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I. All instructors with year-long appointments predominately located in the Writing Program are eligible to vote in the election of members of the Writing Program Personnel Committee, and to stand for election for the Personnel Committee provided they have year-long appointments predominately in the Writing Program during the year in which they would serve.

The Personnel Committee of the Writing Program, which is responsible for most reviews of writing instructors, reports its recommendations for reappointment, and, if appropriate, a merit increase in salary, to the Dean of Humanities. The Personnel Committee consists of:

(A) the Chair of the Writing Program;  
(B) all members of the Writing Program faculty who are Lecturers with Security of Employment;  
(C) three to four members at large elected each year by members of the Writing Program from among those writing faculty with more than six quarters of experience with the Writing Program, at least one of these having served six or more years and at least one fewer than six years, if personnel makes this feasible.

II. At intervals designated in section III below, the Personnel Committee will review writing instructors who are Non-Senate Faculty and who are eligible for reappointment or merit increase, including those eligible for a review to determine an initial Continuing Appointment. The Committee’s evaluation of the pre-six writing instructor’s performance shall address the instructor’s “competence in the field, ability in teaching, academic responsibility and other assigned duties that may include University co-curricular and community service” (MOU, Article 7a, Section C4[a3]). The Committee’s evaluation of an instructor to determine an Initial Continuing Appointment shall address the instructor’s “demonstrated excellence in the field and in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service” (MOU, Article 7b, Section D).

The Chair will assign two members of the Personnel Committee to review the instructor’s file, visit one or more class sessions, and report back to the Personnel Committee. Recommendations made to the Dean of Humanities concerning reappointment shall reflect the decision of the committee as a whole (votes shall be reported), as shall recommendations for merit increases for Continuing Appointments, and salary increases greater than the standard increases recommended in the MOU.

Subcommittees reviewing faculty for an Initial Continuing Appointment shall be chaired by a Lecturer with Security of Employment; the second member may be another Lecturer with Security of Employment or an instructor with a Continuing Appointment. Should the membership of the Personnel Committee
in a given year contain fewer such faculty than are needed for timely review of instructors up for an initial Continuing Appointment, the Chair shall appoint subcommittee members from among the Writing Program instructors with Continuing Appointments.

A writing instructor’s file will include the following materials, all submitted by the instructor except where noted below:

(A) all relevant student evaluations for Writing Program classes, submitted by the Writing Program;
(B) all relevant student evaluations for Writing Program-funded sections of college Core classes;
(C) course descriptions, materials, and syllabi;
(D) a letter from the writing instructor to the committee that helps demonstrate his/her teaching practices and currency in the field:
   • In an instructor’s first review, the letter should include a description of the instructor’s approach to commenting on student work;
   • In an instructor’s third-year review, review for initial Continuing Appointment, and subsequent reviews, the letter should describe the instructor’s teaching goals, innovations, or new projects, and contain whatever information and explanations the writing instructor would like the committee to have as it conducts its evaluation;
(E) the instructor’s narrative evaluations of the students in one class;
(F) current biobibliography;
(G) when required by campus procedure or deemed necessary by the Personnel Committee, letters solicited by the Writing Program from individuals such as former and current students and course assistants, fellow teachers, college provosts, and others conversant with the instructor’s work;
(H) material relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties other than course work.

A writing instructor may include letters solicited from anyone familiar with some aspect of his/her work, and will be given the opportunity to provide the names of people who may not be able to review his or her work objectively. The instructor may also include materials (e.g., writing or research) relevant to his/her work in the Writing Program and/or demonstrating currency in the field, and may include descriptions of service insofar as such descriptions affect or reflect on the instructor’s work for the Writing Program. Such materials are not required for reappointment.

In addition to the file, the Personnel Committee shall consider:

(I) a report on the class visit(s);
(J) the writing instructor’s performance of any assigned administrative or committee or college responsibilities.
In alternate merit reviews starting with the first after the initial Continuing Appointment (i.e., in the second year after the initial Continuing Appointment), instructors may submit a short file, with item (G) optional.

III. The Committee's reviews will take place:

(A) In the second or third quarter of a lecturer's teaching for the Writing Program. As a result of this review, the Committee may recommend reappointment.

(B) In the seventh, eighth, or ninth quarter (the third year) of teaching for the Writing Program. The Committee may recommend reappointment. A two-step salary increase is automatic in the tenth quarter of teaching. A recommendation for a larger, exceptional, salary increase may accompany a recommendation for reappointment, with proper justification.

(C) In the academic year during which the lecturer's eighteenth quarter of teaching for the Writing Program falls, provided that a determination of instructional need has been made. Need must be assessed no later than one calendar year prior to the lecturer's eighteenth quarter of service in the Writing Program. A determination of excellence and approval of a Continuing Appointment will be accompanied by the larger of a two-step merit increase or an increase up to the minimum salary for a Continuing Appointment.

(D) In the second year following the initial Continuing Appointment and every three years thereafter. If the standard of excellence continues to be met, the Committee will recommend an appropriate merit increase of at least two steps. Merits may be accelerated, if justified; merit reviews may be deferred, at the request of the instructor, for up to one year. If the Committee finds cause to recommend against a Continuing Appointment, notice and appeal procedures in the Non-Senate Instructional Unit contract will apply.

Any reappointment of a lecturer in the first six years that does not fall within one of the review occasions detailed above will be determined by decision of the Writing Program Chair.

IV. When a writing instructor with SOE is to be considered for a merit increase or promotion, Academic Senate members of the Personnel Committee will constitute the ad hoc committee if the SOE Lecturers number at least four. Senior SOE Lecturers delegate authority for their reviews to SOE Lecturers, in accordance with APM By-Law 55. If SOE Lecturers in the Writing Program number fewer than four, the following procedure shall govern the creation of a separate By-Law 55 faculty review committee: The SOE Lecturers shall suggest to the Dean of Humanities names of By-Law 55 faculty to serve on a review committee. The Dean shall request service by these By-Law 55 faculty, and prepare a letter to CAP and the Campus Provost/EVC recommending the establishment of a review committee, who then approve the committee.