

# BYLAWS

## Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Cultures

*content revisions last approved by department vote on December 14, 2024*

---

### CONTENTS

<a href="#">Section 1. Unit Academic Governance</a>	1
<a href="#">Section 2. Composition of the Faculty and Voting Procedures</a>	1
<a href="#">Section 3. Department Organization</a>	2
<a href="#">Section 4. Committees of the Department Faculty</a>	6
<a href="#">Section 5. Personnel Procedures</a>	10
<a href="#">Section 6. Parliamentary Authority</a>	24
<a href="#">Section 7. Interpretation of Bylaws</a>	24
<a href="#">Section 8. Amendment Procedures</a>	24
<a href="#">Section 9. Faculty Grievance Procedures</a>	25
<a href="#">Section 10. Student Grievance Procedures</a>	25
<a href="#">Appendix A. Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for Graduate Students</a>	26
<a href="#">Appendix B. Variable Work Assignment Policy</a>	31
<a href="#">Appendix C. 2024 Annual Report Requirements</a>	33
<a href="#">Appendix D. 2024 Annual Review Process</a>	40

## Section 1. Unit Academic Governance

- 1.1. The voting faculty of the Department has shared responsibility with the Department Chair to adopt and publish bylaws, provided they conform with the current Bylaws for Academic Governance (hereafter BAG; <https://acadgov.msu.edu/bylaws>).
- 1.2. Unit bylaws recognize the binding governance of the following documents over its faculty as well as accept the Department's jurisdiction over matters granted it under these documents. These are: Rights and Responsibilities of the Faculty at Michigan State University, Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, Faculty Handbook, Faculty Grievance Procedure, Bylaws of the College of Arts & Letters, and any other documents that may apply.
- 1.3. Instructors in the Department are required to follow the University's Code of Teaching Responsibility (<https://reg.msu.edu/AcademicPrograms/Print.asp?Section=514>).
  - 1.3.1. Instructors are expected to post and hold a minimum of four (4) office hours per week for student conferences.

[Contents](#)

## Section 2. Composition of the Faculty and Voting Procedures

- 2.1. The composition of the voting faculty in the Department shall be as follows: all tenure system faculty and all nontenure-track faculty who have full-time appointments of at least one (1) year in length. Titles and designations of faculty shall be consistent with University stipulations and regulations.
  - 2.1.1. The nontenure-track members of the voting faculty may be prohibited from voting for membership of any committee having a role in the appointment or evaluation of nontenure-track faculty.
- 2.2. The Department faculty shall meet once a semester (excluding summer semester) and as determined by the Chair. All matters introduced at faculty meetings are informational; all substantive matters require a written vote.
- 2.3. The composition of the graduate faculty in the Rhetoric and Writing graduate program shall be determined by the Rhetoric and Writing Graduate Advisory Committee (RWGAC).
  - 2.3.1. Affiliate faculty members are those full-time MSU faculty in other units whose area of expertise is in a field or discipline related to writing and/or rhetoric and composition (e.g., Education, American Studies, Linguistics, English, TESOL, Digital Media Arts and Technology, Journalism) and who express willingness to work with Rhetoric and Writing graduate students as teacher or committee member. A faculty member may nominate someone to be an affiliate faculty member of the program. Once a candidate is nominated, RWGAC reviews that faculty member's credentials to determine whether she/he should be invited to become an affiliate faculty member. Candidates shall be approved by 2/3 of the votes cast in order to be invited to become affiliate faculty.

2.3.2. Affiliate faculty must follow the Graduate School's Procedure to have non-regular MSU faculty, academic specialists, and non-MSU individuals serve on graduate student committees (<https://grad.msu.edu/non-regular-faculty-committees>).

#### 2.4 Committee membership voting procedures.

2.4.1. Except for provisions to fill vacancies as specified in sections 3.3.2.5., 4.4.4., and 4.4.5., voting shall be by electronic ballot for:

- selection of a Department Chair
- nomination and election to the Advisory Council; Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee; and Appointments and Equal Opportunity Committee
- any elected committee representative
- amendments to the bylaws
- significant changes to Department curriculum

2.4.2. Department members unable to serve a full term on adjunct or standing committees must inform the Department Chair or the Chair of the Bylaws and Elections Committee of the reason in writing at least three (3) days before balloting begins.

2.4.3. Provisions shall be made by the Department Chair to allow faculty members on leave to vote, subject to election deadlines.

2.4.4. The Department Bylaws and Elections Committee shall prepare all ballots, supervise balloting, count all ballots, and report the results of all elections to the faculty.

#### 2.5. Proposal voting procedures.

2.5.1. Any proposal brought forward at a Department meeting may be amended by the faculty at that meeting.

2.5.2. The Department faculty vote to move proposals (with or without amendments) forward for an electronic vote at Department meetings.

2.5.3. Each proposal must be voted on separately and approved or disapproved by electronic ballot after the meeting.

2.5.4. The Department Bylaws and Elections Committee shall prepare all proposal ballots, supervise balloting, count all ballots, and report the results of all proposal votes to the faculty.

[Contents](#)

## Section 3. Department Organization

3.1. The Chair of the Department shall be appointed and serve in conformity with University and College bylaws and shall be responsible for educational, research, and service programs; budgetary matters; physical facilities; and personnel matters, seeking the counsel of faculty members as outlined in these bylaws. The Chair has a special obligation to build a Department strong in scholarship, teaching capacity, creative endeavor, and public service.

- 3.1.1. The Chair shall normally serve no more than two consecutive terms in office.
  - 3.1.2. The Department shall have shared responsibility with the Dean of the College on review procedures for the Department Chair.
  - 3.1.3. The Chair shall be reviewed at intervals not to exceed five (5) years. In this process, the Department faculty shall have shared responsibility with the Dean on procedures for review. As part of that review process, there shall be a poll of the faculty on the satisfactory performance of the Chair, the results of which shall be communicated to the Dean.
  - 3.1.4. The Chair shall choose Assistant or Associate Chair(s).
  - 3.1.5. The Assistant or Associate Chair(s) shall serve at the pleasure of the Chair and be responsible to the Chair.
- 3.2. During the next-to-last year of the Chair's last term in office, when it is clear and evident that the Chair shall not be continuing in office, the elected faculty of the Advisory Council shall recommend to the Chair and to the Dean the structure, membership, and procedures for a special Search Committee. Upon approval from the Dean, the Search Committee shall begin the search procedure.
- 3.2.1. An initial step in any search procedure should be a poll of the Department faculty for the purpose of collecting nominees of suitable candidates from within and from outside the Department.
  - 3.2.2. The list of nominees obtained from the Department faculty shall be added to any nominees collected from local and/or national advertising and from nominees submitted by other persons on campus.
  - 3.2.3. The Search Committee shall negotiate with the Dean for a specific date beyond which no further nominees shall be accepted.
  - 3.2.4. The Search Committee shall assume responsibility for contacting all nominees to determine their willingness to be candidates for the position of Department Chair.
  - 3.2.5. The Search Committee shall assume responsibility for collecting all dossiers, vita, and references, and maintaining files on each candidate. These files shall be available only to members of the Search Committee during the period of the search and until such time as it is appropriate for any information to be made public.
  - 3.2.6. In accordance with agreements reached with the office of the Dean, the Search Committee shall narrow the list of candidates to a final list for interviews and invitations to campus visits. In consultation with the office of the Dean, the Search Committee shall arrange for transportation, housing, and interview meetings for each candidate to be invited.
  - 3.2.7. When this list of candidates is determined, and after campus visits and interviews have been conducted, the Department faculty shall be given the opportunity to express a preference among the several candidates. The results of the preferential poll shall be presented along with the final list of candidates to the Dean, who has the final responsibility for appointment of the new Department Chair.

3.2.8. If the search process does not result in the selection of a new Chair, or in the event of a sudden vacancy in the Department Chair due to resignation, involuntary departure, illness, disability, or death, the Advisory Council shall meet with the Dean on the procedure for identifying a suitable nominee for Interim (or Acting) Chair. Such Interim (or Acting) Chair shall serve during the period of time necessary to develop procedures for a search for a permanent replacement. The Department faculty shall be kept informed and apprised throughout all steps of this process and shall have a voice in the selection both of an Interim (or Acting) Chair and in the search for a permanent replacement.

### 3.3 Department advisory procedures and faculty organization.

3.3.1. The Department voting faculty, as defined in 2.1., is understood to have delegated its authority to the Advisory Council to advise the Department Chair with respect to Departmental matters, including those of promotion, appointments, and the preparation of Departmental program plans.

3.3.1.1. The voting faculty of the Department shall review its bylaws at regular intervals not to exceed five (5) years.

#### 3.3.2. The Advisory Council.

3.3.2.1. The elected Advisory Council shall consist of nine voting faculty members. Five shall be from the tenure system, and at least one of these must be an assistant professor. Three elected members shall be nontenure-track faculty and one elected member shall be an academic specialist. There shall be two graduate student representatives (one MA and one PhD), with voice but no vote, selected according to the bylaws of the Rhetoric and Writing graduate student organization.

3.3.2.1.1. All Advisory Council members (other than ex officio members) shall be elected by the voting faculty of the Department.

3.3.2.1.2. Length of term: For tenured faculty, a term consists of two (2) consecutive academic years. For untenured tenure-system faculty, nontenure-track faculty, and academic specialists, a term consists of one (1) academic year.

3.3.2.1.3. Number of terms: Faculty shall serve no more than two consecutive terms. That is, for tenured faculty, four (4) years and for untenured, nontenure-track faculty, and academic specialists, two (2) years.

3.3.2.2. Persons with an approved leave of absence of more than one semester, or who are otherwise unable to serve throughout the academic year, are ineligible for election to the Council, as are ex-officio members.

3.3.2.3. There shall be no limit on the number of terms a faculty member may serve on the Council, except that no member shall serve more than two full terms consecutively.

