1. **The appropriate terminal degree in the discipline.**

2. Consistent evidence of **effective teaching**; such evidence will include informed opinions of peers, student evaluations, and teaching-related honors and initiatives.

3. Significant **scholarship** produced since the last promotion: an ongoing record of substantial publications of the kind found in Category A, such as a book or books (for instance, monographs, edited collections, scholarly editions) and/or peer-reviewed book chapters and articles. Five substantial peer-reviewed articles or book chapters of high quality produced since the last promotion, with evidence of sustained scholarly activity since the last review, would meet the basic requirement in scholarship for promotion to Full Professor. “Sustained scholarly activity” includes the scholarship represented by Categories B and C, which can bolster the candidate’s portfolio but cannot substitute for deficiencies in Category A scholarship.

4. As faculty members progress through the ranks, they should also expand their **service**, so that by the time they come to consideration for promotion to Professor, they should demonstrate significant service to the university, the profession, or the community. Community service would be that which draws upon the candidate’s professional skills, such as teaching, research, or consultation.

**Application Procedure**

The Department of Literature and Philosophy uses a Promotion and Tenure Committee comprised of all its tenured faculty members: a committee of the whole. We recognize the College’s stipulation that "a majority of the committee must hold the rank of associate professor or professor." This has normally been the case in our department. Should conditions change in the future, we will reconstitute the committee to meet the requirements set forth by the College. In the event that a department has fewer than five faculty members eligible to serve or vote as part of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean will consult with the department chair and appoint additional eligible faculty members from within the College to bring the committee up to five voting members. The department’s elected representative on the College Personnel Committee serves as chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**The Procedure:**

In the spring before candidates go up for tenure and/or promotion, the department chair will meet with them as a group or individually and inform them of all the requirements and deadlines for the upcoming summer and fall terms.
Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should submit their completed dossiers to the department no later than the first day of fall classes, usually around August 15.

The department chair and the chair of the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will immediately examine the candidates’ dossiers before making them available to the tenured faculty to make sure that the dossiers are complete, in good order, and that all items are presented clearly. If any clarification or changes are needed, the department chair, in consultation with the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will follow up with the candidates to make sure the appropriate changes are made well in advance of the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting. Once the dossiers are in good order, all tenured faculty should review the dossiers.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee—the tenured faculty in the department—then holds a confidential meeting to discuss the candidates. This meeting must be held by the beginning of September to meet the college deadline of September 20. Although tenured associate professors may serve on department promotion and tenure committees, they may not vote on candidates for promotion and/or tenure at the rank of professor; only full professors may vote on promotion to that rank. The discussion of the candidates during the meeting is similarly limited by rank. Typically, the committee of the whole meets and first discusses and votes on candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Then everyone leaves except the full professors, who discuss and vote on the candidates for full. The department’s elected representative to the College Personnel Review Committee will serve as the chair of the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee and will conduct this meeting. In the case of each candidate, a vote will be taken by closed paper ballot. Two committee members will count and confirm the results and present the tally to the committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee’s recommendation to the department chair should be made in the form of a memorandum that identifies the members of the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee and reports the committee’s vote (e.g. 10 votes in favor, 5 against) and supporting rationale. The committee chair will write the memorandum in consultation with the committee.
Committee members may also individually send written comments to the chair, which the chair may consult and use in writing the cover letter that accompanies candidates’ application dossiers. All such written comments must be received within five working days after the committee’s meeting to discuss the candidates’ applications. When a department chair is a candidate for promotion, the committee’s memorandum and recommendation will be provided to the dean.

The chair reviews written comments from committee members, discussion during the committee meeting, and the committee’s vote and supporting information included in the memorandum. The chair may use these materials to help detail the cover letter to the Dean, but the chair’s recommendation to the Dean is independent of the committee’s recommendation.

Before sending their completed dossiers to the dean, the department chair will meet with all candidates individually to present the chair’s cover letter and the committee’s memorandum, including the results of the vote. When these materials are forwarded to the dean, the chair’s recommendation about each candidate will be made available to the faculty.

By September 20 of each year, our department will provide the dean with the following items for each candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure:

1. Required cover materials, including a completed promotion and/or tenure application form.
2. A cover letter from our chair detailing his or her recommendation to the dean on the faculty member’s candidacy for promotion and/or tenure.
3. A copy of the department promotion and tenure committee’s memorandum to the department chair regarding the candidate.
4. A current *curriculum vitae* in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
5. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.
6. Pre-Tenure Review (if not yet tenured).
7. All annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
8. Summary of student ratings of instruction.
9. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
10. External letters of evaluation of scholarship
11. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
12. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application, including copies of publications and conference papers.

Items 1 through 11 will be submitted in a single 1.5" notebook with supporting materials submitted separately. Additional supporting material should be submitted in one file-"banker’s"-box.

After materials are submitted, only the dean may alter the packet, following consultation with the department chair, based on verified significant accomplishments or other information that has become available since the packet was submitted and only with written notification to the candidate.
The applicant’s dossier will be reviewed by the College Personnel Review Committee, which will make a recommendation to the dean for each applicant for promotion and/or tenure. The recommendations of the College Personnel Review Committee are advisory to the dean.

At the dean’s discretion, promotion applications may also be reviewed by the College Advisory Council.

The dean reviews the materials submitted by the candidates, considers the recommendations of the College Personnel Review Committee, and makes his or her final recommendation to the provost.

Faculty members will be notified in writing at each level of review concerning the recommendation.

**External Review of Scholarship**

The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences values the comment of peers within our disciplines as a part of the promotion and tenure process; therefore, external review of scholarship will be required for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor. To implement external review of scholarship, the department will follow these procedures:

1. The process will be initiated by the faculty member, who will compile a list of four or five potential reviewers (with contact information) and provide these to the department chair on or before October 15 prior to the academic year in which tenure and/or promotion materials are to be submitted. The proposed external reviewers should be specialists in one or more of the candidate’s fields of publication, which the candidate will verify. External reviewers should not be former professors or thesis/dissertation committee members of the candidate, nor should they be co-authors of publications that appear on the candidate’s vita. Normally, external reviewers should be tenured members of the academy and hold the equivalent or higher rank at their respective institutions as the rank sought by the applicant. In cases where candidates seek promotion and tenure in the same year, external review for promotion will also serve as the candidates’ external review for tenure.

