

Introduction

Since arriving at Texas Woman's University in July 2011, I have navigated the First-Year Composition (FYC) program through a series of transformations, including nine major changes in one 18-month period. We have adopted a new book, revamped the writing curriculum, transformed the program's approach to assessment, empowered writing faculty (adjunct and graduate teaching assistant) input by creating four committees, created an annual electronic reader featuring student work, brought back and revised a developmental writing class, created a new non-course based option (NCBO), expanded online offerings, experimented with hybrid courses, developed new ways to recognize outstanding writing faculty, adapted to new state placement criteria (twice), shifted from occasional workshops to a schedule of monthly faculty meetings featuring presentations by program faculty, and more. Some changes evolved from within; some responded to new state policies and mandates. Other changes responded to rapid growth: In the past five years, on-campus FYC enrollment has climbed more than 40%, dual-enrollment offerings have quadrupled, and the number of adjunct faculty teaching composition has roughly doubled. Although the details of these changes will not be addressed until my third subsection, on Service, they had an unavoidable and significant influence on every aspect of my work.

TWU's supportive community has recognized my efforts in multiple ways. In Spring 2015, I was one of two TWU faculty to receive the Mary Mason Lyon Award for outstanding junior faculty (Appendix A). The award, started in 1985 and not issued every year, honors junior faculty who demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, and service. It has only gone to one other English faculty member previously (Dr. Guy Litton in 2000). The English department chair and department's Peer Review Committee have rated me "Outstanding" (the top rating) for teaching, research, and service every year since my arrival, while at the dean's level I received "Excellents" every year except in 2015, when I received an "Outstanding." Finally, my involvement in university assessment has been rewarded with a steady increase in responsibilities. Active participation on the Undergraduate Council Assessment Committee during the critical 2013 year led to my chairing that committee from 2014 to present. That led to two faculty fellow appointments in assessment as we transitioned to a new core curriculum. In May 2016, I accepted a new role as TWU's assistant director of academic assessment, an appointment that replaces my role as director of the university's writing program.

In the following sections, I hope to justify the above recognitions.

Teaching

Table 1. Teaching Workload & Evaluation Summary

Term	Classes Taught	FYC Course Release	Other Course Release	New Course Preps	Course Conversions	FYC Course Designs	Student Evaluations (Overall Teaching)	Student Evaluations (Learning Progress)
Fall 2011	2 ^a	2	0	2	0	0	4.4	4.1
Spring 2012	1	2 ^b	1 ^c	1	0	0	4.0	3.8
Summer 2012	n/a	1	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
Fall 2012	2	2	0	1	0	3	4.7	4.9
Spring 2013	2	2 ^b	0	2 ^e	1 (online)	3 (hybrid versions)	4.8	4.5
Summer 2013	n/a	1	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
Fall 2013	1	2	1 ^c	0	0	0	4.5	4.6
Spring 2014	3	1	0	2	1 (hybrid)	0	4.8	4.5
Summer 2014	n/a	1	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
Fall 2014	2	2	0	0	0	1 (NCBO)	4.3	4.4
Spring 2015	1	2	1 ^d	1 ^e	0	0	5.0 ^f	5.0 ^f
Summer 2015	n/a	1	1 ^d	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
Fall 2015	2	2	0	1 ^e	0	0	4.7	4.7
Spring 2016	1	2	1 ^d	1	0	0	Not available	Not available
Summer 2016	1	0	2 ^d	1	0	0	Not available	Not available

^a Plus one independent study, added in the middle of the term to resolve a problem in one of the FYC classes.

^b Under the terms of my initial appointment, my WPA course release in spring was 1 class. That is why Spring 2014 only has one release. However, given the many changes, mandates, and program revision needs between Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, I received an additional course release in Spring 2012 and again in Spring 2013. The 2-course release for Spring was formalized as an ongoing feature starting in Spring 2015.

^c Course release for research purposes.

^d Course release for university assessment. The first three were faculty fellow roles. The fourth is a new half-time staff position.

^e Includes, in each case, one new seminar or class that was cancelled either due to under-enrollment or when the department badly needed me to teach something else.

^f With 15 student responses.

Table 1 above offers an overview of my teaching and writing-program workload. For each term, it reports the number of new-class preparations, course designs for the FYC program I managed, and conversions to new formats like hybrid and online. It also presents term averages for two student evaluation variables (corresponding to columns A and B in Appendix B: Teaching Evaluations). In each case, the evaluations represent raw data on 5-point Likert scales, with 5 being best.

Teaching Criteria

Below, I address, in turn, each of the departmental and university teaching criteria for tenure.