3.3.2.4. Nomination and election of Advisory Council members.

- 3.3.2.4.1. Each spring semester, the Chair shall notify the faculty of those Advisory Council members whose terms expire fall semester. Faculty members eligible for vacancies on the Council shall constitute a slate of nominees. Voting for the new Council members shall take place during the spring semester, and newly elected representatives will assume their positions on August 16.
- 3.3.2.4.2. Each voting faculty member may nominate as many eligible individuals as there are vacancies.
- 3.3.2.4.3. The Bylaws and Elections Committee shall list the candidates in alphabetical order and distribute the list to the voting faculty.
- 3.3.2.4.4. Each faculty member may vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. In the event of a tie, a run-off election shall be held.
- 3.3.2.5. Vacancies on the Council of more than one semester's duration shall be filled, for the remainder of the member's term, by the election procedure specified above; a vacancy of one semester shall be filled by the Chair's appointment, with the approval of the Council, of a faculty member in the same category as that of a member being replaced.
- 3.3.3. Advisory Council procedures.
  - 3.3.3.1. The Department Chair shall assist the elected Chair of the Council in drawing up the agenda for the Council meetings.
  - 3.3.3.2. The Associate Chairs shall serve ex officio on the Advisory Council.
  - 3.3.3.3. The Advisory Council will meet regularly (at least once a month) during the academic year, and at such other times as deemed necessary at the request of the Chair or per a majority of the elected members. All regular meetings shall be considered open to the faculty as observers except when the Council is considering personnel matters.
    - 3.3.3.3.1. No votes will be taken in the Advisory Council unless there is a quorum. A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of voting members.
  - 3.3.3.4. The Advisory Council, if it deems necessary, may hold open meetings without the Chair of the Department.
    - 3.3.3.4.1. As a matter of professional courtesy, the Department Chair shall be notified in advance of such a meeting.
    - 3.3.3.4.2. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Advisory Council to confer with the Department Chair upon conclusion of the meeting to bring to the Chair's attention any matters of departmental concern resulting from the open meeting.

- 3.3.3.5. Minutes of all Advisory Council meetings will be taken and distributed to the entire faculty of the Department.
- 3.3.4. Referendum procedures. Recognizing the advisory nature and function of the Advisory Council and its essentially representative role, it may be necessary to explore the preferences and knowledge of the collective faculty of the Department. The following referendum procedure may be used.
- 3.3.4.1. If desired before the Advisory Council or Chair takes a position, the Department's voting faculty shall be polled for an expression of sentiment on the posed question.
- 3.3.4.2. Petition by one-third of the voting faculty of the Department shall require polling the faculty for an expression of sentiment on the question of amending Department policy.
- 3.3.4.3. The above procedures do not prevent the Chair from seeking voting faculty sentiment on any question and in any matter the Chair desires.
- 3.3.4.4. Referendum proceedings shall not refer to personnel actions (except as provided for in section 5.4.15. of these bylaws).

[Contents](#)

## Section 4. Committees of the Department Faculty

- 4.1. Annual Review Advisory Committee.
- 4.1.1. The Annual Review Advisory Committee shall consist of faculty and academic specialists as described in 4.1.1.2.1. and 4.1.1.2.2. below. The committee shall be constituted by September 30 of each year and members shall serve for one (1) year.
- 4.1.2. The Annual Review Advisory Committee shall form subcommittees—one for the review of tenure-system faculty, and one for the review of nontenure-track faculty and academic specialists.
- 4.1.2.1. The Annual Review Advisory Subcommittee for Tenure-system Faculty shall be comprised of:
- three elected tenure-system members of the Advisory Council
  - one additional tenure-system faculty member chosen from a regular rotation
- 4.1.2.2. The Annual Review Advisory Subcommittee for Nontenure-track Faculty and Academic Specialists shall be comprised of:
- an academic specialist member chosen from a regular rotation
  - three nontenure-track faculty members chosen from a regular rotation

## 4.2. Standing committees of the Department.

- 4.2.1. A standing committee is composed of faculty and students who meet on a regular basis. Standing committees are advisory to the Chair. The Associate Chairs may sit with the standing committees ex-officio.
- 4.2.2. Voting for elected standing committees to serve for the following academic year shall take place during the last half of the preceding spring semester. A vacancy of one semester shall be filled by the Chair's appointment, with the approval of the Council, of a faculty member in the same category as that of the member being replaced.
- 4.2.3. Membership of standing committees shall be drawn from all voting faculty as well as undergraduate students who have declared a major in the Department and graduate students in Rhetoric and Writing.
- 4.2.4. The Chair of the Department shall meet with the elected chairs of each standing committee during the first half of the fall semester to determine specific committee charges for the academic year. A document summarizing standing committee charges shall be distributed to the Council and will thus be available to faculty as part of the Council minutes.
- 4.2.5. Each standing committee is directly responsible to the Chair and shall report to the Chair at least once a semester:
- all recommendations for changes in Department policies and procedures;
  - curricular or instructional matters that should be considered or acted upon; and
  - contacts that involve committees, University officials, or other bodies outside the Department.
- 4.2.6. Each standing committee shall, at the request of the Department Chair, submit a written summary report of its deliberations, actions, and recommendations to the Chair and Council no later than April 15. The report must be approved by a majority of the members of the committee. Committee members may file a minority report. Reports should be made available for faculty review.
- 4.2.7. At the written request of any voting faculty member or members, a standing committee shall announce and hold a meeting on any matter appropriate to that committee's purview.
- 4.2.8. Each standing committee shall follow the communications policies of the Department.
- 4.2.9. Program advisory committees.
- 4.2.9.1. **First-Year Writing Advisory Committee.** The Director of First-Year Writing shall convene and chair the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee. The composition of the committee shall be five to seven faculty members and the First-Year Writing Graduate Assistant, and may include one additional graduate student representative and one undergraduate representative. Membership shall be open to all faculty and graduate teaching assistants who teach in the Department. Committee members shall be selected and recruited by the Director of First-Year Writing in consultation with the Chair of the Department.



- 4.2.9.2. **Undergraduate Programs Committee.** The Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies shall convene and chair the Professional and Public Writing Program Committee. The composition of the committee shall be five to seven members, including one graduate student representative, and may include one undergraduate representative. Membership shall be open to all faculty who regularly teach in the Department. Committee members shall be selected and recruited by the Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the Chair of the Department.
- 4.2.9.3. **Rhetoric and Writing Graduate Advisory Committee.** The Director of the Rhetoric and Writing graduate program shall convene and chair the Rhetoric and Writing Graduate Advisory Committee. The composition of the committee shall be five to seven members, including two graduate student representatives (one MA student and one PhD student), and including the two Assistant Directors (one each for CSLP and DRPW).
- 4.2.9.4. The Department as a whole will vote on major curricular matters (proposals for new courses, significant course changes, major program changes) required to go through University governance procedures.
- 4.2.10. Other standing committees.
- 4.2.10.1. The **Bylaws and Elections Committee** shall consist of an indeterminate number of members selected annually by the Chair in close consultation with the Advisory Council.
- 4.2.10.2. The **Appointments and Equal Opportunity (AEO) Committee** shall consist of six tenure-system members elected for one academic year. Members cannot serve more than two consecutive academic years. The Chair may appoint additional members to achieve needed balance or expertise, depending on the written job description. The Chair may also appoint a graduate student to serve on the AEO Committee in a given year by requesting the Rhetoric and Writing graduate student organization to recommend a representative.
- 4.2.10.3. As required by the University, WRAC will have an Academic Hearing Board, the composition of which shall be stipulated by the “Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for Graduate Students” (see Appendix A).
- 4.2.10.4. The **Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee** shall consist of seven tenure-system faculty: four faculty at the rank of full professor, two faculty at the rank of associate professor, one at the rank of assistant professor. The Committee will be constituted by the end of the fall semester and members shall serve for one year. The RPT shall form Reappointment and Promotion Subcommittees, one for the review of tenure-system faculty, another for the review of Non-Tenure faculty and Academic Specialists.
- 4.2.10.4.1. The Reappointment and Promotion Committee (RP) Subcommittee will be constituted by the end of the fall semester and members shall serve for one year.

- 4.2.10.4.1.1. The RP Subcommittee for Nontenure track Faculty under review for Designation B or for promotion to associate professor shall be comprised of:
- two elected tenure-system faculty members from the RPT Committee
  - one nontenure-track associate professor
  - one Designation B nontenure-track faculty member
  - one non-Designation B nontenure track faculty member

- 4.2.10.4.1.2. The RP Subcommittee for Academic Specialists under third-year review or review for promotion to senior academic specialist shall be comprised of:
- two elected tenure-system faculty members from the RPT Committee
  - one academic specialist past third year review
  - one academic specialist in their probationary period
  - one senior academic specialist (an academic specialist from outside the unit may be appointed)

4.2.10.5. The **Equity and Justice Committee** shall consist of nine elected members. Elected members shall include four tenure-system faculty members, two nontenure-system faculty members, one academic specialist, and two graduate student representatives (one MA and one PhD). One undergraduate student representative will be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Programs.

4.2.10.5.1. Length of term: For tenured faculty, a term consists of two consecutive academic years. For untenured tenure-system faculty, nontenure-track faculty, and academic specialists, a term consists of one academic year.

4.2.10.5.2. Number of terms: Faculty shall serve no more than two consecutive terms. That is, for tenured faculty, four (4) years and for untenured, nontenure-track faculty, and academic specialists, two (2) years.

4.2.11. Department ad hoc committees.

4.2.11.1. The Chair, in consultation with the Council, shall designate the chairs of special committees. The committee chairs shall report to the Department Chair and the Council.

4.2.11.2. Reports and recommendations of ad hoc committees shall be governed by the provisions of section 4.2.6. and 4.2.7.

4.2.11.3. The membership of ad hoc committees shall be named by the Chair in consultation with the Council.

4.2.11.4. Ad hoc committees should be kept at a minimum; existing committees should be used whenever possible.

4.3. The Chair is a member of all Departmental committees and may attend meetings, but shall normally delegate responsibility to the committee Chair. All committee meetings are open except meetings or portions of meetings in which the Advisory Council and Chair are considering personnel decisions.

4.4. Selection and replacement of Department members on College committees.

4.4.1. The representative to the **College Advisory Council** shall be elected by the voting faculty of the Department.

4.4.2. The representative to the **College Curriculum Committee** shall be the Director of Undergraduate Programs.

4.4.3. The representative to the **College Graduate Council** shall be the Graduate Director of the Rhetoric and Writing Program.

