

African Studies Program
Governance documents
August 2017

Preface

The 2015 internal review of the African Studies Program recommended several initiatives to “rejuvenate African Studies” after “the unprecedented loss of Title VI NRC funding.” The first was to “reinvigorate leadership and governance.” Noting that “few ASP governance documents currently exist,” the review report recommended that the new director “consult more regularly with faculty and revisit and disseminate a new set of governance documents.”

I set about the task of reviewing ASP governance documents, upon assuming the director position in July 2015. It was a challenge: the previous director had left no office files from the past eight years, either in paper or digital format, beyond the few files given to the administrative coordinator over the years. Those files were limited, too, because the previous administrative coordinator had not given many files to the current administrative coordinator. In July 2015, I had one governance document, regarding the selection of the director, and no information about the history of ASP governance deliberations.

In fall 2015, I met with the ASP executive committee and obtained their agreement to the formation of an ad hoc governance sub-committee that might use the Dar India Studies Program governance documents as a guide. After the meeting, I informed the ASP faculty about these plans. At that point, the previous ASP director sent the administrative coordinator several governance documents. I forwarded those materials to the executive committee. No one could shed any light on the process associated with creating and approving the governance documents. The executive committee nonetheless decided to delay work on new governance documents.

The ASP added new policy on Promotion and Reappointment of Senior Lecturers. The backdrop was the ASP lecturer promotion case of 2014-15: it had been denied, and in 2015-16 the Faculty Review Board took the appeal, noted significant procedural errors in the case, and recommended a new review. I supervised that review and discovered that existing ASP policy did not define a review process and had standards for promotion at odds with recommendations from the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. I drafted new policy and revised it based on executive committee recommendations. I then circulated the draft new policy in advance of an ASP faculty meeting devoted to its discussion. New policy was approved by unanimous vote on February 24, 2017.

Below are the governance documents that the administrative coordinator received from the previous director. I include, in green, the new policy, just after the section it revised, in red.

I have been drafting other new policies for deliberation and approval, and these may be added in 2017-18. My plan for 2018-19 is to conduct a wholesale review of ASP governance documents.

John H. Hanson

RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

(Clinical Faculty, Lecturers and Academic Specialists)

Faculty appointed to clinical, lecturer and academic specialist ranks in the African Studies Program (ASP) are expected to participate in Program activities relevant to the tasks assigned them. In return, the ASP is expected to provide the necessary resources for teaching and service responsibilities (for Clinical Faculty and Lecturers), and teaching and administrative responsibilities (for Academic Specialist faculty).

The ASP will solicit the input of non-tenure-track faculty (NTT) on any aspect of Program business; however, *they typically will not cast a vote in decisions regarding the hiring, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty.* However, non-tenure-track faculty on multi-year contract will be permitted to vote on hiring and promotion decisions concerning NTT faculty of their rank.

The teaching mission of the Program shall be within the purview of faculty on tenured or tenure-track lines as well as those on Non-Tenure lines. Thus, NTT faculty will play an important role in determining, how best to implement the teaching and service missions of the Program. However, major decisions concerning curriculum and the overall direction of the Program are responsibility of tenured and tenure-track faculty in consultation with the Director and the Executive Committee.

Each non-tenure-track faculty will be required to teach three courses each semester. In exceptional case (such as when the NTT faculty has an administrative responsibility such as language coordination, directing outreach, being an adviser for the undergraduate Certificate and Minor, etc.) the NTT faculty may teach two courses per semester with approval from the Dean. In all cases, teaching loads for NTT faculty will be consistent with prevailing national standards at peer research institutions.

The Research Mission of the Program shall be within the purview of faculty on tenured or tenure-track lines. However, even though NTT faculty members are not expected to perform research or creative activities, they are expected to keep up with research in their area of expertise and apply it in their teaching. The ASP will assist in ensuring the availability of an opportunity for intellectual development and growth in the NTT faculties' field.

The ASP will make available, a written set of grievance procedures for NTT faculty. Also to be made available to NTT faculty is access to procedures and mechanisms for grievance, appeal or review of administrative decisions after the NTT faculty's appointment.