2. The department chair, in consultation with the promotion committee chair, must solicit at least three external reviewers and add their letters of evaluation to the applicant’s dossier. Normally, the chair will use the list of reviewers submitted by the faculty member to select external referees, reserving the right to solicit letters from individuals not on the list.

3. If a reviewer declines to evaluate the faculty member’s scholarship, the chair will contact other people on the list, if necessary scheduling another meeting with the candidate to add additional names. The chair will keep the faculty member informed about progress in procuring three reviewers.

4. The letter to potential reviewers will include the following:

   - The name of the candidate, his or her discipline, and area(s) of scholarly activity, and the rank being sought.
• A request that the reviewer comment on the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments in the context of the candidate’s field and evaluate the candidate’s potential for future development. Included will be the department’s research and publication expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and for promotion to full professor. The letter should not solicit comments about teaching or service or a recommendation for or against promotion.

• Mention of the deadline of July 1 for the department chair to receive the reviewer’s letter.

• A request to accept or decline a review of the candidate’s scholarship within two weeks of receipt of the communication.

5. The candidate will prepare packets of publications, which the chair will send to the reviewers. The department will provide the costs of procuring or copying those publications, and for mailing them, if necessary.

6. If a reviewer fails to submit a candidate’s review by the July 1 deadline, the chair will request an immediate submission.

7. After the review is completed, the chair will send a letter of thanks to each reviewer.

**Appeal Procedure**

If an applicant has not been recommended for promotion and/or tenure at the departmental level, the applicant must notify the dean in writing by October 10 that he or she wishes to appeal the departmental recommendation and state his or her reasons for appeal in a memorandum. The appealing candidate’s memorandum will be added to the application materials and will be reviewed by the College Personnel Review Committee and the dean.

If an applicant has not been recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the dean, the applicant may appeal this decision to the provost, following University guidelines.

Once submitted, all applications will proceed through the process. Withdrawn applications will not be reviewed by the College but may be reviewed by the provost.
Evaluation and Promotion of Lecturers

See Appendix D: CLASS Policy 302: Evaluation and Promotion of Lecturers

Appointment and Renewal

Lecturers are initially appointed for a one-year period with subsequent renewal on an annual basis. Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing.

1. The department chair will seek the advice of tenured faculty and senior lecturers about the reappointment or non-reappointment of lecturers.

2. For lecturers with less than three years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice should be given as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.

3. For lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time service, the department will provide a non-reappointment notice at least 30 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.

4. For senior lecturers or lecturers with six years or more of full-time service, the department will provide non-reappointment notice at least 180 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.

Lecturers or senior lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at Georgia Southern and who have received timely notice about non-reappointment are entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with Georgia Southern University procedures.

Annual Evaluations

Lecturers and senior lecturers shall have an annual review conducted by the department chair along the same schedule as tenure-track and tenured faculty. For lecturers, annual performance reviews should evaluate performance in teaching and service. These annual evaluations will be used for determination of merit increases (when available) and the decisions concerning reappointment and promotion.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Lecturers who have served at least six years at the institution and who demonstrate a sustained record of noteworthy achievement may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. In the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences a faculty member must be promoted to the rank of senior lecturer to be eligible for continuation beyond the initial six-year period.

For reappointment to senior lecturer and reappointment beyond six years, the faculty member must demonstrate “exceptional teaching ability” and “extraordinary value to the institution” (see Appendix D: CLASS Policy 302, Section C)

The department will utilize a lecturer reappointment and promotion committee comprised of five or more tenured faculty members and senior lecturers. A majority of the committee must be tenured
faculty, but the department review committee also shall include one or more senior lecturers if any exist. The lecturer reappointment and promotion committee will review the candidate’s dossier and make recommendations to the department chair for each applicant for reappointment and promotion in the form of a memorandum that identifies the members of the committee and reports the committee’s vote (e.g., 4 votes in favor, 2 against) and the rationale for the committee’s recommendation. For reappointment as a lecturer the chair will provide the faculty member with a copy of the chair’s and departmental review committee’s recommendations.

For candidates for promotion to senior lecturer the following will occur:

1. The tenured and senior lecturer faculty, the lecturer reappointment and promotion committee, and the department chair will meet to discuss the merits of the candidate. Confidentiality will be respected.

2. Within five working days, the tenured and senior lecturer faculty will submit written comments to the chair.

3. The chair will provide the faculty member with a copy of the chair’s and lecturer and promotion committee’s recommendation.

By October 1 the chair will provide the dean with the following items for each lecturer seeking continuation and promotion to senior lecturer beyond the sixth year:

1. A department chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of reappointment and promotion.
2. A copy of the department reappointment and promotion committee’s memorandum to the chair regarding the candidate.
3. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting the review period.
4. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period.
5. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period.
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
7. Evidence of service activities during the review period.

The applicant’s dossier will be reviewed by the advisory College Personnel Review Committee, which will make a recommendation to the dean for each lecturer for reappointment and promotion. At the dean’s discretion, applications may be reviewed by the College Advisory Council. The dean makes a determination as to whether a candidate should be retained and promoted to senior lecturer.

The candidate for promotion and reappointment beyond the sixth year may appeal a negative decision following the process outlined in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook (214.0103).

**Major Review**

After the sixth year and promotion to senior lecturer (if applicable), the faculty member will, in addition to annual reviews, undergo a major review every five years.
For the major review of senior lecturers the department will utilize a review committee comprised of three or more tenured faculty members and senior lecturers that reports to the chair. A majority of the committee must be tenured faculty but also shall include one or more senior lecturers if any exist.

By February 1 the chair will provide the dean with the following items for each senior lecturer undergoing a major review:

1. A chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of the major review.
2. The department review committee’s report.
3. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting the review period.
4. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period.
5. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period.
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
7. Evidence of service activities during the review period.
8. Self-evaluation narrative with projected goals.