4.4.4. When a Department member on a College committee is unable to serve that committee for a period of one semester or less, the Chair is authorized to appoint, after advice from the Council, a substitute who shall serve until the regularly elected member's return.

4.4.5. When a Department representative on a College committee is unable to serve for a period in excess of one semester (not counting summer), a successor shall be elected for the unexpired portion of the term.

[Contents](#)

## Section 5. Personnel Procedures

5.1. Across the annual review; academic raise process; and reappointment, promotion, and tenure procedures, there should be recognition that Department faculty and academic staff work in a wide range of fields, disciplines, and interdisciplines. Review will happen on an individual, case-by-case basis by the relevant committees performing review. Review will be based on the faculty member's or academic staff's contract appointment and percentages, and on standards deemed relevant to the particular candidate by general agreement of the Department peers serving on the committee and using a flexible, collective, and holistic approach. Review committees should value diversity of scholarship and scholarly innovation and consider the context of the particular fields, disciplines, and interdisciplines in which the person under review works.

Quality is inherently contextual and rhetorical, and the Department processes for determining quality shall allow for a diversity of faculty and academic specialist work and a broad range of products generated by that work.

5.2. Annual Review.

- 5.2.1. Each tenure-system faculty member, academic specialist in the continuing system, and non-tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated on an annual basis and informed in writing of the result of their review by the Department Chairperson.

Annual reviews are the means by which faculty and the Department Chairperson together assess the faculty's or academic specialist's past calendar year performance in the context of their appointment and contract percentages. Annual reviews are also the basis for recommendations for academic raises made by the Department Chairperson to the Dean's Office, according to procedures outlined by the College and University.

- 5.2.2. See Appendix C for the details regarding faculty and academic specialist annual reports.
- 5.2.3. See Appendix D for details regarding the faculty and academic specialist annual review process.
- 5.2.4. Informed by the annual report submitted along with any Annual Review Advisory Committee assessment, the Chair will produce and deliver to each faculty member and academic specialist an annual review letter that becomes part of their HR file.
  - 5.2.4.1. A faculty member or academic specialist may provide a written response to their annual review letter, which becomes an appendix and is stored with their annual review letter.
  - 5.2.4.2. Untenured tenure-system faculty and probationary academic staff are required to meet with the Chair to discuss their annual review letter. On request, other faculty members may meet with the Chair to discuss their annual review letter.

### 5.3. Annual academic raise determinations.

- 5.3.1. Tenure-system faculty and academic specialist academic raise review will occur each year.
  - 5.3.1.1. Whether or not funds will be released by the university for tenure-system faculty and academic specialists to receive raises will be announced by the university the summer after the review year.
- 5.3.2. UNTF faculty will undergo an academic raise review process each year.
  - 5.3.2.1. UNTF raises will follow the Agreement Between Michigan State University and the Union of Nontenure-track Faculty of Michigan State University, June 2022-May 2026 (see [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1t4mcJYWDBKAhRB17i\\_TZICTG2O19jDzL/vi](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1t4mcJYWDBKAhRB17i_TZICTG2O19jDzL/vi)) and MSU HR's policy on UNTF Salary Adjustments (see <https://hr.msu.edu/ua/recognition/faculty-academic-staff/untf-salary-adjustment.html>).

### 5.4. Procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion for tenure-system faculty.

- 5.4.1. Before a date that is dependent on decisions of the Dean and Provost, the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the RPT Committee shall each year notify the tenure system faculty of their eligibility to be considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and shall inform them of the deadline for application. (The College review process should be consulted by the candidate: [http://www.cal.msu.edu/faculty/college\\_reappointment-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines](http://www.cal.msu.edu/faculty/college_reappointment-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines).)
- 5.4.2. The notification shall reference the Form on Progress and Excellence (<https://hr.msu.edu/ua/forms/faculty-academic-staff/info-rrpt-pages.html>); the University forms used for recommendation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure; and other relevant Departmental, College, and University documents.
- 5.4.3. Candidates who wish to apply for promotion shall inform the Chair in writing on or before the date designated.
- 5.4.4. Eligible faculty who do not wish to apply for promotion in any given year shall notify the Chair in writing on or before the date designated.
- 5.4.5. Candidates shall present supporting materials to the Department according to the process, guidelines, and timelines determined by the College of Arts & Letters.
- 5.4.6. Individual members of the RPT Committee shall not participate in evaluations of their own reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- 5.4.7. Research Review Committee. Although the RPT Committee conducts a research review, faculty under review have the option of assembling a Research Review Committee comprised of colleagues with expertise in fields of study specific to the candidate. The Committee reviews the publication and research portion of the tenure dossier and writes a formal report to be included as a portion of the dossier forwarded to the College.
- 5.4.7.1. An initial Research Review Committee pool shall be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the Associate Chairs and the Advisory Council, constituted as follows:
- A list of seven persons shall be nominated from tenure-stream Department or external faculty from within the University.
  - Six of these persons shall be nominated by the faculty member being considered for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, and one by the Chair.
  - No more than two members of the pool may be external to the Department. (In the case that the Chair wishes to make an external nomination to the pool, the faculty member being reviewed may make only one external nomination.)
- 5.4.7.2. An individual Research Review Committee shall be selected, consisting of three individuals selected from the pool, and one more person designated as an alternate. The majority of the committee must be Department faculty. The faculty member being considered for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, as well as the Chair, shall be responsible for contacting the individuals they wish to

nominate for possible service on the review committee and obtain their agreement.

- 5.4.8. Teaching Review Committee. A tenure-system faculty member shall have a Teaching Review Committee assigned for the academic year that the individual is being considered for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- 5.4.8.1. An initial Teaching Review Committee pool shall be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the Associate Chairs and the Advisory Council from a pool to be constituted as follows:
- A list of seven persons shall be nominated from tenure-stream Department or external faculty from within the University.
  - Six of these persons shall be nominated by the faculty member being considered for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, and one by the Chair.
  - No more than two members of the pool may be external to the Department. (In the case that the Chair wishes to make an external nomination to the pool, the faculty member being reviewed may make only one external nomination.)
- 5.4.8.2. An individual Teaching Review Committee shall be selected, consisting of three individuals selected from the pool, and one more person designated as an alternate. The majority of the committee must be tenure-system faculty in the Department. The faculty member being considered for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, as well as the Chair, shall be responsible for contacting the individuals they wish to nominate for possible service on the review committee and obtain their agreement.
- 5.4.8.3. No tenured faculty member shall serve on more than two teaching review committees during an academic year.
- 5.4.8.4. The Teaching Review Committee shall use the following process in assessing the individual's teaching performance:
- 5.4.8.4.1. Meet with the individual to discuss course syllabi, assignments, philosophy of teaching, and methodologies and strategies for teaching and meeting Department or programmatic course objectives. Prior to this meeting, the individual will provide the Teaching Review Committee with a teaching portfolio (as described in Section 5.4.12.1. of these Bylaws).
- 5.4.8.4.2. Set two agreed-upon dates during one semester for classroom visitations with at least two of the three committee members present; the individual faculty member can request one additional visitation if he or she so desires.
- 5.4.8.4.3. Meet with the individual faculty member after the classroom visitations are completed for discussion, questions, clarifications, and feedback.

- 5.4.8.4.4. Write a committee report focusing on:
- organization and presentation of concepts, skills, and reading and discussion materials;
  - interaction with students; and
  - effective and productive use of class period in relation to instructional objectives.
- 5.4.8.4.5. Submit a draft of the report to the individual faculty member, who shall have the opportunity to respond to it in person or in writing, in order to make relevant comments regarding points of substance, emphasis, or neglect.
- 5.4.8.4.6. Submit a revised and final report to the Department Chair and to the Chair of the RPT Committee.
- 5.4.8.5. Teaching review committees shall restrict their reports to the substance of the teaching and instruction according to the areas identified above and to the course and instructional materials made available to them. Committee members shall recognize a diversity of instructional methodologies and strategies that can be used to reach common curricular goals. Teaching review committees shall not make recommendations on the individual's overall worthiness for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- 5.4.8.6. The individual faculty member shall be provided with a copy of the final report and shall sign and date a copy to be returned to the Department Chair. The faculty member may request a conference with the Chair to discuss the report and may file a response to the report that will become part of the permanent record.
- 5.4.9. Criteria for promotion recommendations. For reappointment, as well as for promotion and tenure, the candidate must provide solid evidence of consistent and persistent professional improvement and effectiveness at Michigan State University and in the College of Arts & Letters sufficient to demonstrate the promise of continued professional achievement and growth as relevant to the applicable position.
- 5.4.10. A recommendation **for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor** in the tenure system must be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission. These achievements must be consistent with performance levels expected for promotion to associate professor at peer institutions, and there must be a sufficiently long period in rank prior to the promotion. (See Faculty Handbook, <https://www.hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html>.)

A recommendation **for promotion from associate professor to professor** in the tenure system must be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission. These achievements must be consistent

with performance levels expected for promotion to professor at peer institutions, and there must be a sufficiently long period in rank prior to promotion. (See Faculty Handbook, <https://www.hr.msu.edu/ua/promotion/faculty-academic-staff/guide.html>.)

5.4.11. The candidate's performance in the following areas will provide the basis for evaluation, the first two areas being considered primary:

- instruction,
- research and creative activity, and
- service and outreach engagement within the academic and broader community.

It is often difficult to identify a scholarly activity as belonging solely to one of the main functional areas of instruction, research and creative activities, and service. Faculty work should be evaluated where it is most appropriate, be that instruction, research and creative activities, or service and outreach within the academic and broader community.

Faculty work may also be viewed from the perspective of integration across multiple mission functions of the University—instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader community.

Recognizing that Department faculty work in a wide range of fields, disciplines, and interdisciplines, there is no single, universal standard for quality and performance (including scholarly output) applicable to all faculty members in the Department. Instead, quality and performance (including scholarly output) will be evaluated in all areas (e.g., instruction, research and creative activity, and service and outreach engagement within the academic and broader community) on a case-by-case basis for each faculty member independently (and not in relation to Department peers generally) based on personalized standards communicated by the Chair to the faculty member in annual review letters and other standards deemed relevant to the particular candidate by general agreement of the Department peers serving on the applicable review committee, in each case using a flexible, collective, and holistic approach that values diversity of scholarship and scholarly innovation and considers the context of the particular fields, disciplines, and interdisciplines in which the candidate works (see, also, Section 5.1.4.).