1. *Demonstrate excellence in all aspects of teaching, both undergraduate and graduate levels, as the curriculum allows.* (In covering this criterion, I am also addressing the university criterion *Demonstrate excellence in all aspects of teaching.*)

Since I started receiving teaching evaluations in 2012, I have consistently received “Outstanding” ratings for teaching from my department chair and Peer Review Committee, each of which has cited the large number of graduate student committees I have served on, the range of new classes I have prepped, my revisions of classes, and my innovations in teaching (for an example that also earned specific mention from the dean in 2015, see Appendix C: Learning Outcome Validations). As my department chair notes in her 2013 review, I have taken pains to teach a wide range of courses and formats within the program that I supervised, including face-to-face, hybrid, and online courses, in order to better understand the challenges facing our faculty. As table 1 shows, my evaluations range from excellent (4.0) to outstanding (5.0), and my comments for many of those classes have been, per the department chair, “glowing.”

2. *Accept multiple preparations and large classes, if necessary, to meet departmental needs.*

Including courses developed for the FYC program and two revisions of my own courses for new hybrid or online formats, I have developed 18 undergraduate and graduate courses over the past five years. I have taught 11 of those courses and course conversions, and I have taught three of those more than once, as shown in Appendix D: Courses Developed for Personal Use. Only one class have I taught more than twice using the same delivery method: a Fall graduate seminar on teaching composition (ENG 5343). The only term in which I taught more than one section of the same course was Fall 2015, when unusually high demand prompted the department to open up an additional section of ENG 5343. The totals reported in the previous sentences do not include three proposed classes—a doctoral seminar on assessment, a doctoral seminar on Milton, and an online, team-taught professional writing course that I had been building with Dr. Dundee Lackey – that were cancelled due to department needs or low enrollment, though I did develop preparatory materials for those as well.

3. *Engage in curriculum development as needed, course enhancement/modifications, and/or ongoing program evaluations.*

Program reviews. As a member of the Graduate Studies Committee, I was one of four contributors to the February 2014 program review for the department’s master’s program.

Curriculum development. With many other members of the department, I also contributed to the department’s 2014 redesign of the bachelor’s program, working with colleagues to identify a suite of core courses for the major and three tracks for students to choose among: rhetoric and writing, literature, and teaching. As part of this effort, I worked within small teams of colleagues to build course proposals and outcomes for the following

new classes: Introduction to English Studies (ENG 3113), Senior Capstone in English (ENG 4983), Topics in Writing and Rhetoric (ENG 4473), Digital Rhetoric (ENG 4903), Methods of Teaching English (ENG 4903), and Advanced Expository Writing (ENG 4903). In addition, as a member of the Graduate Studies Committee that same year, I helped develop a proposal for an Introduction to Graduate Studies graduate seminar (now ENG 5103, starting this Fall), and, drawing on input from the committee, I created and distributed a PsychData survey of graduate students that helped the department see how much support there was for several proposed program changes, including the addition of the required Introduction to Graduate Studies course and changes to ways that we handle our third exam areas for doctoral students.

Revisions of departmental outcomes. In Academic Year 2014-2015, as the only member in common between our undergraduate and graduate assessment committees, I led an overhaul of the departmental criteria for the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs and our department's assessment rubric for evaluating those criteria. We used those revised criteria in last academic year's assessments.

4. *Advise and mentor students effectively and foster scholarly development of students.*

It is routine at this point to say that one's teaching, service, and scholarship all inform one another. For writing program administrators, pointing out that interrelationship borders on redundancy. Our research centers on the programs that we manage, which in turn involve service to the university's teaching mission. Although I routinely advise, mentor, and coach graduate students in my role as writing program administrator, and even talk to students at all levels about career options (as some note in evaluation comments), I have decided to discuss those details under Service because in those cases the mentorship is more often professional than scholarly.

I do, however, engage in scholarly mentoring, typically within class contexts, where I often try to find ways for students to apply their work toward outside-of-class accomplishments. For example, students in my online graduate seminar on the rhetoric and composition of electronic texts in 2013 created a textbook for undergraduates: *Composing in Digital Environments*. Students who took the course a year later revised the book, transforming it into a Web site (see Appendix E for a screen shot). A pair of student editors on the project, Ginger Hughes and Erika Johnson, presented their work at the Trends in College Composition Conference at Collin College in October 2013. Graduate students in my seminar on composition pedagogy have in the past year submitted two team-written papers for publication, one to *WPA: Writing Program Administration* (being revised)

and the other to *College Composition and Communication* (rejected and being revised for submission elsewhere). Other students have published YouTube videos (example: <http://bit.ly/2aLQqez>).