Academic Specialist Appointments

Academic Specialist appointees have academic responsibilities but may not themselves offer courses for credit or act as principal investigators in research. Academic Specialist appointments include appointees designated as Academic Specialists, Research Associates and Post Doctoral Fellows. In the ASP, Academic Specialist appointees may teach a course, on Director's advisement, serve on Dissertation committees, and perform administrative responsibilities needed for the advancement of the Program.

Acting, Visiting, and Adjunct Appointments

Acting, Visiting, and Adjunct Appointments are non-probationary appointments. Visiting and Adjunct appointees may not have voting rights in ASP faculty governance. Their voting rights in faculty governance in the ASP, if deemed necessary, are subject to ASP regulation as determined by the Executive Committee.

CLINICAL RANK PROMOTION CRITERIA

Procedures for merit review and promotion in rank shall be the same for clinical rank faculty as for tenured and tenure-probationary faculty. Criteria for merit review and promotion in the areas of **teaching** and **service** shall be the same as those for tenured and tenure-probationary faculty.

*A research component is not expected for a clinical rank appointment.

I. Evidence of Teaching

Contributions in the teaching area may be substantiated by the following, as appropriate to the specific discipline:

- A list of specific courses taught and the enrollments listed by semester and academic year (including numbers and levels of applied students)
- Associate Instructor mentoring
- Independent study supervision and supervision of minor field candidates
- Registrars grade distribution during the period in status or as may be available
- Masters and/or Doctoral committees (advisory and research), including titles of dissertations or documents directed (with dates) (including membership in research committees at other institutions)
- Pedagogical refereed books
- Data-based pedagogical articles (up to 6 in rank) in refereed pedagogical journals
- Educational recordings and other materials (e.g. Vodcasts, Podcasts, CD ROMs, videos)
- Reviews of the materials as evidence of the national impact of the pedagogical contribution
- Certifications from recognized language pedagogy bodies or language examination bodies
- Evidence showing outstanding/excellent quality and quantity of teaching: student evaluations (summaries of teaching evaluations, transcriptions of student comments)
- Peer evaluations based on class or lesson observations
- Solicited student letters and juries testifying to faculty member's quality teaching, or activities of students
- Solicited letters from those whose teaching the faculty member supervised
- Evidence of course development: syllabi, descriptions of innovative approaches to instruction, special curriculum design, incorporation of new technologies
- Workshops, festivals and lectures, including peer evaluations of presentations and materials

- Grants for curriculum development
- Pedagogical awards and recognition
- Unsolicited comments from students and colleagues indicating the influence of the candidate's teaching
- Evidence of student achievement
- Evidence of national recognition as a pedagogue (based on materials such as publications and reviews, work with national educational institutions or committees, and student awards).
- For full professor, the candidate must have achieved a documented national reputation as a successful teacher
- Consistently high student evaluations

II. Evidence of Service Contributions in the service area may be substantiated by the following:

- A list of the candidate's service activities at each level: department, school, campus, community, profession
- Contributions to workshops, symposia, conferences, and other similar activities in candidates area
- Administrative contributions at IU (chairs of committees, departments, coordination of programs, or areas)
- Administrative contributions at the (inter)national level
- Reviews and publications (including pre-publication reviews) that are related to professional service
- Program notes and other service to the public
- Journal editing and refereeing
- Student advising and letters of recommendation for students
- Recommendations for faculty colleagues, including tenure reviews for faculty outside of the candidate's department (inside or outside Indiana University)
- Program committees for Pedagogical Associations
- Participation in professional organizations
- Administering exams, etc.
- Evaluation of the quality of the service activity by associates in the service activity

Evaluation for Teaching – To be rated *very good* in teaching the contribution of the candidate should have a significant educational impact not only within Indiana University but also outside the university at a more national/international level.

Evaluation for Service – To be rated *very good* in service, the contribution of the candidate should have a significant service impact not only within Indiana University but also outside the university at a more national/international level.

LECTURER RANK PROMOTION CRITERIA

[revised on February 24, 2017: see new policy below]

Criteria for merit review and promotion in the areas of **teaching** and **service** shall be the similar to those for tenure-probationary faculty.

*A research component is not expected for a clinical rank appointment.