By way of example and not requirement, possible quality criteria that may be considered included, but need not be limited to:

**Scholarship:** To what extent is the effort consistent with the methods and goals of the field and shaped by knowledge, understanding, and insight current or appropriate to the topic? To what extent does the effort generate, apply, and utilize knowledge?

**Significance:** To what extent does the effort address issues important to the scholarly community, specific constituents, or the public?

**Impact:** To what extent does the effort benefit or affect fields of scholarly inquiry, external issues, communities, or individuals? To what extent does the effort inform



and foster further activity in instruction, research and creative activities, or service and outreach?

**Attention to context:** To what extent is the effort consistent with the University Mission Statement (<https://strategicplan.msu.edu/mission>), issues within the scholarly community, constituent needs, and available resources?

- 5.4.12. Instruction. Standards for evaluating teaching quality should be established in the manner described in Section 5.4.11 and in consideration of Section 5.1.4. The following subsections include examples of materials on which the quality of instruction may be evaluated.
- 5.4.12.1. The following materials **must** be included in a teaching portfolio, to be submitted when the application for promotion/tenure is made, and to be evaluated by the Teaching Review Committee.
- 5.4.12.1.1. Reflective teaching statement, showing ongoing development of effective instructional practices.
  - 5.4.12.1.2. Syllabi and instructional materials (heuristics, activities, multimedia learning materials, projects, assignments, etc.) consistent with the Department's pedagogical aims.
  - 5.4.12.1.3. Departmental SIRS forms and any additional University or instructor-developed course evaluations (although reviewers should not afford undue weight to SIRS forms and similar evaluations due to their general unreliability as determiners of teaching quality).
  - 5.4.12.1.4. If applicable, evidence of graduate student mentoring, including service on exam and thesis committees, advising, and professional development.
- 5.4.12.2. The following materials **may** be included in a teaching portfolio, to be submitted when the application for promotion/tenure is made, and to be evaluated by the Teaching Review Committee.
- 5.4.12.2.1. Examples of student papers and projects.
  - 5.4.12.2.2. Evidence of effective formative and summative commentary on student papers and projects.
  - 5.4.12.2.3. Letters of commendation written by colleagues or peers.
  - 5.4.12.2.4. Reflective statements or learning narratives written by students.
  - 5.4.12.2.5. Honors or awards.
  - 5.4.12.2.6. Evidence of course and curriculum development.
  - 5.4.12.2.7. Evidence of participation in professional development workshops, seminars, and/or activities.

- 5.4.12.2.8. Evidence of teacher–research.
- 5.4.12.2.9. Demonstration of work in the instruction and mentoring of other instructors.
- 5.4.12.2.10. Outreach instruction that might include credit courses offered in off-campus locations during hours set to accommodate non-traditional students; noncredit seminars, workshops, conferences, exhibits, and performances.
- 5.4.12.2.11. Evidence of instructional materials and activities particular to online or distance education; such materials should be reviewed in the media for which they were intended.

5.4.13. Research and creative activity. Standards for evaluating quality of research and creative activities should be established in the manner described in Section 5.4.11. and in consideration of Section 5.1.4. Although evaluating the significance and quality of research and creative activities is often difficult and subjective, peer review is essential for evaluation. However, non-peer-reviewed research and creative works can be considered in all reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The following subsections include examples of materials or activities by which research and creative activity may be evaluated. Sections 5.4.13.1.–5.4.13.6. should be viewed as most valued in descending order of importance. Faculty should make arguments for the relative importance of other activities particular to their case.

Collaborative work is to be valued as a legitimate form of inquiry and production and as co-equal with single authorship.

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

The following, non-exhaustive list of possible ways creative works can be considered:

- invited showings and peer-reviewed conferences, gallery, or film festival exhibits;
- positive reviews (outside of a formal peer-review context) by qualified academic and professional external judges;
- academic and professional commissions, honors, prizes, reviews, and awards received for the activity.

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

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

significance to the teaching mission of the Department, College, and University may be eligible to be considered.

- 5.4.13.1. Producing a scholarly book, belletristic book, trade book, or textbook of substantial quality. Editing peer-reviewed journals in a manner that demonstrates substantial quality. Editing a scholarly book of substantial quality. Producing a full-length film, a series of video shorts, or some combination of video-based and other materials that make sustained and/or substantial contributions to scholarship or creative expression. Producing a full-length work in other media demonstrating substantial quality.
- 5.4.13.2. Publishing articles, book chapters, short stories, poetry, or works in other media that make a significant contribution to the field and that are reviewed according to the standards of the field or genre. Publishing in a trade or literary periodical that is reviewed according to the standards of the genre or field and that makes a significant contribution to the field.
- 5.4.13.3. Delivering peer-reviewed conference papers. Delivering invited papers and talks. Giving peer-reviewed or juried public readings, performances, screenings, or showings. Editing an edition of letters; editing an anthology or reader.
- 5.4.13.4. Receiving a major outside fellowship, such as a summer-, semester-, or year-long postdoctoral fellowship, grant, scholarship, or award for study or research. Examples of such awards include (but are not limited to) Fulbright, Andrew Mellon, Woodrow Wilson, Ford Foundation, or NEH fellowships.
- 5.4.13.5. Consulting with government, non-profit, corporate, private, or other outside agencies on projects and activities related to one's research expertise and scholarship.
  - 5.4.13.5.1. Research-related consulting includes activities that create new knowledge. Examples include (but are not limited to) curating a museum exhibit; consulting work that entails production of proposals, instructional materials, etc.; conducting a usability study with a local organization that requires development of survey materials, assessment tools, etc.
- 5.4.13.6. Producing reviews, abstracts, and public/community documents (including teaching materials disseminated beyond the classroom). Editing magazines and newsletters. Presenting at non-peer-reviewed conferences; delivering readings, performances, screenings, or showings.
- 5.4.14. Service and outreach. Standards for evaluating service quality should be established in the manner described in Section 5.4.11.

By way of example and not requirement, the following subsections include examples of accomplishments by which service within the academic and broader community may be evaluated. The service part of the mission refers to service to the University and service to

the profession. It may also be understood as service to a community when there is a connection to a faculty member's expertise. For example:

- Participating in University affairs through faculty governance and Departmental, College, and University committees is service to the University.
- Peer reviewing journal or book submissions, organizing scholarly meetings, administering or advising an academic professional organization are examples of service to the profession.
- Facilitating web site development or producing an edited document to a community agency or organization represents service to the community.

Service and outreach activities concern the extension of faculty knowledge and engagement within an area of expertise (e.g., providing organizational support to a community literacy coalition). The MSU model emphasizes outreach across the mission, performed for and with the public, which will benefit directly from faculty expertise.

Evaluation of service and outreach will address the scholarship, significance, impact, and attention to context of the faculty member's accomplishments as evidenced, for instance, in committee accomplishments (e.g., policies, reports, organizational changes); evaluation by committee colleagues, chair, or organization executive officers; and service awards or other forms of professional/alumni recognition. Other options include publications, programs offered, presentations, performances, exhibits, broadcasts, websites, brochures and other print materials, grants received in support of community activities, evaluations by affected groups including comments by outside evaluators.

5.4.14.1. Service to scholarly and professional organizations includes:

- significant committee/administrative responsibilities in support of scholarly and professional organizations (at the local, state, national, and international levels) including elected and appointed offices held;
- committee memberships and memberships on review or accreditation teams; reports written and submitted; grants received in support of the organization;
- editorial positions, review boards, and ad hoc review requests;
- programs and conferences planned and coordinated; and
- sessions coordinated or chaired.

5.4.14.2. Service within the University includes:

- committee service, including appointed and elected University, College, and Department ad hoc or standing committees, grievance panels, councils, task forces, boards, or graduate committees;
- administrative responsibilities, including the direction/coordination of programs or offices; admissions; participation in special studies or projects; grants received in support of the institution;
- significant committee or administrative responsibilities and contributions within the University;
- service that advances the University's equal opportunity commitment;
- evidence of contributions to and significant role in any major reports

issued, policy changes recommended and implemented, and

- administrative units restructured (e.g., evaluations by peers and affected groups).

5.4.14.3. Service within the broader community includes evidence in support of or emanating from significant contributions (as a representative of the University) to local, national, or international communities that have not been listed elsewhere. Appropriate contributions or activities may include technical assistance, consulting arrangements, and information sharing; targeted publications and presentations; assistance with building of external capacity or assessment; cultural and civic programs; and efforts to build international competence; evidence of contributions may include evaluations by affected groups; development of innovative approaches, strategies, technologies, systems of delivery; awards.

5.4.15. In making its individual recommendations to the Chair, the RPT Committee shall recognize Section 5.1.4. and also the following:

5.4.15.1. No single criterion for promotion to any of the ranks should be demanded or accepted.

5.4.15.2. A colleague's achievement as teacher and scholar before joining the Department shall be considered.

5.4.15.3. Service and outreach contributions can stretch across the categories of research and instruction and should be evaluated within the context of those categories as well as separately.

5.4.16. A faculty member notified of non-reappointment may request reconsideration of the decision.

5.4.16.1. On the faculty member's written request to the Chair and Council, the member shall be afforded a hearing, and may be represented by a colleague.

5.4.16.2. Additionally, the faculty member may request in writing a poll of the tenured faculty of the Department, who shall then indicate approval or disapproval of the reappointment.

5.4.16.2.1. The approval of sixty percent (60%) or more of the tenured faculty voting shall be reported to the Dean and other appropriate University officials.

5.4.16.2.2. Failure of sixty percent (60%) of the tenured faculty voting to approve reappointment shall confirm the Department decision against reappointment.

5.4.16.3. The Chair shall fully inform the faculty member concerned of the results of all appeal procedures, including, on written request, a letter setting forth the reasons within the Chair's purview for non-reappointment.