The faculty member’s major review dossier will be reviewed by the advisory College Personnel Review Committee. The committee will be instructed to evaluate faculty members holistically in the areas of teaching and service.

The College Personnel Review Committee will forward to the dean one of the following recommendations for each senior lecturer undergoing review:

- The faculty member is exceeding the college’s expectations for performance and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary
- The faculty member is meeting the college’s expectations for performance and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary
- The faculty member is meeting the college’s expectations for performance, but it is recommended that improvements be made.
- The faculty member is not meeting the college’s expectations for performance.

The dean will make a final evaluation and convey the result in writing to the senior lecturer. The senior lecturer will sign the evaluation indicating that he or she has received it and will return a copy to the dean. A signed copy of the dean’s evaluation and the faculty member’s response, if applicable, will be forwarded to the chair and provost. An unsatisfactory major review may result in nonrenewal or the implementation of a work improvement plan for the faculty member.
College and Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committees

The dossiers of applicants for tenure and/or promotion will be reviewed by the College Personnel Review Committee. The committee will consist of one elected representative from each department in the college. Terms of service on the committee will be two years, with staggered expiration of terms when possible. In accordance with College policy, our department’s elected representative to the College committee must be tenured and hold the rank of professor. Faculty may not serve in this position during their post-tenure review year. In the event that no faculty member from the department meets these criteria, the department may elect a tenured associate professor to serve on the committee, but that person may not review the dossiers of candidates for promotion to professor.

The department will elect a faculty member to chair its own Tenure and Promotion Committee. This person may also serve concurrently as the department’s elected representative to the College Personnel Review Committee, provided that he or she is a tenured professor. Election to this position will be held before March 1.
CLASS Policy on Post-Tenure Review

See Appendix E: CLASS Policy 330: Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is intended to provide a periodic, comprehensive evaluation of the performance of tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity (as appropriate to the discipline), and service. Recognizing that faculty may choose to emphasize one or more of these areas at various times during their post-tenure careers, the three areas will be evaluated holistically in gauging the overall performance of tenured faculty undergoing tenure review. Demonstrated activity and/or competence is required in each area.

A. Regular Procedure

All tenured faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences will undergo a thorough review on a regular basis (See Section 213 of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook).

Each faculty member’s post-tenure review will occur on a rotating five-year schedule. The five-year period will begin with the faculty member’s last major personnel decision (i.e., tenure or promotion). This schedule of reviews will be maintained by the associate dean for faculty services and research and verified by the Office of the Provost.

Post-tenure reviews will continue every five years until the faculty member submits to the dean a written statement of his or her intention to retire within the next five years.

A faculty member’s five-year evaluation period may be interrupted by a change of status (for instance, a full-time administrative assignment) or promotion. In these cases, a new five-year interval will be set.

Each department is responsible for setting appropriate deadlines for the submission of post-tenure review materials to allow ample time for review as prescribed by departmental policy and timely reporting of departmental decisions.

By February 1 of a faculty member’s review year, the department will forward to the college the following items for each faculty member undergoing review:

1. A department chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of the post-tenure review.
2. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting the review period.
3. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period.
4. The results of the faculty member’s most recent major personnel evaluation (tenure, promotion, or previous post-tenure) by the department.
5. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period.
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction.
7. Self-evaluation narrative with projected goals.

Items 1-7 will be submitted in a single 1.5” notebook with supporting materials, if any, submitted separately.

After materials are submitted by the faculty member, only the dean may alter the packet, following consultation with the department chair, based on verified significant accomplishments or other
information that has become available since the packet was submitted and only with written
notification to the candidate.

Prior to submission of a faculty member’s post-tenure review dossier to the dean, the faculty member
will be provided with a copy of the department chair’s post-tenure review evaluation.

The faculty member’s post-tenure review dossier will be reviewed by the college personnel review
committee. The committee will be instructed to evaluate faculty members holistically in the following
areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Where appropriate, the committee may also evaluate the
faculty member’s progress towards promotion.

The committee will forward to the dean one of the following recommendations for each faculty
member undergoing review:

- The faculty member is exceeding the college’s expectations for performance and no specific
  recommendations for improvement are necessary.
- The faculty member is meeting the college’s expectations for performance and no specific
  recommendations for improvement are necessary.
- The faculty member is meeting the college’s expectations for performance, but it is
  recommended that improvements be made. [State specific recommendations.]
- The faculty member is not meeting the college’s expectations for performance. [State specific
  areas of concern.]

The recommendations of the college personnel review committee are advisory to the dean.

The dean will review all recommendations of the college personnel review committee and all materials
submitted by faculty members undergoing review. The dean will make a final evaluation and convey
the result, in writing, to the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the evaluation indicating
that he or she has received it and will return a copy to the dean. A signed copy of the dean’s evaluation
and the faculty member’s response, if applicable, will be forwarded to the chair and provost.

B. Appeal Procedure

A faculty member who wishes to appeal a post-tenure review may do so in writing by appending a
response to the dean’s evaluation. Both documents are placed in the faculty member’s file at the
departmental and college levels. A copy of the response is also sent to the provost, along with a
request by the faculty member that the dean’s decision be reviewed by the provost.

At that time, the dean forwards all materials reviewed during the post-tenure review to the Office
of the Provost.
C. Remediation of Deficiencies

In cases where a faculty member is identified as having deficiencies, the department chair and faculty member will establish a formal plan of development for addressing those deficiencies, along with a timeline as described in Section 213.IV of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook.

In cases where severe or chronic deficiencies are found, or in cases where deficiencies have not been remedied according to the established timeline, the dean may recommend that the faculty member be dismissed. In these extreme cases, the dean will follow the university’s policy on the dismissal of tenured faculty.
ENGL 2111 & 2112 Student Learning Outcomes

These objectives should be included in all ENGL 2111 & 2112 syllabi.