I also find I can encourage student scholarship by sharing examples of other student successes, particularly publications. For example, by the time I arrived at TWU, I had helped 11 former composition students get published in two editions of *Sticks & Stones and Other Student Essays*, an official supplement to the *St. Martin's Guide to Writing*. (Each edition has 37 essays, total, from a national pool of submissions.) When the First-Year Composition program at TWU adopted the same textbook, I started an annual essay contest, with writing faculty judges selecting the best examples of each genre that we taught for inclusion in our now-annual essay reader. Students in our program read and discuss exemplary essays that they know are from other students at the same university. Our program assessments suggest that students who are assigned to read students writers, as well as writers of similar ethnicity or sex, may improve more than those who read professionals, $r(506)=0.08$, $p<.05$. Additionally, two of our internally-published essays have appeared now in the most recent edition of *Sticks & Stones*, competing with a national audience. One third of the entries in that book are now from students I have taught or students from the composition program that I managed.

5. *Attain outstanding or excellent student evaluations.* (In covering this criterion, I am also covering the university criterion *Participate effectively in course development and evaluations.*)

My worst-reviewed class was the Spring 2012 iteration of ENG 5353: Rhetoric & Composition of Electronic Texts, a course outside my specialization and eventually handed off to Dr. Lackey, who does specialize in such things. I have since taught the material twice more, in two other formats: online, then hybrid. As I revised the course and strengthened my familiarity with the material, my ratings improved, with overall teaching effectiveness ratings climbing from 4.0 in Spring 2012 to 5.0 in Spring 2014.

My numeric evaluations, listed on table 1, average a 4.6 on a 5-point scale (once weighted for number of sections taught). In some classes, the ratings have reached as high as 5.0. Comments (see Appendix B and the flash drive) consistently identify class activity design, the rigor of class demands, my enthusiasm for subject matter, and feedback as strengths. Because I often experiment with approaches that are new to students, the most common criticism is that students sometimes become confused by unfamiliar class features (like the objective-based grading). Although I aggressively anticipate such confusion during the term, contacting students personally

when they miss deadlines or objectives and providing an anonymous Blackboard forum where students may ask questions, a minority of students wait until formal evaluations to express concerns. I then take their concerns into consideration as I revise my classes, as documented in Appendix F: Revisions of ENG 5343.

6. *Obtain and maintain membership on the Graduate Faculty at the level of Associate Graduate Faculty status or higher.* (In covering this criterion, I am addressing an identical university-level requirement.)

I have Full Graduate Faculty status. See Appendix G.

7. *Serve on graduate student advisory and/or research committees.*

I have served on dissertation committees for six students who have completed their PhDs and serve presently on committees for another four. Additionally, I have served on thesis committees for two MA students who have completed and an equal number of professional paper committees, also completed. I am on two other thesis committees for students in progress. I have served on advisory committees for two students and exam committees for thirteen doctoral students, ten of whom have completed exams. The students are listed and named in my CV. My usual role on a research committee is to help students with methods, as exhibited in Appendix H: Dissertation Draft Feedback. I have not yet chaired a committee, but I look forward to doing so.

8. *Engage in professional development designed to improve teaching, such as conferences or workshops.*

In Summer 2014, I completed phase 1 (of 2) of the university's Quality Matters training, but held off on completing phase 2 due to competing demands for time. This summer, I taught an online British Literature class for which I intend in Fall to pursue QM certification, which will complete the second phase. That same summer, I completed a three-day course on assessment at Alverno College, which has been a leader in faculty-driven assessment since the 1970s, and that course has had a tremendous influence on all of my teaching, particularly in its contribution to my learning-outcomes validation approach (see my answer to item 1 in this section).

Finally, while running FYC, I routinely recruited writing program faculty to give workshops, often based on exemplary work I witnessed during classroom observations. My favorite example comes from Cheri Edwards, then a new GTA. In the class that I observed, Ms. Edwards had students write reflective statements after finishing their paper – not an unusual move. She then had students read their reflections aloud, which I have also seen before. What I had never seen before, however, was an instructor give an entire class period over to the exercise, with *everyone* reading their reflections. Most faculty feel too pressed for time; other lessons beckon. But Ms.

Edwards' students began to recognize patterns in the reflective statements – similarities in experiences, struggles, fears, triumphs. Students later in the sequence embellished their statements, sometimes on the fly, to connect them to what others had said. By the time she was done, there were epiphanies, backed by a sense that everyone had learned the same lessons. I asked her to share what she did with the other faculty in a workshop, and she did.

9. *Establish collegial, and often interdisciplinary, relationships to strengthen teaching. Actively support the academic endeavors of the department.*

In Fall 2012, I worked with faculty from History & Government and staff in Student Life to put together a Presidential Debate Watch event that attracted more than 250 students on one night and nearly 200 on a second. For the event, I recruited a half dozen faculty to participate in a live “Twitter panel” with our exchanges (under the #twudebate hashtag) and student remarks projected onto the wall of the hall alongside a projection of the debate as it unfolded. I acted as moderator and managed the projection. I hope to repeat the debate watch this Fall.