- 5.4.16.4. The Chair shall invite the recommendations of tenured faculty on promotions and shall report these recommendations, along with other appropriate information and recommendations from faculty members, to the RPT Committee.
- 5.4.17. Assistant Professors in the tenure system who are candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall have a mentor appointed.
  - 5.4.17.1. During the candidate's first year in the tenure system, his or her mentor shall be chosen by the Department Chair in consultation with the candidate.
  - 5.4.17.2. This mentor shall be a tenured faculty member. He or she shall meet regularly with the candidate at their mutual convenience to facilitate adjustment to the Department, teaching, and professional development.
  - 5.4.17.3. In the event that compelling personal reasons (such as the mentor's illness or leave of absence) or the incompatibility of a candidate and mentor make it evident that they cannot work together effectively, either the candidate or the mentor may request that a replacement be made.
- 5.5. Procedures for reappointment and promotion for academic specialists.
  - 5.5.1. Review processes.
    - 5.5.1.1. The RP Subcommittee for Academic Specialists shall advise the Department Chair about the reappointment, award of continuing appointment status, or promotion of the academic specialist. Every attempt should be made to ensure that the review committee is composed of individuals knowledgeable about the position under review and the Academic Specialist Appointment System and should include at least one academic specialist. An academic specialist from outside the unit may be appointed.
    - 5.5.1.2. The evaluation of an academic specialist's performance shall be based on the duties and responsibilities specified in the letter of appointment for the position of that specialist and the provisions of the Academic Specialist Appointment System.
    - 5.5.1.3. The academic specialist with a probationary appointment shall be evaluated annually to determine progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. Units may also use the annual evaluation to assist in the assignment of merit and other salary adjustments.
    - 5.5.1.4. The academic specialist shall be notified when the evaluation is to take place, what procedures are to be followed, and what criteria are to be used for the evaluation. This notification should be at the time of appointment and, subsequently, two (2) months prior to the evaluation.
    - 5.5.1.5. A written summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the academic specialist's personnel file in the unit.

- 5.5.1.6. An academic specialist with a fixed-term appointment should be reviewed regardless of the probability of reappointment in order to assess progress toward goals and/or the identification of goals. The academic specialist appointed on a fixed-term basis for six (6) months or more shall be evaluated by the Department Chair no later than two (2) months prior to the appointment ending date. A summary of this evaluation shall be placed in the personnel file in the unit and be given to the academic specialist.
- 5.5.2. Academic specialists shall have a review mentor, for preparation of their review dossiers. Academic specialists shall have a career mentor to facilitate professional growth in the Department, teaching, and professional development.
  - 5.5.2.1. An academic specialist's review mentor and career mentor may be the same person.
  - 5.5.2.2. Mentoring may happen either individually or, as appropriate, as a group.
  - 5.5.2.3. Both review mentors and career mentors shall be Senior Academic Specialists with a similar specialization.
  - 5.5.2.4. Meetings with review mentors and career mentors shall be as needed and regular. In the event that compelling personal reasons (such as the mentor's illness or leave of absence) or the incompatibility of an academic specialist and mentor make it evident that they cannot work together effectively, either the academic specialist or the mentor may request that a replacement be made.
- 5.6. Annual merit determinations for nontenure-track faculty, who will be evaluated for merit in terms consistent with the UNTF contract and/or their letters of appointment as applicable.
- 5.7. Procedures for reappointment and promotion for nontenure-track faculty.
  - 5.7.1. Before a date that is dependent on decisions of the Dean and Provost, the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the RPT Committee shall each year notify the nontenure track faculty of their eligibility to be considered for promotion, and shall inform them of the deadline for application.
  - 5.7.2. The notification shall reference the University forms used for recommendation for promotion of nontenure-track faculty; and other relevant Departmental, College, and University documents.
  - 5.7.3. Candidates who wish to apply for promotion shall inform the Chair in writing on or before the date designated.
  - 5.7.4. Candidates shall present supporting materials to the Department according to the process, guidelines, and timelines determined by the College of Arts & Letters.
  - 5.7.5. Individual members of the RP Committee shall not participate in evaluations of their own promotion (see Section 4.2.10.4. regarding the make up of the RP Subcommittees).

- 5.7.6. Teaching Review Committee. A nontenure-track faculty member shall have a Teaching Review Committee assigned for the academic year that the individual is being considered for promotion.
- 5.7.6.1. An initial Teaching Review Committee pool shall be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the Associate Chairs and the Advisory Council and will include:
- one tenure-system faculty member
  - one nontenure-track faculty member
  - one nontenure-track faculty member at the rank of associate professor (if possible and if available)
- 5.7.6.2. No faculty member shall serve on more than two teaching review committees during an academic year.
- 5.7.6.3. The Teaching Review Committee shall use the following process in assessing the individual's teaching performance:
- 5.7.6.3.1. Meet with the individual to discuss course syllabi, assignments, philosophy of teaching, and methodologies and strategies for teaching and meeting Department or programmatic course objectives. Prior to this meeting, the individual will provide the Teaching Review Committee with a teaching portfolio (as described in Section 5.4.12. of these Bylaws).
- 5.7.6.3.2. Set two agreed-upon dates during one semester for classroom visitations with at least two of the three committee members present; the individual faculty member can request one additional visitation if he or she so desires. At least one of the visitations shall involve specific writing instruction and activities.
- 5.7.6.3.3. Meet with the individual faculty member after the classroom visitations are completed for discussion, questions, clarifications, and feedback.
- 5.7.6.3.4. Write a committee report focusing on:
- organization and presentation of concepts, skills, and reading and discussion materials;
  - interaction with students; and
  - effective and productive use of class period in relation to instructional objectives.
- 5.7.6.3.5. Submit a draft of the report to the individual faculty member, who shall have the opportunity to respond to it in person or in writing, in order to make relevant comments regarding points of substance, emphasis, or neglect.



5.7.6.3.6. Submit a revised and final report to the Department Chair and to the Chair of the RPT Committee.

5.7.6.4. Teaching review committees shall restrict their reports to the substance of the teaching and instruction according to the areas identified above and to the course and instructional materials made available to them. Committee members shall recognize a diversity of instructional methodologies and strategies that can be used to reach common curricular goals. Teaching review committees shall not make recommendations on the individual's overall worthiness for promotion.

5.7.7. Criteria for promotion recommendations. For promotion, the candidate must provide solid evidence of consistent and persistent professional improvement and effectiveness at Michigan State University and in the College of Arts & Letters sufficient to demonstrate the promise of continued professional achievement and growth as relevant to the applicable position.

[Contents](#)

## Section 6. Parliamentary Authority

6.1. Should any parliamentary question arise in the conduct of any Departmental or committee meetings, the Sturgis Code shall apply.

[Contents](#)

## Section 7. Interpretation of the Bylaws

7.1. All questions of interpretation regarding the Department bylaws shall be referred to the Chair, who should consult with the Advisory Council regarding a ruling or judgment. Either may consult with the Bylaws and Elections Committee.

7.2. Appeals regarding conformity of the language of Department bylaws with College or University bylaws may be directed to the appropriate College or University committee, or to the University Committee on Academic Governance (see section 4.4 of the Bylaws for Academic Governance: <https://acadgov.msu.edu/bylaws>).

[Contents](#)

## Section 8. Amendment Procedures

8.1. An amendment to these bylaws may be initiated by either the Advisory Council or by a voting faculty member from the floor at a Departmental meeting (see also section 2.5. of this document).

8.1.1. A Departmental Council-initiated amendment will be introduced for discussion at a Departmental faculty meeting and will be adopted upon a majority vote.

- 8.1.2. An amendment introduced by a voting faculty member will be referred to the Advisory Council; the amendment and recommendations of the Advisory Council will be returned to the floor at the next Departmental meeting for further discussion.
- 8.1.3. All amendments to the Department bylaws will be adopted by a majority vote of the eligible voting faculty.
- 8.2. Department bylaws shall be understood to be amended when action on a University or College level makes changes necessary. The departmental Bylaws and Elections Committee shall review the University and College bylaws annually to determine if changes to the Department bylaws are necessary to conform with changes made to the University and College bylaws.
- 8.3. All revisions shall be made available to the Department faculty in writing as soon as possible.

[Contents](#)

## Section 9. Faculty Grievance Procedures

- 9.1. The Department follows the University Faculty Grievance Procedures (please see [https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/grievance\\_policy.html](https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/grievance_policy.html)).
- 9.2. The University's administrative review procedure is an informal process for faculty to request an independent assessment from their department chair, dean, or Provost on such personnel matters as salary status, reappointment, promotion, and tenure (please see [https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/administrative\\_review.html](https://hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/faculty-handbook/administrative_review.html)).

[Contents](#)

## Section 10. Student Grievance Procedures

- 10.1. The definition of a grievance, the responsibilities of the Department Chair regarding a student grievance, the responsibilities of the WRAC Hearing Board, the rights and responsibilities of the student-complainant, the rights and responsibilities of the faculty member respondent, the conduct of the hearing, the disposition of the outcome, and the procedure for appeal are described in the Department's "Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for Graduate Students," found in full in Appendix A.

Procedures for undergraduate student grievances are managed at the university level as described at <https://ombud.msu.edu/resources-self-help/for-undergraduate-students/request-grievance-hearing>.

[Contents](#)

# Appendix A. Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for Graduate Students

The Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University (AFR) and the Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) documents establish the rights and responsibilities of MSU students and prescribe procedures for resolving allegations of violations of those rights through formal grievance hearings. In accordance with the AFR and the GSRR, Writing, Rhetoric, and Cultures has established the following WRAC Hearing Board procedures for adjudicating academic grievances and complaints.

## I. JURISDICTION OF THE WRAC HEARING BOARD:

- A. The WRAC Hearing Board serves as the initial Hearing Board for academic grievance hearings involving graduate students who allege violations of academic rights and graduate students seeking to contest an allegation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records).
- B. Students may not request an academic grievance hearing based on an allegation of incompetent instruction.

## II. COMPOSITION OF THE WRAC HEARING BOARD:

- A. Writing, Rhetoric, and Cultures shall constitute a Hearing Board pool no later than the end of the tenth week of the spring semester.
  - For hearings involving graduate students, the WRAC Hearing Board shall include the Chair of the Department or a designee, and an equal number of faculty and graduate students appointed by the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Advisory Council. Members shall serve a term of one academic year. The chair of the WRAC Hearing Board shall be the faculty member of rank.
- B. Writing, Rhetoric, and Cultures will train hearing board members about these procedures and the applicable sections of the AFR and GSRR.