Upon successful completion of this course, a student will be able to:

- Demonstrate familiarity with literary language, periods, and genres.
- Analyze literary texts in their cultural contexts.
- Differentiate the features of literatures produced by various world cultures.
Literature Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

Literature Program Goals

A student graduating with a BA degree in English from Georgia Southern University will be able to demonstrate the following:

1. A knowledge of literary periods, movements, genres, and authors that is informed by historical awareness, literary criticism, and theory.

2. The ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate a variety of texts.

3. The ability to communicate in a clear and concise manner for a variety of audiences.

4. The ability to incorporate, engage, and utilize well-planned and executed research.

Literature Program Student Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of their course of study, students graduating with a BA degree in English will be able to:

1. Situate and interpret texts in their historical and cultural contexts.
2. Apply appropriate literary criticism and theory in discussing assigned texts.
3. Evaluate the literary structures inherent in assigned texts.
4. Analyze connections among various works of literature.
5. Create clear and precise writing concerning assigned texts.
6. Apply an awareness of various audiences to their written work.
7. Critically engage the ideas of other scholars.
8. Synthesize research in their writing about assigned texts.
9. Construct a clear and poised oral presentation directed to an audience conversant with literary concepts.
Philosophy Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

Philosophy Program Goals

A student graduating with a BA degree in Philosophy from Georgia Southern University will be able to demonstrate the following:

1. Knowledge of the major philosophers and their theories, major philosophical fields, and ethical theories in the western tradition.

2. Skill in critical thinking and argument evaluation.

3. The ability to understand, interpret, and evaluate philosophical arguments.

4. The ability to communicate ideas in a clear, concise, and persuasive manner, providing reasons and arguments for viewpoints, and adhering to the standards of academic writing.

Philosophy Program Student Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of their course of study, students graduating with a BA degree in Philosophy will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an ability to explicate major fields, philosophers and theories.

2a. Utilize appropriate critical thinking skills.
2b. Support their positions with well-reasoned argumentation.

3a. Demonstrate an understanding of philosophical arguments.
3b. Present their interpretations and evaluations of philosophical arguments.

4a. Present their thoughts on a philosophical topic in a clear, concise, and persuasive manner.
4b. Follow all the standards of academic writing within their papers.

5. Critically engage the ideas of other scholars.
The M.A. Program and Information on Graduate Faculty Status

The M.A. Program

The M.A. program is designed to develop scholars with critical and comprehensive understanding of studies in English and literature. While offering the opportunity of specializing in one of the various areas of study in the department, the program asks students to ground their interests in a wide and flexible appreciation of literary history and criticism.

The M.A. program is conceived as one which will serve graduate students in several ways. It will help them develop critical acumen and mature habits of reasoning about literary problems and texts and familiarize them with a broad spectrum of literary types and periods and allow them to acquire special knowledge and advanced understanding of literature and literary research. The program is designed to be complete in itself or to prepare students for further graduate study at the doctoral level.

M.A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Upon graduating with an MA in English from Georgia Southern University, students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an ability to situate and interpret texts in their historical and cultural contexts, using appropriate literary criticism and theory in discussing texts, presenting different critical stances when necessary.
2. Analyze and explicate the underlying structures, thematic concerns, and literary devices employed in texts, through various critical lenses.
3. Produce clear and precise written work which adheres to professional scholarly standards for grammar, mechanics, and usage.
4. Plan and execute an original research agenda which results in work of a publishable level, presented to an audience of scholars.

Information on Graduate Faculty Status

For information on joining the Graduate Faculty and its privileges and responsibilities; please see the document “Graduate Faculty Model” page on the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies web site.
Graduate Assistants

The Department of Literature and Philosophy is usually granted seven or eight graduate assistantships for the academic year. The graduate students who fill these assistantships work twenty hours per week. They must take at least nine hours of courses (and not more than twelve hours) per semester.

Their duties have been the following:

1. Serving as teaching apprentices in our General Program—i.e., assisting in the instruction of the sophomore literature courses. See the department’s Graduate Student Handbook for a description of this assignment. Usually this assignment is for one-half of the student’s workload.

2. Serving as research assistants to faculty engaged in scholarly projects. Usually this assignment is for half of the student’s workload.

3. Serving in the Writing Center as tutors. Usually this assignment is for half of the student’s workload.

Graduate assistants may also be assigned to other duties as needs present themselves, such as assisting with conferences sponsored by the department or helping with editorial work on one of the journals housed within the department. Assignments for graduate students are never merely or mainly work that work-study students might just as well perform. Rather, they must be activities that promote the professional growth and development of the graduate student.

At the end of each semester, the graduate director will issue a call for faculty requests for use of graduate assistants. The director assigns students on the bases of equity and the merit of the project.
Graduate Apprenticing: Guidelines

The apprentice should meet with the instructor before each semester begins to discuss the particulars of the apprenticeship, including contents of the course syllabus and the instructor’s philosophy and goals, etc. It is the instructor’s responsibility to provide the course texts for the apprentice.

The apprentice should be present for all class meetings and should read all the material on the syllabus, unless otherwise approved by the instructor. This is very important. Should the instructor suddenly become ill or be called away, the apprentice would be expected to fill in on very short notice.

The apprentice should teach the equivalent of at least two classes per semester, but no more than four. The instructor should be present when the apprentice teaches and should confer with the apprentice about his or her teaching after each teaching performance.

Instructors will probably wish to talk informally with apprentices once or twice a week before or after class about course procedures, such as the instructor’s teaching strategies or classroom management.

Apprentices may be asked to grade quizzes and parts of tests, e.g., objective parts of tests and/or, with at least initial supervision, some essay questions. At least one-half of each test should be graded by the instructor. Apprentices may be asked to administer tests.

Teaching Apprentices should not be asked to perform research for instructors. Smaller chores, such as helping with library reserves for the apprenticing course, would seem a useful task for apprentices. In no instance should an apprentice be asked to help with or attend a class other than the assigned course.

During the last regular class week of the semester, apprentices need attend only one class, so that they may have more time to work on assignments for the classes they are taking. This should be worked out between the instructor and apprentice. Apprentices should be available, though, during exams to help grade finals or help with other aspects of the course, such as computing grades.