I. Evidence of Teaching

Contributions in the teaching area may be substantiated by the following, as appropriate to the specific discipline:

- A list of specific courses taught and the enrollments listed by semester and academic year (including numbers and levels of applied students)
- Associate Instructor mentoring
- Independent study supervision and supervision of minor field candidates
- Registrars grade distribution during the period in status or as may be available
- Pedagogical refereed books (at least 1)
- Data-based pedagogical articles (up to 4 in rank) in refereed pedagogical journals
- Educational recordings and other materials (e.g. Podcasts, You-Tube Resources, CD ROMs, videos)
- Reviews of the materials as evidence of the national impact of the pedagogical contribution
- Evidence showing outstanding/excellent quality and quantity of teaching: student evaluations (summaries of teaching evaluations, transcriptions of student comments)
- Peer evaluations based on class or lesson observations
- Solicited student letters and juries testifying to faculty member's quality teaching, or activities of students
- Solicited letters from those whose teaching the faculty member supervised
- Evidence of course development: syllabi, descriptions of innovative approaches to instruction, special curriculum design, and incorporation of new technologies.
- Workshops, festivals and lectures, including peer evaluations of presentations and materials
- Grants for curriculum development
- Teaching awards and recognition

- Unsolicited comments from students and colleagues indicating the influence of the candidate's teaching
- Evidence of national recognition as a pedagogue (based on materials such as publications and reviews, work with national educational institutions or committees, and student awards).
- Consistently high student evaluations

II. Evidence of Service Contributions in the service area may be substantiated by the following:

- A list of the candidate's service activities at each level: department, school, campus, community, profession
- Contributions to workshops, symposia, conferences, and other similar activities in candidates area
- Administrative contributions at IU (Membership on committees, departments, coordination of programs, or areas)
- Administrative contributions at the (inter)national level
- Reviews and publications (including pre-publication reviews) that are related to professional service
- Program notes and other service to the public
- Journal refereeing
- Student advising and letters of recommendation for students
- Recommendations for faculty colleagues outside of the candidate's department (inside or outside Indiana University)
- Program committees for Pedagogical Associations
- Participation in professional organizations
- Administering exams, etc.
- Evaluation of the quality of the service activity by associates in the service activity

Evaluation for Teaching – To be rated *very good* in teaching the contribution of the candidate should have educational impact not only within Indiana University but also outside the university at the national level.

Evaluation for Service -- To be rated *very good* in service, the contribution of the candidate should have impact not only within Indiana University but also outside the university at the national level.

Policy on Promotion and Reappointment of Senior Lecturers [approved on February 24, 2017]

The African Studies Program (ASP) will follow Indiana University (IU) and School of Global and International Studies (SGIS) policies regarding promotion and reappointment of Non-Tenure Track faculty. Promotion to or reappointment as Senior Lecturer is contingent on demonstrating excellence in teaching and satisfactory contributions in service.

Excellence in teaching is defined by:

- Development of clear course syllabi
- Professional classroom management and constructive engagement with students
- Learning outcomes for students that are appropriate to university and national standards, such as ACTFL
- Enrollments in a range of language levels, especially beginning and intermediate levels
- Evidence of pedagogical innovation and improvement over time
- Development of high quality instructional materials
- Awards to the instructor for pedagogy and to the instructor's students for language learning
- Professional development, including participation in pedagogy workshops and/or conferences as well as professional certification of language instructional skills

Satisfactory service is defined by:

- Participation in committee work for the ASP and SGIS
- Participation in outreach activities as requested by the program's director or associate director.
- Participation in the academic programming and intellectual life of the ASP
- Provision of service to the profession or community

The procedure for conducting the promotion or reappointment review will conform to IU and SGIS policies. The ASP director will form an ad hoc Promotion Review Committee (PRC) or Reappointment Review Committee (RRC) to evaluate the candidate. The PRC or RRC will consist of five members: the ASP's African Languages Coordinator, a member of the ASP's Undergraduate Affairs Committee, two members of the ASP's affiliated faculty selected by the ASP's Executive Committee, and one additional member of the ASP's affiliated faculty selected by the ASP director; at least one member of the committee should be a Senior Lecturer, if possible. The PRC or RRC will evaluate all materials submitted by the candidate, hold a confidential vote on the question of promotion or reappointment and on the quality of teaching and service, and write a report that conveys the committee's evaluation and its confidential vote. The ASP director will review the applicant's materials and make a separate recommendation.