## III. REFERRAL TO WRAC HEARING BOARD:

- A. After consulting with the instructor and appropriate unit administrator, graduate students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of student academic rights may request an academic grievance hearing. When appropriate, the Department Chair/School Director, in consultation with the Dean, may waive jurisdiction and refer the request for a hearing to the College Hearing Board. At any time in the grievance process, students may consult with the University Ombudsperson.
- B. After consulting with the instructor and appropriate unit administrator, graduate students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records) may request an academic grievance hearing. When appropriate, the Department Chair/School Director, in consultation with the Dean, may waive jurisdiction and refer the request for a hearing to the College Hearing Board. At any time in the grievance process, students may consult with the University Ombudsperson.
- C. In cases of ambiguous jurisdiction, the Dean of The Graduate School will select the appropriate Hearing Board for cases involving graduate students.

- D. The deadline for submitting the written request for a hearing is the middle of the next semester in which the student is enrolled (including summer). If either the student (the complainant) or the respondent (usually, the instructor or an administrator) is absent from the university during that semester, or if other appropriate reasons emerge, the WRAC Hearing Board may grant an extension of this deadline. If the university no longer employs the respondent before the grievance hearing commences, the hearing may still proceed.
- E. A written request for an academic grievance hearing must (1) specify the alleged violation(s) of the AFR or GSRR, (2) identify the individual against whom the grievance is filed (the respondent) and (3) state the desired redress. Anonymous grievances will not be accepted.

#### IV. PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES

- A. After receiving a student's written request for a hearing, the Chair of Writing, Rhetoric, and Cultures will promptly refer the grievance to the Chair of the Hearing Board.
- B. Within **ten (10)** class days, the Chair of the Hearing Board will:
  - 1. forward the request for a hearing to the respondent;
  - 2. send the names of the pool of Hearing Board members to both parties and, to avoid conflicts of interest between the two parties and the Hearing Board members, request written challenges, if any, within **three (3)** class days of this notification;
  - 3. rule promptly on any challenges, impanel a Hearing Board and send each party the names of the Hearing Board members. If the Chair of the Hearing Board is the subject of a challenge, the challenge shall be filed with the Dean of the College, or designee; and
  - 4. send the Hearing Board members a copy of the request for a hearing and the written response, and send all parties a copy of these procedures.
- C. Within **ten (10)** class days of being established, the Hearing Board shall review the request, and, after considering all requested and submitted information:
  - 1. accept the request, in full or in part, and promptly schedule a hearing.
  - 2. reject the request and provide a written explanation to appropriate parties; e.g., lack of jurisdiction. (The student may appeal this decision.)
  - 3. invite the two parties to meet with the Hearing Board in an informal session to try to resolve the matter. (Such a meeting does not preclude a later hearing.)
- D. If the WRAC Hearing Board calls for a hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall promptly negotiate a hearing date, schedule an additional meeting only for the Hearing Board should additional deliberations on the findings become necessary, and request a written response to the grievance from the respondent.
- E. At least **five (5)** class days before the scheduled hearing, the Chair of the WRAC Hearing Board shall notify the respondent and the complainant in writing of the (1) time, date, and place of the hearing; (2) the names of the parties to the grievance; (3) a copy of the hearing request and the respondent's reply; and (4) the names of the WRAC Hearing Board members after any challenges.
- F. At least **three (3)** class days before the scheduled hearing, the parties must notify the Chair of the WRAC Hearing Board the names of their witnesses and advisor, if any, and request permission for the advisor to have voice at the hearing. The chair may grant or deny this request. The Chair will promptly forward the names given by the complainant to the respondent and vice versa.
- G. The Chair of the Hearing Board may accept written statements from either party's witnesses at least **three (3)** class days before the hearing.

- H. In unusual circumstances and in lieu of a personal appearance, either party may request permission to submit a written statement to the WRAC Hearing Board or request permission to participate in the hearing through an electronic communication channel. Written statements must be submitted to the WRAC Hearing Board at least **three (3)** class days before the scheduled hearing.
  - I. Either party to the grievance hearing may request a postponement of the hearing. The WRAC Hearing Board may either grant or deny the request.
  - J. At its discretion, the WRAC Hearing Board may set a reasonable time limit for each party to present its case, and the Chair of the WRAC Hearing Board must inform the parties of such a time limit in the written notification of the hearing.
  - K. Hearings are closed unless the student requests an open hearing, which would be open to all members of the MSU community. The WRAC Hearing Board may close an open hearing to protect the confidentiality of information or to maintain order.
  - L. Members of the WRAC Hearing Board are expected to respect the confidentiality of the hearing process.
- V. HEARING PROCEDURES:
- A. The Hearing will proceed as follows:
    - 1. Introductory remarks by the Chair of the WRAC Hearing Board: The Chair of the Hearing Board introduces hearing panel members, the complainant, the respondent and advisors, if any. The Chair reviews the hearing procedures, including announced time restraints for presentations by each party and the witnesses, and informs the parties if their advisors may have a voice in the hearings and if the proceedings are being recorded. Witnesses shall be excluded from the proceedings except when testifying. The Chair also explains:
      - a) In academic grievance hearings in which a student alleges a violation of academic rights, the student bears the burden of proof.
      - b) In hearings involving graduate students seeking to contest allegations of academic misconduct, the instructor bears the burden of proof.
      - c) All Hearing Board decisions must be reached by a majority of the Hearing Board, based on a “preponderance of the evidence.”
    - 2. If the complainant fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the WRAC Hearing Board may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case for demonstrated cause.
    - 3. If the respondent fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the WRAC Hearing Board may postpone the hearing, hear the case in the respondent’s absence, or dismiss the case.
    - 4. If the respondent is absent from the University during the semester of the grievance hearing or no longer employed by the University before the grievance procedure concludes, the hearing process may still proceed.
    - 5. To assure orderly questioning, the Chair of the Hearing Board will recognize individuals before they speak. All parties have a right to speak without interruption. Each party has a right to question the other party and to rebut any oral or written statements submitted to the Hearing Board.
    - 6. Presentation by the Complainant: The Chair recognizes the complainant to present without interruption any statements relevant to the complainant’s case, including the redress

sought. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the complainant by the WRAC Hearing Board, the respondent and the respondent's advisor, if any.

7. Presentation by the Complainant's Witnesses: The Chair recognizes the complainant's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, any statement directly relevant to the complainant's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the WRAC Hearing Board, the respondent, and the respondent's advisor, if any.
8. Presentation by the Respondent: The Chair recognizes the respondent to present without interruption any statements relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the respondent by the WRAC Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.
9. Presentation by the Respondent's Witnesses: The Chair recognizes the respondent's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, and statement directly relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the WRAC Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.
10. Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Complainant: The complainant refutes statements by the respondent, the respondent's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
11. Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Respondent: The respondent refutes statements by the complainant, the complainant's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
12. Final questions by the Hearing Board: The WRAC Hearing Board asks questions of any of the participants in the hearing.

## VI. POST-HEARING PROCEDURES

- A. Deliberation: After all evidence has been presented, with full opportunity for explanations, questions and rebuttal, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall excuse all parties to the grievance and convene the Hearing Board to determine its findings in executive session. When possible, deliberations should take place directly following the hearing and/or at the previously scheduled follow-up meeting. (See Section III.I above.)
- B. Decision:
  1. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students and a majority of the WRAC Hearing Board finds, based on a "preponderance of the evidence," that a violation of the student's academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall direct the Chair/Director of the Department/School to implement an appropriate remedy, in consultation with the Hearing Board. If the WRAC Hearing Board finds that no violation of academic rights has occurred, it shall so inform the Chair/Director.
  2. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students in which the WRAC Hearing Board serves as the initial hearing body to adjudicate an allegation of academic dishonesty and, based on a "preponderance of the evidence," the Hearing Board finds for the student, the Hearing Board shall recommend to the Chair/Director of the Department/School that the penalty grade be removed, the Academic Dishonesty Report be removed from the student's records and a "good faith judgment" of the student's academic performance in the course take place. If the WRAC Hearing Board finds for the complainant (instructor), the penalty grade shall stand and the Academic Dishonesty Report regarding the allegation will remain on file, pending an appeal, if any to the College Hearing Board within **ten (10)** class days of the WRAC Hearing Board's decision. If an

academic disciplinary hearing is pending, and the Hearing Board decides for the complainant, the graduate student's disciplinary hearing before either the College Hearing Board or the Dean of The Graduate School would promptly follow, pending an appeal, if any, within **ten (10)** class days.

- C. Written Report: The Chair of the WRAC Hearing Board shall prepare a written report of the Hearing Board's findings, including redress for the complainant, if applicable, or sanctions, if applicable, and forward a copy of the decision to the appropriate unit administrator within **three (3)** class days of the hearing. The report shall indicate the rationale for the decision and the major elements of evidence, or lack thereof, that support the Hearing Board's decision. The report also should inform the parties of the right to appeal within **five (5)** class days following notice of the decision. The Chair shall forward copies to the parties involved, the responsible administrators, the University Ombudsperson and, in hearings involving graduate students, the Dean of The Graduate School. All recipients must respect the confidentiality of the report and of the hearing board's deliberations resulting in a decision.

VII. APPEAL OF WRAC HEARING BOARD DECISION:

- A. In hearings involving graduate students, either party may appeal a decision by the WRAC Hearing Board to the College Hearing Board for cases involving (1) academic grievances alleging violations of student rights heard initially by the WRAC Hearing Board and (2) alleged violations of regulations involving academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, professional standards or falsification of admission and academic records).
- B. All appeals must be in writing, signed and submitted to the Chair of either the University Academic Appeal Board or the College Hearing Board within **five (5)** class days following notification of the WRAC Hearing Board's decision. While under appeal, the original decision of the WRAC Hearing Board will be held in abeyance.
- C. A request for an appeal of a WRAC Hearing Board decision to either the University Academic Appeal Board or the College Hearing Board must allege, in sufficient particularity to justify a hearing, that the WRAC Hearing Board failed to follow applicable procedures for adjudicating the hearing or that findings of the WRAC Hearing Board were not supported by the "preponderance of the evidence." The request also must include the redress sought. Presentation of new evidence normally will be inappropriate.