At the end of each semester, ideally before leaving for the break, apprentices and instructors will complete an evaluation of their experiences. These will be used to determine future assignments and for program assessment.
The Business of Department Meetings

Procedures for Bringing Motions Before the Department

1. Faculty should, whenever possible, first direct concerns, proposed motions, and suggestions for change in departmental policies and procedures to the chair of the appropriate committee. The action that the committee takes on the proposal, whether it be positive or negative, will be reported at a future departmental meeting. For issues not part of the committee process, the item “New Business” should be added to each meeting agenda. Voting on New Business should not take place during the initial meeting at which the issue is discussed.

2. Committees receiving proposals from individual faculty members must address them in committee as expeditiously as possible, normally within one month. Committees should also act upon the proposals expeditiously, normally within the semester the proposals are forwarded to the committee.

3. Recommendations from committees must come to the department at the next available department meeting.

4. At the beginning of each semester, the chair will announce the tentative schedule of meeting dates, insuring that there will be the necessary number of meetings devoted to business to act upon motions coming from the committees.

5. On issues of curriculum and instruction, while the department as a whole will be consulted, voting is limited to faculty members within the program.

6. Agendas of department meetings will be distributed at least one week in advance, except in unusual circumstances.

7. Meetings should always be of fixed length, with the ending time stated in advance, and all speakers should remain focused on the topic and show collegiality and respect for others.

8. Once motions are made at department meetings, participants have two opportunities for speaking, one during a first round, and then a second time, after everyone who wanted to speak in the first round has had that opportunity. When it is obvious that certain items will require further discussion, the department will have parts of meetings (or several meetings) devoted to those items so that people can speak numerous times on a particular topic. Thus, it is important that motions be made only when the matter seems to have had sufficient discussion already.

9. A faculty member will be selected to serve as secretary at the meetings for one year. In the event that the secretary cannot attend a meeting, a second secretary should be ready to stand in for the first.

10. Minutes of the previous meeting will be distributed for approval. Drafts of the minutes will be posted before the meeting on the “Archives” section of the department web site.
Procedures for Meetings

General Principles:

We will conduct meetings according to Robert’s Rules of Order. The fundamental right of deliberative assemblies requires all questions to be thoroughly discussed before action is taken. The rules by which an assembly operates are designed to assure that everyone has an opportunity to speak. In the spirit of collegiality and fair play, the rules should not be used to gain an advantage in debate. When the meeting is over and business decided, all members, even those whose are not in agreement with the assembly’s decisions, should feel that they have been heard and their position fairly considered.

Specific Guidelines:

1. To introduce new business, obtain the floor by addressing the chair.

2. Ideally, motions should be in writing. Read the motion and give a copy of it to the chair. The proper language to make a motion is “I move that...”

3. The chair will call for a second.

4. After a second is obtained, the motion is available for debate. The secretary will record the exact language of the motion.

5. All who wish to speak to the motion should let the chair know by raising their hands; the chair will keep a list of those who wish to speak. Everyone who wishes to speak to the motion has the right to do so before anyone has a second chance to speak. The person making the motion usually has the right to speak first. Robert’s Rules of Order allows for two complete rounds of debate. We can allow as many rounds as we wish.

6. Speakers should be courteous in language and deportment; and they should avoid personalities and mentioning others by name. Speak to the motion, not to or about other people. When no one wishes to speak further on the motion, the chair puts the question to a vote.

7. Amending a motion is possible when a member wishes to add, delete, or strike out and insert words into an existing motion. Amendments in writing are preferred. A majority vote is necessary to pass a motion to amend.

8. The purpose of a motion to table a resolution is to postpone consideration of it so that more urgent business can be tended to; it is not designed to cut off debate. Resolutions laid on the table may be revisited during the same meeting. A motion to table requires a majority vote. Tabling a motion is not the same as postponing a motion. For postponement, see below.

9. A motion to limit or extend debate—which may mean to shorten or extend the time of a meeting—takes a 2/3 vote of those present. Such a motion applies only to the immediately-pending question.

10. If a member believes that debate has gone on too long and is no longer productive or touching new points, a member may move to close debate by first seeking recognition from the chair
and then stating “I move the previous question.” Interrupting another member by “calling the question” is not allowed. Motions to move the previous question, which are not debatable, must be seconded and adopted by a 2/3 vote.

11. A motion may be made to “postpone debate to a certain time.” If a motion is postponed, it must be taken up again no later than the next meeting. Such a motion is itself debatable. It is also possible to move to postpone a motion indefinitely once debate has begun. This requires a majority vote.

12. A motion to “commit” may be used to refer a matter to the appropriate committee for further study. Such a motion is itself debatable.
**Department Committees and Guidelines for Committee Business**

Standing committees of the Department:

- Assessment
- Personnel
- Faculty Welfare
- Philosophy (B.A. Philosophy)
- General Program
- Postcolonial Conference
- Graduate Program (M.A. English)
- Publicity
- Library
- Religious Studies
- Major Program (B.A. English)
- Scholarships/Best Papers

1. By Board of Regents policy, all committees report to the chair and are advisory in nature.
2. The chair determines the size of each committee.
3. Membership on any standing committee is part of the normal load of a faculty member and will receive no reassigned time.
4. The chair, at his or her discretion, may grant reassigned time for committee work when special circumstances warrant it.
5. The chairs of the Philosophy, Major, and General Program committees will rotate on a three-year basis.
6. Faculty may consult with the chair about particular committee assignments.
7. Committee assignments for new faculty members (two years and less of service) will be kept to a minimum.
8. Committee chairs will announce committee meetings and agendas to the department at least one week in advance. Faculty not on a standing committee who wish to attend may do so under the stipulations contained in Robert’s Rules of Order 52.2:

   Members of the Society have a right to appear at the committee meetings and present their views on the subject before it at such reasonable times as, upon request, the committee may appoint. But during the deliberations of the committee no one has a right to be present, except members of the committee.