The candidate's dossier of materials for promotion or reappointment consideration should include:

- A personal statement of teaching philosophy that discusses the pedagogical approaches used by the candidate, reflects on teaching successes and challenges, describes the candidate's published work on teaching, describes curricular innovations, and discusses the evidence used evaluating for learning outcomes and teaching success
- A curriculum vitae
- Evidence of teaching leadership and recognition, such as competitive grants, awards, and certifications
- A list of all courses taught for the ASP and their enrollments
- Copies of all course syllabi as well as representative supplementary materials (assignments, examinations, grading rubrics, etc.)
- Evidence of the quantity and quality of classroom teaching (eg, list of enrollments in all courses taught for the ASP; summaries of standardized quantitative student course evaluations, including reports on the mandatory questions on the Online Course Questionnaire Copies and earlier BEST documentation; and evidence of student learning outcomes)
- Copies of peer and tenured faculty observations of teaching
- Solicited and unsolicited letters and emails from students, colleagues, and others regarding teaching
- Evidence of service activities

Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer will adhere to relevant IU and SGIS policies. In the event of non-reappointment or appointment termination of a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, the ASP will conform to relevant IU and SGIS policies.

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING PROGRAM DIRECTOR

The ultimate decision about Director selection is a prerogative of the College Dean. However, the Dean may seek faculty input in making his decision.

Internal Search

For internal search, the Executive Committee, based on instructions from the Dean's office:

- a) Calls for nominations
- b) Asks faculty to cast a ballot, and
- c) Submit/forward names(s) to the Dean to help him in his ultimate decision-making.

Factors taken into consideration by the Executive Committee in its deliberations include but are not limited to:

- a) Prospective candidates' grant-writing ability and/or experience;
- b) Administrative experience (in overseeing grant, ability to spend US Department of Education grant money appropriately and within its stated goals);
- c) Financial accounts supervision;
- d) International contacts;
- e) Collaborative ability (working with the established faculty clusters, and encouraging the emergence of new ones);
- f) Ability to foster the professional development of graduate students;
- g) Having editorial experience;
- h) Curriculum development experience;
- i) Ability to provide oversight of the African Languages;
- j) Ability to provide oversight of the Outreach Program
- k) Supporting the African Studies library; and
- l) Ability to serve on multiple boards and committees.

External Search

The criteria for external search is same as stipulated by Trustees of Indiana University and in compliance with federal laws on hiring. Important steps taken in the search process include:

- a) Getting authorization to hire from the College;
- b) Having a clear job description
- c) Advertisizing job in print and electronic media
- d) Establishing a search committee
- e) Interviewing candidates; and
- f) Submitting names to Dean for final decision.

STANDING COMMITTEES

The African Studies Program faculty are involved in Program planning and policy-making. The Executive Committee and 7 Standing Committees advise and make recommendations to the Director who reports to the College Dean.

The Executive Committee has 9 voting members composed of the seven Standing Committee chairs (appointed yearly) and 2 members elected annually by the faculty-at-large. Graduate students have an elected representative and the Director and Associate Director serve as *ex officio* members. Executive Committee members are selected to ensure that at least 1 professional school ASP affiliate serves on the committee.

The Standing Committees of the ASP include:

- (a) Academic Initiatives Committee;
- (b) Graduate Affairs Committee;
- (c) Undergraduate Affairs Committee;
- (d) Languages Committee;
- (e) Library Committee; and
- (f) Outreach Committee; and
- (g) Technology Committee.

Each Standing Committee has up to five members appointed by the committee chair in consultation with the director.

The Standing Committees reflect the disciplinary breadth of the Program.

AFRICAN STUDIES PROGRAM'S SALARY POLICY

The ASP's salary policy is based on the goals and principles stated below. The guiding factors are:

- (i) The primacy of rewarding merit,
- (ii) The consideration of a faculty member's overall contributions,
- (iii) The need to accommodate exceptional circumstances when considering teaching and service activities,
- (iv) The value of percentage based increments, and
- (v) Respect for a variety of individual circumstances.