- VIII. RECONSIDERATION: If new evidence should arise, either party to a hearing may request the WRAC Hearing Board to reconsider the case within **thirty (30)** days upon receipt of the hearing outcome. The written request for reconsideration is to be sent to the Chair of the Hearing Board, who shall promptly convene the WRAC Hearing Board to review the new material and render a decision on a new hearing.

*Approved by the WRAC voting faculty on October 28, 2011.*

# Appendix B. Variable Work Assignment Policy for Tenure-System Faculty

This policy addresses the fact that concentrated effort in one of the three areas may require the faculty member to redistribute the normal percentages of effort.

## Standard distribution

The standard distribution of effort for tenure-system faculty in an academic year is as follows:

- 40% teaching** (including new course development and existing course enhancement)
- 40% research and publication** (includes professional conference papers, formal performances, creative projects, etc.)
- 20% service/engagement** (to the university, to the profession, and within the community)

Each faculty member is expected to make demonstrable contributions in each of the three areas each year. Untenured faculty are required to use the standard distribution.

## Guiding principles

The Variable Work Assignment Policy is guided by the following principles and values:

- All three areas—teaching, research, and service/engagement—are part of the regular responsibility of tenure-system faculty. Under normal circumstances, no category may be reduced to zero effort.
- At different times or in response to different opportunities, emphases can temporarily shift.
- Tenure carries with it both the right and the responsibility of the faculty member to determine, in concert with the department chair, priorities for carrying out one's work in light of the missions of the department, college, and university.

## Memorandum of understanding

Each case of redistribution of effort must be accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding, prepared and agreed to by both the chair of the department and the faculty member before the redistribution may take effect.

- The MOU should detail the length of time for which the redistribution agreement is to be in effect.
- The MOU must detail how the reassignment will affect the evaluation of the faculty member's work for merit pay.
- Faculty are obliged to negotiate these arrangements in a timely manner, especially in order to facilitate programmatic scheduling.
- In most cases, the MOU should be agreed upon two weeks before the semester in which the redistribution would take effect.

## Redistribution of effort

Request for redistribution of effort may be initiated by either the faculty member or the chair.

Redistribution of effort may be triggered by one of the following:

1. A contractual administrative responsibility
2. A sabbatical agreement
3. Receipt of a grant, fellowship, or award that buys out some portion of a teaching assignment



4. Leaves of absence (paid or unpaid)
5. In addition to the above four conditions, an agreement for the redistribution of effort may be reached between the chair and the faculty member as a long-term plan to respond to changing circumstances in the faculty member's professional work. Typical arrangements would be the following:
  - 20% redistribution from research to teaching for a 60-20-20 arrangement. This arrangement requires that the faculty member teach 3 courses per semester.
  - 20% from research to service for a 40-20-40 arrangement. This arrangement increases the expected service work and reduces the expected research output.
  - 20% redistribution is the maximum allowed.

Faculty members who have arranged for retirement and/or consultantships leading to retirements (prior to the formal departmental adoption of this policy) are excluded from this policy.

*The Variable Work Assignment Policy was drafted by the Advisory Council of 2008–2009 (Bratzel, Bresnahan [chair], Grabill, Larabee, Powell, Rehberger, Smith). On May 1, 2009, it was approved by a majority of the eligible voting faculty in the department.*

# Appendix C. 2024 Annual Report Requirements

All faculty and academic specialists will submit the following by uploading three documents:

1. A cover sheet that includes their role, rank, and contract percentages, along with their self-assessment (see Appendix D).
2. A current CV.
3. A narrative report of no more than 4 pages that addresses the faculty member's contract work during the previous calendar year and future goals. The report should be attentive to faculty contract percentages, and it should provide evidence and examples to strengthen the claims made. Faculty also have the option to provide additional support documents and contextualize them in the narrative report. Note that as DEI is integral to all of our work, discussion of DEI should be integrated into the narrative report.
4. All faculty and academic specialists may also include an optional labor impact statement.

## NARRATIVE REPORT

The narrative report should address teaching, broader work, and goals (4 pages maximum, with up to 4 additional pages for optional supporting materials).

- **Contract Percentages:** Because each faculty role requires specific percentages for teaching and other duties, each faculty member should be mindful of their percentage workload and distribute their narratives accordingly based on those percentages. For instance, since most teaching focused faculty contracts specify teaching as the primary responsibility, narratives for teaching focused faculty should provide the committee a way to document and highlight instructional excellence as the core of the narrative and include a smaller focus on the “curriculum development” (professional development in pedagogy; or service) work they do, in relation to that 90% teaching role.
- **Contextualized Evidence and Examples:** Faculty should describe, draw upon, contextualize, and/or cite specific materials related to their contract-specified responsibilities to provide evidence for claims about their work.
- **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI):** DEI work should be integrated into the narrative report. DEI work is integral to the mission of the university and is not accessory to but spans the areas of all faculty work, including teaching, research/creative activities, service, outreach, and engagement. For example, DEI efforts encompass work to advance equitable access in classrooms; research or creative work amplifying marginalized<sup>1</sup> populations; service/outreach working to address the needs of marginalized communities; mentoring and supporting marginalized faculty and staff; and the equitable implementation of policy and procedure (e.g., serving on committees). Considering the numerous groups that make up our intellectual community, a faculty member's contributions

---

<sup>1</sup> See note on page 38 for a qualified definition of this word.

can include impact at multiple levels, including an individual faculty level, at a programmatic unit level, and/or at an institutional or professional organizational level (see “Incorporating DEI” below for more details).

### **SUPPORT DOCUMENTS (OPTIONAL)**

Faculty have the option to include documents in support of the narrative report (of no more than 4 additional pages).

- Optional support documents can be appended to the narrative report if their length is not prohibitive (more than 4 additional pages) when more documentation is needed outside of the CV and narrative report.
- Optional support documents should be referenced and contextualized within the narrative itself. For instance, responses from student evaluations do not speak for themselves; faculty should point to and explain documents that amplify and extend the points being made in the narrative report about their job performance over the past year.
- Faculty that choose *not* to include optional support documents should provide sufficient evidence and examples *in* the narrative report itself to support claims about their work. For example, faculty could provide evidence such as sample student comments, excerpts from student reflections, or summaries of responses to student evaluation questions along with contextualizing information within the four-page limit.
- A faculty member who chooses *not* to submit optional support documents will not be penalized, as long as they provide evidence and examples within the narrative report.

### **Evidence and Examples of Optional Support Documents**

To provide evidence and examples for claims within the narrative report, faculty are invited to explain and draw upon the following materials, as well as explain and append them as optional support documents. These lists are not exhaustive, but suggestive in nature.

#### **Tenure-Stream Faculty** (most typically on a 40% / 40% / 20% contract):

##### *Teaching*

- Description of course materials such as assignment sheets, syllabi excerpts, or lessons
- Teaching observation letters
- Summaries of student evaluations, student comments, or other means of receiving feedback from students
- Letters of support, certificates, or awards for teaching or student mentorship
- Descriptions of work with graduate students such as overseeing independent studies, supervising theses and dissertations, or chairing committees

##### *Research*

- Excerpts from articles or book chapters
- Book abstracts or publication contracts
- Letters of support or awards for research, scholarship, or grants

##### *Service*

- Letters of support, certificates, or awards for local/institutional/community service,

- leadership, peer mentorship, and/or community engagement
- Letters of support, certificate, or awards for national service or leadership

**Academic Specialists:** This job category has numerous subcategories (Academic Advising; Curriculum Development; Research; Service/admin; Outreach/public service), but the positions are usually divided into **three primary areas:** *Academic Advising/Teaching/Curriculum Development; Research; and Service/Outreach.*<sup>2</sup>

*Academic Advising/Teaching/Curriculum Development*

- Description of course materials such as assignment sheets, syllabi excerpts, or lessons
- Teaching observation letters
- Summaries of student evaluations, student comments, or other means of receiving feedback from students
- Materials that document substantial contributions to creation of a minor (curriculum development)
- Materials that document substantial advising work in support of student success (advising)

*Research*

- Materials that document lead role on research projects, including developing grant proposals and directing / performing research responsibilities that require a doctorate degree.

*Service/Outreach*

- Materials that demonstrate a significant role in disseminating knowledge resources of the university, to meet the knowledge needs of people outside the university; providing non-credit educational programs to off-campus students or client groups; involved in the writing, resource identification, and data gathering related to such projects

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty** (or teaching-focused faculty; most typically on a 90% / 10% contract):

*Teaching*

- Description of how syllabi innovates, by focusing on a particular theme or inclusive pedagogy
- Descriptions of innovative lesson plans, presentations, use of technology, etc.
- Descriptions of innovating, redeveloping, revising teaching approaches and/or assignments classroom teaching (in person or online)
- Examples of rubrics created to evaluate student work, or innovative approaches to responding to, evaluating, or assessing student work
- Examples of student responses to their teaching (university course evaluations, optional midterm evaluations, excerpts from emails or letters written to the faculty member by a student)
- Examples of contributions to the teaching culture of WRAC and the program(s) within which faculty teach (participating in a teaching circle or specific group discussing a teaching-focussed issue (like AI).
- Discussion of a course observation (of someone else's class), and / or a teaching consult about a particular teaching challenge (like teaching hybrid for the first time)

---

<sup>2</sup> This information is adapted from the Academic Specialist Handbook: [https://hr.msu.edu/\\_resources/pdf/academic-specialist-handbook/acad\\_spec\\_man.pdf](https://hr.msu.edu/_resources/pdf/academic-specialist-handbook/acad_spec_man.pdf)

- Numbers of student recommendation letters written during the reporting year (indicative of students seeking you out, for further support)
- Discussion of any extra individualized support provided to a student / students during the reporting period
- Further description of course materials such as assignment sheets, syllabi excerpts, or lessons
- Teaching observation letters

*Curriculum Development (professional development in pedagogy; or service)*

Because NT faculty are primarily teachers (at 90%), their curriculum development work (10%, or 3-4 hours a week, for most NT faculty) should either relate back to their teaching, or make use of their teaching status in some way (for example, representing the perspective of teaching faculty on a university committee). The link between teaching and curriculum development, professional development in pedagogy, or service should be clearly articulated in the narrative report.