9. All committees will take minutes and present them to the faculty through the departmental web site’s “Archive” page. (For information on committees’ presentation of recommendations to the faculty, see “The Business of Department Meetings” section above).
10. All changes to this manual should be referred to the appropriate committee for review and recommendation before being presented to faculty. Once every three years, the chair will convene an ad hoc committee to review and revise this manual.
Priorities for Reassigned Time

See Appendix F: CLASS Policy 200: Teaching Loads

Reassigned time depends on a number of issues, some of which have to do with changes among our faculty. Some faculty members retire, take other jobs, go on leave, etc. Thus, any policy involving when faculty members can receive reassigned time needs to be flexible and to account for contingencies. For instance, someone might be expecting reassigned time for thesis supervision in the semester immediately following completion of a thesis, but that might also be the semester during which the department experiences a particular demand for Core classes, and one or two faculty members might simultaneously be on leaves of various kinds. The aim should be to award reassigned time as close as possible to the time of its justified request.

In general, faculty members will be given reassigned time for the following reasons:

1. An automatic reduction of three hours (at some point, when scheduling allows) for those who have completed the direction of five (5) M.A. theses within one academic year of being earned.

2. Where authorized, teaching loads for faculty with administrative responsibilities may be reassigned as follows:
   - Center directors – one course reduction per semester
   - Program directors – one course reduction per semester
   - Assistant chairs – one course reduction per semester
   - Graduate director – one course reduction per academic year
   - Other positions – as approved

3. A reduction of three hours to encourage research and publication. These requests are usually made at the time faculty members make course preferences for an upcoming semester. The person receiving a reduced assignment for research must present evidence of progress on the research (such as a completed article, sections of a monograph, chapters of a book, or a narrative of ongoing research, etc.), before being considered for another reduced teaching load for another semester. Reassigned time for research will be awarded on the basis of prior accomplishment in scholarly publication, and will also be influenced by the contingencies outlined above.

The chair will note—on the document sent to each faculty member detailing semester course assignments—the basis on which the faculty member has received reassigned time (from the categories listed above). When the reassigned time is for theses directed, the chair will also indicate how many slots for reassigned time remain for theses directed.
Policy on Summer Teaching

1. In assigning summer semester courses, the Chair should make every effort to ensure that all permanent faculty who wish to teach one course may do so. At the appropriate time, the Chair will poll all faculty to see who is interested in teaching a summer course, asking how many courses the faculty member wants to teach, which term, and in what format (online or face-to-face).

2. In assigning summer courses, the Chair must try to create a schedule that meets curricular needs and maximizes enrollment. Therefore, the Chair should estimate how many courses in the different disciplines are needed in Term A face-to-face, Term A online, Term B face-to-face, and Term B online. After doing that, the Chair will consult a list of faculty by discipline who have asked to teach in each term and in each format, and rank the faculty in each group in order of previous summer teaching, putting faculty members who taught the least in the department the previous summer above those who taught more. After the chair has made assignments on this basis, he or she will assign classes according to seniority. For purposes of this policy, seniority will be defined as years of experience at Georgia Southern without reference to rank.

3. Under normal circumstances a faculty member who teaches a major program or graduate course will teach in areas where he or she is able to demonstrate competence through scholarship, course work in the degree program, or a combination of the two.

4. The Chair normally should assign a second course to a faculty member only if all faculty who wish to teach a first summer course have been offered one. When opportunities arise to teach a second course, and all faculty who want to teach have been assigned one course, assignments of second courses will be made according to whether the faculty member taught two departmental courses the previous summer. Anyone who did not have two departmental courses assigned the previous summer will have priority over those who did teach two classes. After the chair has made assignments based on this rotation, decisions about second classes will be based on seniority.*

5. Temporary faculty should not expect summer teaching assignments; temporary faculty will only be considered for summer courses when the need arises after the Chair has followed the procedures outlined in items #1-#4 above.

6. Due to scheduling exigencies and variables, the Chair has the right to amend or alter these procedures, but he or she should make every effort to avoid doing so and will communicate with faculty involved to explain the course assignments.

*Anyone who informs the chair in writing that he or she plans to retire within two years will for two consecutive summers be at the top of the priority list to teach one class, or to teach two classes, but only if everyone who wants to teach has been assigned one class. This option can only be exercised once.
New Courses

Any instructor wishing to develop a new course should first see the chair and explain the idea and its proposed structure. After discussion with the chair, the instructor presents the proposed course to the appropriate curriculum committee in the department. Once approved by that committee, the instructor, in accordance with a practice developed by CLASS, should try out the course successfully twice as Special Topics or Selected Topics classes first, prior to presenting the course as a new standing course. Approval of the Special or Selected Topics course must come at least one semester prior to the planned semester for running the class the first time. Once the course makes twice, the instructor may then fill out a New Course Form (currently available online at University Registrar > Faculty-Staff > Committees > Undergraduate Committee > Curriculum Forms, Instructions, and Other Documents > Curriculum Forms and Instructions) and draw up a proposed course outline. The proposed course will then be presented to the appropriate departmental committees for review and discussion. After passage through the department, a course proposal then proceeds to the Undergraduate Council for approval and finally to the university-wide APCC. If it is approved at that level, the course becomes part of the regular rotation and may then be offered the following semester.
Expectations for Instruction in the Department

Syllabus Content
Faculty should follow the University guidelines for inclusions in their syllabi:

Basic Identification Elements
1. University Name
2. Department Name
3. Course Title (as indicated in the catalog)
4. Course Number (and CRN)
5. Semester (Spring, Fall, Summer) and Year
6. Credit Hours
7. Class Meeting Day/Time
8. Class Room / Building

Instructor Elements
1. Instructor Name
2. Instructor Phone
3. Instructor Email
4. Instructor Office Location / number
5. Instructor Office Hours

Course Description and Requirements
1. Course Catalog Description
2. Course Learning Outcomes
3. Prerequisites
4. Drop/Add Date
5. Date of the last day to withdraw without academic penalty
6. Texts
7. Material
8. Schedule: class assignments, readings, preparation, due dates, etc.
9. Attendance expectations
10. Evaluation
   • Clear descriptions of assignments
   • Grading guidelines for assignments
   • How the final grade will be calculated

Disability Accommodation Statement
The following should be reproduced verbatim:
This class complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Students with disabilities needing academic accommodations must:
   • Register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC), and,
   • Provide a letter to the instructor from the SDRC indicating what your need may be for academic accommodation.
This should be done within the first week of class. Students with these particular needs should contact the Student Disability Resource Center, Hampton Hall, 912.871.1566.
Academic Integrity Statement

Academic Honesty Honor Code.
Students are expected to uphold the Academic Honesty Honor Code as published in the Georgia Southern University Student Conduct Code.