In accordance with these considerations, the policy below is enacted.

A. SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS:

- a) A sub-committee composed of the Director and an Executive Committee member will conduct an annual review of each NTT faculty member.
- b) The sub-committee will evaluate individual merit in the areas of teaching and service.
- c) The Director will use the merit score (see appendix 1) to calculate a specific recommended salary increase for each individual faculty member.
- d) The Director reports to the faculty the nature and results of the review process.

B. INPUT FOR EVALUATION

The input for evaluation of merit includes the following elements:

- (1) The year-end Faculty Summary Report (as submitted to the Dean and Provost's Office);
- (2) A current curriculum vitae.
- (3) Additional materials may include:
 - A brief letter of self-evaluation which can include suggestions for re-evaluating specific work from prior years;
 - Any outside expert opinions the committee finds helpful.
 - Input from the Director; and
 - Past annual reports and evaluations that are still relevant;
 - Student and/or Peer teaching evaluations;

Faculty members are responsible for providing their Faculty Summary Report and curriculum vitae to the Director by January 13 of each year.

C. EVALUATION PROCESS

- i. The above-mentioned sub-committee performs the merit evaluation.
- ii. Note that no individual takes part in his/her own evaluation.
- iii. Two categories are evaluated separately: teaching, and service.

Evaluation of Teaching

With respect to teaching, the committee shall consider:

- a) Courses taught (The quality and load of teaching)
- b) Course enrollments
- c) Courses developed, and
- d) Pedagogical publications

Generally, it is assumed that all faculty members are doing their fair share of teaching, course development, and advising; the evaluation is therefore primarily concerned with significant deviations from the norm. See Appendix 1 for details.

Evaluation of Service

With respect to service, the committee considers:

- a) Quality and load of service (Program, College, University Service & Service to the profession)
- b) Level of service responsibility.

As with teaching, it is generally assumed that all faculty members are doing their fair share of service; the evaluation is therefore mainly concerned with major departures from the norm.

Although research-based or pedagogical publications are not required, they may be considered in the evaluation process

D. EVALUATION PROCESS

In each of the two areas, the faculty member's merit is ranked within several levels (See Appendix 1). The number of levels per area embodies a 10/10 relative weighting of the two areas.

The overall evaluation level for a single year is the simple sum of the two individual levels, which lies therefore in the range from zero to ten.

E. RECOMMENDED RAISE

All recommended raises are calculated based on the total increment money the Program receives from the College. This is how it works arithmetically:

- i. All recommended raises are calculated as a proportion of each faculty member's current base salary and his or her merit score.
- ii. In calculating a raise, the committee multiplies the merit score, the current base salary, and the current FTE to determine merit points per each faculty member.
- iii. Merit points are summed across the Program (core faculty), and the total monetary increment for each merit point is determined by dividing the total amount of funds allocated to the Program by the total merit points across the Program for salary increments.

F. COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS

After all individual evaluations are completed and before the Program's (Director's) budget conference, the Director reports to the faculty about:

1. The results of the evaluation
2. Averages (or overall distribution) for merit
3. Problems encountered, resolved, and not resolved
4. Any other abundantly important issues

F. APPROVAL OF THE POLICY

This salary policy must be approved by secret ballot by faculty whose FTE is in the ASP.

G. ENACTMENT OF THE POLICY

Once fully enacted, this policy remains in force unless revisions are required by a majority vote of the faculty members affected by the policy.

H: The Director's salary is set by the College Dean.

APPENDIX A.

SALARY-SETTING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR NTT FACULTY

The point system is used in setting salaries.

A. TEACHING

i.	Courses Taught	4
ii.	Course Enrollments	2
iii.	Courses Developed	2
iv.	<u>Pedagogical/Research Publications</u>	<u>2</u>
Total:		10 Points

B. SERVICE

i.	Program Service	5
ii.	College and University Service	3
iii.	<u>Service to the Profession & Community</u>	<u>2</u>
Total:		10 Points

Faculty salaries are set based on the total number of points they receive. A sub-committee is put in place to review each faculty profile. Faculty members' CVs are sought as are their Annual Faculty Summary Reports. These aid the committee in making informed decisions.