- participating in teaching-related workshops, and how these apply back to teaching
- (co-) / hosting/leading teaching-related workshops, and how these reflect teaching
- attending professional symposia and conferences to support teaching, description of learning, how to apply these ideas in teaching.
- presenting at professional symposia and conferences to share and discuss teaching approaches with others
- researching and/or presenting on work related to teaching
- serving on program, department, college, university, or national committees as a teaching faculty representative
- leveraging teaching in community/outreach/engagement efforts; considering how these community efforts inform teaching
- mentoring fellow faculty in their teaching, and possibly, how this mentoring informs teaching
- mentoring or supporting students in the context of teaching or teaching expertise (e.g., writing letters of recommendation for students, overseeing Undergraduate Research Initiative projects, serving as an advisor for a Registered Student Organization)
- participating and/or co-leading one of the university's faculty learning communities in ways that informs teaching practice
- volunteering for undergraduate/graduate events (conferences, UURAF symposia, Learning Abroad Conference, First Generation week, Welcomes to specific student groups such as TRIO, Black students, CAMP students, veterans, etc.) in ways that informs teaching practice

**LABOR IMPACT STATEMENT (OPTIONAL)**

Given our varied positionalities, identities, and roles, we acknowledge that faculty members have differing experiences as to how, when, and what processes are necessary for us to complete our work. We know things like race, gender, embodiment, disability, and class (among other things) matter as it applies to invisible and visible labor demands (see Craig & Perryman-Clark, 2011, Hubrig, 2021, Pryor, 2021, and Ribero & Arellano, 2019 for some starting points of reference). In efforts to recognize the impacts of difference on our labor demands, we invite faculty to describe ways that their work has been directly or indirectly affected by externalities.

These externalities can include COVID, child care, dependent care, and elder care, invisibilized mentorship, racial injustice, lack of access, lack of accommodations for disability, shortage of human resources, etc. This statement is optional and WRAC is committed to acknowledging the impact that difference has on labor demands and production in a trauma-informed and responsive manner.

## **INCORPORATING DEI**

The following section discusses ways to think about and incorporate DEI into faculty annual reports; see, also, the Evidence for DEI Contributions sections below (adapted from the College of Education). To foreground key dimensions related to these areas, a list below provides ways to think about and discuss DEI work in WRAC faculty annual reports. **Faculty members are not necessarily expected to have contributed to all areas listed, but the lists below can provide faculty with a starting point for identifying their DEI work.**

*Note that throughout this document, we use the term “marginalized” to denote individuals, communities, and populations that systematically experience racism, cis-genderism, ethnocentrism, ableism, heterosexism, transphobia, religious oppression, nativism, classism, xenophobia, among a myriad of other forms of identity-based discrimination not listed here. Marginalization is systemic and systematic and is one of the ways that oppression (see Young, 1990) manifests and becomes a tool for exclusion.*

## **Evidence for DEI Contributions in Research and Creative Activities**

The Council of Diversity Deans (CODD) states that “in the realm of research, there are numerous ways that faculty activities can align with DEI, including, but not limited to: producing scholarship/creative work, leading scholarly and creative programs, and initiatives, applying for external grants, and generating new knowledge that focuses on DEI and engages with equity and inclusion issues” (p. 2). The activities below exemplify evidence of DEI contributions in research and creative activities.

- Pursuing scholarship addressing issues relevant to DEI, such as racism, genderism, ethnocentrism, ableism, heterosexism, transphobia, religious oppression, nativism, classism, among other forms of identity-based discrimination and marginalization.
- Pursuing scholarship addressing the barriers that marginalized groups face in writing studies (broadly defined), including considerations of linguistic justice, inclusive curriculum in rhetoric and writing, engagement with writing and rhetoric in a variety of cultural instantiations.
- Studying and/or evaluating programs, curricula, and teaching strategies designed to enhance participation and inclusion of members of underrepresented groups in K 12, post-secondary, and physical education.
- Pursuing and/or administering grant funded research, as a Principal Investigator, that supports and/or that is informed by DEI concerns.
- Amplifying systemically marginalized knowledges and epistemologies (e.g., data sets, theories, methodologies) and centering diverse cultural and historic experiences, particularly in reference to Black and Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC) and other systemically marginalized groups.
- Pursuing artistic and creative texts, performances, expression, and other works that reflect culturally diverse communities or voices not well represented in the arts and humanities.
- Nurturing and promoting research or creative opportunities with individuals historically excluded

from their disciplines.

- Developing sustained research or creative partnerships based on reciprocity with and accountability to marginalized communities or entities within and outside MSU (e.g., Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions).
- Pursuing scholarly productivity in outlets (e.g., journals, chapters, public platforms) that center diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Developing tools and products for research/scholarship that honor the perspectives of minoritized communities (e.g., social media apps, animation, photo elicitation).

### **Evidence for DEI Contributions in Teaching, Mentoring, and Advising**

The CODD states that, “as teachers, faculty can exhibit a commitment to DEI by doing the following, among others: fostering inclusive learning environments and pedagogies, ensuring that students are provided with equitable opportunities for success, incorporating DEI into their curricula, and mentoring” marginalized students (p. 4). Teaching, mentoring, and advising that advances DEI may include but is not limited to:

- Developing and using inclusive teaching practices (e.g., pedagogy, advancing culturally- relevant health care/health education, attending to experiences of disabled/students with disabilities).
- Leading and adopting curricula reform in a unit or profession that broadly integrates resources that amplify the voices of marginalized groups and/or are authored by these scholars (e.g., culturally responsive study abroad programs).
- Enrolling in professional development intended to support faculty member’s skills and knowledge to support the advancement of BIPOC and marginalized students. • Teaching in programs that serve BIPOC and marginalized groups (e.g., local community colleges, bridge to college programs, within prison systems, summer enrichment/internship programs that support historically underrepresented students).
- Mentoring BIPOC and marginalized undergraduate and/or graduate students (e.g., serving on guidance or dissertation committees, providing consistent feedback and guidance concerning career opportunities, incorporating such students into laboratory groups and research teams).
- Designing courses and/or mentoring structures that account for and respect the accessibility needs of students (e.g., respecting RCPD’s accommodations, providing accessible course materials, considering expense of course materials, inclusive evaluative criteria).

### **Evidence for DEI Contributions in Service**

The CODD states that, “participating in on-campus DEI initiatives is a clear example of DEI university service, but there are other examples. In the area of outreach and engagement, faculty can engage with systemically and systematically marginalized communities and promote DEI values to the broader public. In the area of professional service, faculty can be involved in a range of activities within their fields that promote inclusive excellence” (p. 5). The following examples are some potential ways that faculty may contribute to DEI through service.

- Chairing or participating in a department, school, and/or campus committee pertaining to DEI work.
- Leading or participating in crisis response teams/task forces that involve DEI matters.
- Engaging in community-based outreach to marginalized communities (e.g., K-12 schools, community-based health agencies, local, national, or international NGOs, religious institutions).

- Leading/delivering DEI professional development programming (e.g., consulting work, paid or unpaid).
- Leading/delivering professional development programming focused on the inclusion and/or advancement of BIPOC and marginalized groups (e.g., students, faculty colleagues).
- Assuming a major leadership role in an externally facing DEI professional society/association.
- Advancing DEI initiatives and priorities through national or local professional associations.
- Creating and/or leading programs related to DEI, on campus and/or beyond (e.g., efforts that create spaces/programs that facilitate greater sense of belonging and a welcoming environment for marginalized students, faculty, and/or staff).
- Producing DEI-related resource materials for the general public (e.g., peer reviewed publications, creative works, manuals, resource guides, websites, webinars, etc.).
- Participating in DEI focus programs for BIPOC and marginalized faculty and staff (e.g., Diversity Research Network (DRM), Womxn of Color Initiative (WOCI), Coalition of Racial and Ethnic Minorities (CoREM), Black Faculty, Staff, and Administrators Association (BFSAA), Employee Pride and Inclusion Coalition (EPIC), Educating Anishinaabe: Giving, Learning and Empowering (EAGLE), SSC Dean's Research Associate Program, etc.).
- Creating and/or leading an undergraduate or graduate BIPOC student organization on campus as a faculty/staff advisor/mentor.



## Appendix D. 2024 Annual Report Requirements

**December 1:** In consultation with the previous year's Annual Review Advisory Committee, the department Advisory Council revises and shares the rubrics for the year's review.

**December 15:** The department chair shares out a cover sheet and points faculty and academic specialists toward the department bylaws, Appendix C, for instructions regarding the completion of annual reports.

**January:** At the first department meeting of the semester, the department chair will provide an overview of the annual report cover sheet and information regarding how to engage the self-evaluation.

**January 31:** Each faculty member and academic specialist submits an annual report with a cover sheet on which the faculty member or academic specialist self-assesses their work for the prior calendar year in the context of their contract percentages using the rubric for the year's review on an exceeds/meets/doesn't meet expectations ranking. The faculty or academic specialist also indicates whether they wish their annual report to be reviewed by either the WRAC Admin Team or the WRAC Annual Review Committee.

**Early February:** The WRAC Admin Team meets to review the annual report materials of any faculty member or academic staff member who chooses WRAC Admin Team review. If WRAC Admin Team agrees with the self-assessment, the faculty member's or academic specialist's annual report is forwarded to the department chair. If they don't agree or have any concerns, the annual report is passed to the appropriate WRAC Annual Review Advisory Committee.

**Mid-February to End of March:** The appropriate WRAC Annual Review Advisory Subcommittee (see Bylaws section 4.1.1.2.) reads the annual reports of all faculty members and academic specialists who choose their review and any reports passed along by the WRAC Admin Team.

The appropriate Annual Review Advisory Committee reviews annual reports. Instead of assigning rankings, they mark whether they agree/disagree with the self-assessment. They forward each faculty member's or academic specialist's annual report to the chair, along with a brief summary of their review.

**Mid May–Mid July:** The department chair reviews all annual reports, determines a merit ranking for each faculty member or academic specialist, and writes an annual review letter for each faculty member or academic specialist.