(The more detailed and specific you can be in your definition of academic dishonesty and in your description of the specific penalties you will exact when you have evidence of academic dishonesty, the better.)

Caveat
e.g., “The above schedule and procedures are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances.”

Student Evaluations

All faculty members must turn in student evaluations for each course they teach each semester.

Instructor Absences

If instructors must miss classes for any reason, they should notify the chair or secretary as soon as possible, so that the class may either be canceled or a substitute instructor found. If instructors know in advance that they will be missing classes, they should notify the chair, and make arrangements for those classes to be covered by graduate assistants or colleagues.
ENGL Course-Specific Information

ENGL 2131: Introduction to Literary Studies

As ENGL 2132 covers writing in the discipline, this course should evaluate a student’s learning primarily through exams and short assignments. For the introductory study of literary theory, instructors should use a casebook or find some other means of applying theory to interpretation of a specific text or texts.

2000-level British and American survey courses

A researched paper or documented critical essay is not a requirement of these courses. One aim of the survey should be to provide study of the widest possible range of primary texts for the period covered.

Upper-division ENGL courses

A 10-page (minimum) researched paper is required of all students in all upper-division ENGL courses.

ENGL 4630: Senior Seminar

A 15-page (minimum) researched Capstone Paper is required of all students in all sections of the Senior Seminar.

Each semester the Major Program Committee will take a random sampling of the Capstone Papers produced in the Senior Seminar course (ENGL 4630). These artifacts will then be assessed using the Undergraduate English Program Essay Rubric.
Rescheduling Final Examinations

University Policy for Changing a Student's Final Examination

A change in a student’s final examination schedule will be approved only for emergency reasons, such as serious illness (a note from Health Services or family physician is required) or the death of an immediate family member (a letter or phone call from a parent, guardian, or physician is required). Letters and phone calls should be directed to the appropriate faculty member.

Final examination schedules will not normally be changed for any of the following reasons: wedding of the student, relative, or friend; part-time or full-time job or job interview; internship or field study; vacation; graduation of relative or friend; convenience of travel schedule; or only one final examination remaining at the end of the week. Exceptions to these guidelines can be made, but should be based on a very compelling case. Using these guidelines, the student may submit a Request to Reschedule a Final Examination form to the instructor, who, with approval of the department chair, has authority to reschedule the final examination to a new time not conflicting with other regularly-scheduled examinations or classes, if he or she desires. The form is available on the Provost’s Office website and is included here as Appendix H.

University Policy for Changing a Student's Final Examination if There is a Conflict

A conflict is defined as three exams in a calendar day or two exams at the same time. Conflict Periods are scheduled at the stated times in the semester exam schedule, which can be accessed at through the Registrar’s website. To resolve a conflict in which a student has two examinations scheduled for the same period, the instructor of the lower-numbered course shall reschedule the exam to another time mutually agreed on by the instructor and the student, or to one of the Conflict Periods. To resolve a conflict in which a student has three examinations scheduled in one calendar day, the examination scheduled for the middle period shall be rescheduled to another time mutually agreed on by the instructor and the student, or to a Conflict Period on another day. It is incumbent upon the student to petition his/her professor no later than the last week of classes so that an alternative arrangement can reasonably be made.

Student Form for requesting a rescheduled Final Examination

See Appendix H: Final Exam Rescheduling Request.
Independent Study and Overrides

The policy of the department on independent study is clear: “Since faculty members do not receive compensation for independent study work, our departmental policy is that we do not arrange for independent study with students. We will work with you to find possible alternatives for courses that you want, but which do not appear in our course schedule.”

Overrides for Core courses are controlled strictly by the CLASS dean’s office. Unless a student is in the final semester of graduation, the dean’s office will likely refuse a student’s request for an override. In order to prevent a host of students from trying out requests for overrides in Core classes at the dean’s office, faculty members should direct students with questions about overrides to the department office. Overrides are given only in exceptional circumstances. All overrides for upper-division courses go through the chair. Individual faculty members can speak with the chair about certain students they’d like in their courses after courses have reached their limits, and those special requests are always negotiable.
Travel Funds

Travel funds will be allocated to give everyone a chance to attend meetings for professional development as well as to support those who give papers or serve in other capacities at professional meetings. Faculty are encouraged to apply for external funding for travel whenever possible (faculty development grants, etc.). First allocation priority will be given to persons chairing or presenting papers at professional meetings.

Travel to out-of-state meetings must be approved in advance by submitting the proper Travel Request Form to the department chair. To obtain reimbursement for travel expenses for such meetings, faculty should submit the appropriate travel expense statement upon their return. Substantiation is required for lodging, parking, and registration fees; none is required for meals. If the trip is made by automobile, an odometer reading should be recorded for departure and arrival back at the point of departure.

At the beginning of each academic year, the chair determines, from the resources available, a funding limit per conference or research trip that will apply to all travel expenses (during the 2003-2004 year that limit was $900 per faculty member). Travel to meetings out of the country cannot be fully funded by the department. The faculty members need to apply for faculty development funds for these trips.

The department will fund one-half of such travel for those who wish to attend meetings only.

If extra funds are available, other trips may be possible at the chair’s discretion.

Because Department travel funds are limited, faculty are strongly encouraged to apply for funds from University sources:

1. Faculty Development and Welfare
2. Research Funding
3. College of Graduate Studies

Faculty should contact these offices for further information and application forms, although we try to keep copies of these forms in the main office for informational purposes.

