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All English Department faculty members are expected to contribute to the well-being of the departmental community through working to achieve both individual goals and departmental goals.

According to Board of Regents policy, all faculty members must be reviewed on an annual basis. Instructors are evaluated on the basis of teaching as their primary responsibility to the Department. Each instructor being evaluated will provide the following:

- A letter of self-evaluation (not more than 2 pages), noting contributions in this area.
- A current CV.
- Teaching materials, such as samples of syllabi, writing assignments, and other instructional materials that provide evidence of theoretical sophistication and pedagogical creativity.
- Optional: A statement of teaching philosophy for further evidence that the instructor understands connections between theory and practice in rhetoric and composition.

Teaching (100%):
All Instructors should submit materials that reflect their completion of requirements of effective teaching and show their adherence to Writing Programs policies. The list of requirements that follows is divided up into mandatory elements that each instructor must meet and optional elements that are not mandatory but can be used to supplement and enhance an evaluation.

Teaching (mandatory):
- Clear syllabus and supporting materials (schedule, writing project guidelines, samples of assignments, class discussions, or handouts) as evidence of effective course design.
- Classes held in accordance with schedule (with allowances made for department approved absences).
- Meeting students for scheduled conferences and office hours.
- Being available for individual conferences with students by appointment.
Professional/Collegial Obligations as a Department Member (mandatory):

- Submission of complete and accurate documents by program or department deadlines, such as syllabi, office hours, textbook order forms, custom course materials (when appropriate), ePortfolio links requested at end of semester.
- Participation in required meetings, required program practices, use of Digication, and occasional mandatory training, etc.
- Responding promptly to communications from Writing Programs administrators (email, phone).

Materials submitted will be supplemented by the Department with the mean scores from the University’s machine-readable student evaluation forms completed at the end of each semester. Instructors may include optional class visit reports.

Additional Metrics: Discussion of additional activities may be included, along with submission of documenting materials, to supplement the annual self-evaluation.

Service/Administration: Contributions in this category vary, according to the particular activities in which the instructor may be engaged, and will be evaluated for the time and effort invested. Contributions may include, for example:

- Participation in any of the administrative committees, such as the Writing Programs Committee.
- Evaluating possible textbooks, holding meetings with teachers of other courses, reviewing course syllabi, collecting materials to be made available to all teachers of specific courses, etc.
- Serving as liaison with other programs, such as the Service Learning Program.
- Preparation of in-service workshops for other teachers in the program. Workshops may focus on theory or strategies for teaching specific courses or on more broadly applicable theory and practice.
- Preparation of a writing workshop or service on a board as community outreach.

Professional Development: Contributions in this category may include, for example:

- Current graduate course work in the field as evidence of growth.
- Participation in ENG 594 practicum offerings for Writing Programs teachers.
- Participation in local, regional, and/or national professional conferences, such as the ASU Composition Conference or conferences sponsored by the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the Modern Language Association, the Arizona English Teachers Association, and the Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Conference.
- Participation in webinars related to teaching and/or writing.
- Publications that demonstrate some knowledge of work in the field.
Evaluation Procedures
All submitted materials will be considered by the Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair and the Director of Writing Programs. For instructional contributions a rating will be assigned. Additional metrics may be considered as a means to raise the rating but cannot be required as part of the evaluation of instructional contributions, nor can they be used as the basis for denying a highly meritorious rating.

- A **highly meritorious rating (level 3)** will require evidence that the faculty member performed at an exceptional level, as per the indicators.
- A **satisfactory rating (level 2)** will require evidence that the faculty member has met the minimum requirements for fulfilling the responsibilities in the assigned area, as per the indicators.
- An **unsatisfactory rating (level 1)** will require evidence that the faculty member has failed to perform assigned duties in a particular area, as per the indicators.

Evaluations will be made on the basis of multiple indicators. For detailed indicators, see below. Faculty are encouraged to review the indicators for each area prior to filling out their annual evaluation. The Instructor’s workload is 100% teaching.

In addition, Instructors who receive a 3 will further demonstrate their commitment to the Writing Programs’ mission in one or more of the following ways:

- Using innovative strategies in teaching materials and presentation and helping students understand how these contribute to learning.
- Participating in course development and/or curriculum development.
- Effectively carrying out programmatic assignments.
• Demonstrating commitment to departmental needs (teaching at the lower division, teaching at other campuses, teaching overloads, serving as a short-term substitute teacher, teaching at night/early morning/weekend, etc.).

Instructors who receive a merit rating of 2 must do the following:

• Demonstrate purposeful pedagogy, use adequate teaching materials, define course requirements and goals on syllabi.
• Meet classes according to schedule and hold regularly scheduled office hours.
• Receive course evaluation scores at or within one (1) point of the departmental mean for comparable classes.
• Participate in most required program-wide events and projects.
• Fulfill most professional and collegial obligations as a department member (submission of complete syllabi, textbook order forms, ePortfolio links, etc.)

Instructors who receive a merit rating of 1 (one or more of the items listed below would justify that rating)

• Offer a less than satisfactory learning environment, fail to provide adequate teaching materials/course guidelines to students, and/or violate the professional student/teacher relationship.
• Fail to meet regularly scheduled classes and provide office hours.
• Repeatedly receive evaluations more than one (1) point worse than the department mean for comparable classes.
• Fail to participate in required program-wide events and projects.
• Fail to fulfill professional and collegial obligations as a department member (submission of syllabi, textbook order forms, ePortfolio links, etc.)