A copy of the University’s travel regulations is available on the department web site. Faculty are encouraged to use online forms for requests to the department for funding and to meet the deadline specified for submitting them.

Faculty members have ten working days, beginning with the first working day after they return from a trip, to complete their Travel Expense Statements and turn them in, along with all supporting documents, to the department secretary. After that, the chair reserves the right to reallocate those funds to other faculty members.

Faculty who decide not to use their travel funds should immediately inform the chair so that those funds may be allocated to other members of the department.
Copying

The office staff would like copying requests at least 24 hours in advance. Large copying projects for research are simply not possible in the current budget climate. Faculty members might be directed to include copying costs in their proposals for research grants, for example. To save on the cost of paper, faculty members are encouraged to use email, the online course management system, or other online vehicles for making class materials accessible. Faculty members are discouraged from trying to do anything with the equipment other than photocopying (e.g., faculty members should not be trying to fix paper jams on the photocopier, etc., since that can lead to repair bills of thousands of dollars, should the attempted “fix” go wrong!)
Department Policy on Temporary Faculty

1. When the department has the opportunity to hire temporary faculty, whenever possible, a search of some kind should be held, so that the candidate is chosen and not just appointed by the chair. It is the sense of the department that as much information about potential temporary faculty (including CVs, campus visits, and teaching observations) be gathered prior to the offering of a contract.

2. After temporary faculty have been hired, the following policies and procedures should be followed, wherever practical:

   a. The temporary faculty member’s teaching will be observed and evaluated by a written statement once a year by a tenured faculty member or the department chair.

   b. Temporary faculty members are invited and encouraged to attend departmental meetings and may vote on departmental business. However, the vote of temporary faculty members should not be the determinative factor in deciding major departmental policies.

   c. Temporary faculty may, if they choose, render service to the department. Such service is not required and no such expectations, explicit or otherwise, should be put upon a temporary faculty member.

   d. Temporary faculty may apply for departmental travel funds; these may be awarded by the chair if funds are available after tenured and tenure-track faculty members’ travel requests have been filled.
Department Policy on Teaching Loads

See Appendix F: CLASS Policy 200: Teaching Loads

Standard Load for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

In accordance with CLASS policy, teaching loads for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty without approved administrative, service, or thesis reassignments must be at least 15 hours (3/2 load or equivalent) per academic year, and normally should not exceed 21 hours (4/3 load or equivalent) per academic year.

- With pre-approval from the CLASS dean, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty may be assigned up to 24 hours of teaching per academic year (4/4 load or equivalent).

- Faculty may not be assigned to fewer than six contact hours (2 courses) per semester without pre-approval from the CLASS dean.

The following provisions apply:

- Fulfilling programmatic and Core responsibilities takes precedence over the assignment of reduced teaching loads.

- All courses with enrollments of 125 or greater count as a “double,” or 6 hours toward load.

- Course Releases for Direction of Theses:

  As per the CLASS Teaching Load Policy, a course release will be given to faculty members upon the completion of every 5th M.A. thesis under their direction, dependent upon program and core needs. The release must be taken within one academic year of being earned.

- Administrative Reassignments:

  Department chair: 1/1 teaching load
  Director of Graduate Studies: 1 course release per year
  Director, Center for Irish Studies: 2 course releases per year
  Those with certain college- or university-wide responsibilities, such as Moderator of the Faculty Senate, may also receive reassignment of their teaching load.

- Faculty members teaching the standard 3/3 load are expected to be active in scholarship. This Department Manual sets forth the following criteria for tenure in a faculty member’s 5th or 6th year:

  Faculty must show strong evidence of scholarly achievement (such as a book or 3 substantial articles, published or accepted in refereed journals listed in a major scholarly
A portion of the scholarly achievement presented must be in print, which can include online as well as “hard copy” peer-reviewed publications.

It follows, then, that those with a 3/3 load should achieve the following:

a. 1 peer-reviewed book every five or six years, OR

b. On average, 1-2 substantial peer-reviewed or invited articles or book chapters accepted or in print within a given 2-year cycle. This helps insure that a faculty member has enough scholarship to earn tenure in the 5th year, should he or she decide to apply in that year.

c. Besides the scholarship listed in points a. and b. above, those with a 3/3 load are expected to engage in other scholarly work such as translations, book reviews, encyclopedia articles, or conference presentations, and may pursue grants or other fund-raising opportunities. However, peer-reviewed or invited print scholarship is our benchmark for scholarly achievement.

‡ By “print,” we mean either paper print or hypertext print, provided it is subject to the same rigorous peer review applied to paper print materials.

- A reduced teaching load is available to faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional scholarly achievement. Qualification for a reduced load under this provision will be determined at the time of a faculty member’s annual review in the spring semester. Qualifying faculty members will be assigned the reduced load in the following academic year; continued eligibility will be determined each spring. The following qualify a faculty member for a 3/2 load:

  a. Completing two books in a five or six-year period, besides engaging in other scholarly activities mentioned in point c. above.

  b. Completing and placing 3 or more peer-reviewed or invited articles or book chapters within a 2-year period, in addition to engaging in other scholarly activities mentioned in point c. above.

  c. Completing 6 articles or book chapters within a 5- or 6-year period.

  d. Completing a book and 3 articles or book chapters within a 5- or 6-year period.

  e. Other combinations of exceptional scholarly activities not mentioned in points a.-d. may qualify a faculty member for a reduced teaching load and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- Faculty members who do not meet the scholarship expectations associated with the normal 3/3 load may be assigned additional courses. A 4/3 load may be assigned at the chair’s discretion; a 4/4 load may be assigned only with the approval of the CLASS dean.
Teaching Load for Temporary Faculty

- In accordance with University policy, Temporary Faculty must teach a 5/5 load (or equivalent).
- Temporary Faculty members have no research or service expectations in the Department.

Overload Policy

The department follows CLASS guidelines for overload teaching, as posted in the dean’s memo of October 23, 2009, “Teaching Overloads and Faculty Compensation.” See Appendix G.
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