In response to invitations, I have visited Dundee Lackey's professional writing class to talk about interviewing strategies, guest lectured about Shakespearean authorship in Phyllis Bridges' Shakespeare seminar, judged class debates among three composition classes, provided a workshop on the teaching of writing for students in the College of Professional Education, and presented a talk on plagiarism for English faculty at University of Texas, Arlington (all documented in my CV). I have, in turn, asked other faculty for aid, inviting graduate student Jamie Jones to talk to my seminar about queer studies in composition and bringing drama professor Steven Young to my Shakespeare course to discuss his direction of a Spring 2015 production of *Henry V*, which featured a woman in the lead role. I then took my entire class to the performance (which was excellent).

Scholarship

Table 2. Overview of Scholarly Activities

Year	Peer-Reviewed Articles	Editor-Reviewed Academic Articles	Textbooks	Grant Applications (internal, external)	Scholarly Presentations	Assessment Reports	Weights
2005-2010	2	1	2 chapters, 1 instructor's manual	1,0	3	0	44 pgs peer-reviewed 21 pgs editor-reviewed 393 pgs textbook 1 semester course-release funded
2011	0	0	1 instructor's manual	1,0	0	0	140 pgs textbook
2012	0	0	4 chapters	0,0	1	0	216 pgs textbook

Year	Peer-Reviewed Articles	Editor-Reviewed Academic Articles	Textbooks	Grant Applications (internal, external)	Scholarly Presentations	Assessment Reports	Weights
2013	0	0	0	2, 1	1	1	10 pgs assessment
2014	1	0	0	1,0	0	1	14 pgs peer-reviewed 5 pgs assessment \$750 internal grant funded
2015	2	0	0	1, 2	3	1	51 pgs peer-reviewed 7 pgs assessment \$708 internal grant funded \$1,750 external grant funded
2016	0	1	1 chapter	0,0	1	1	3 pgs editor-reviewed 53 pgs textbook 37 pgs assessment

Since 2006, I have published 47,376 words of peer-reviewed articles, with another 12,267 words submitted (one article under revision; another awaiting reply); another 5,662 words reviewed editorially by academics and published for academic readers; 294 pages across six chapters and three editions of the *St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, one of the most-used and most-imitated textbooks in composition; 533 pages of instructor manual text for faculty using the *Guide*; and 59 pages of assessment reports. In these totals, I have deliberately omitted subsequent editions of textbooks and manuals even if they include my previous work and feature my name on the cover, and I have omitted republication of my paper "The 36% Problem" in a later print edition of the journal *Interchange* in 2016. The textbook work I have chosen to highlight in the table represents significant investments of time and energy, particularly for any text related to the 9th edition of the *St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, which saw a major overhaul of the textbook. Many of these materials can be found in the flash drives I have included in this portfolio and in an open Google Drive at <http://bit.ly/2apXHnU>. A letter from Rise Axelrod, lead author of the *St. Martin's Guide*, is included as Appendix I, describing my contributions to the textbook and noting our plans to develop a new textbook. Based on the work enumerated above, I believe I meet the scholarship criteria for tenure at TWU. Below, I address each of the scholarship criteria in turn.

1. *Demonstrate excellence in research and creative activities.* (Identical to one of the three university requirements.)

My scholarly work was rated **excellent** by my department chair in 2012 and has been rated **outstanding** by her every other year. During the Peer Review Committee's review of my work in 2013, it also rated my scholarly work **outstanding**, remarking that "he is rapidly establishing a professional identity tied to the issues of

general education and assessment” and arguing that my focus on collaboration in the writing of articles and grant applications is “entirely appropriate” and “common, even admirable, in the field of rhetoric and composition.” My work on the impact of academic integrity on assessment gains (see “The 36% Problem”) has led to an invited talk before the English department at the University of Texas at Arlington. My paper on Shakespeare attribution, “Signifying Nothing,” has been cited in works from Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells’ *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy* (Cambridge UP, 2013) to Joseph Rudman’s 2016 article in the *Journal of Early Modern Studies* and MacDonald P. Jackson’s 2007 article in *EMLS*. My work with Jennifer Danley-Scott on the role of adjuncts in assessment has been cited in books like *Working in Class: Recognizing How Social Class Shapes Our Academic Work* by Allison L. Hurst and Sandi Kawecka Nenga (Rowman & Littlefield, 2016). My article in *Intersection* on unrealistic expectations for rater reliabilities in assessment work earned me a near-immediate invitation to join *Intersection*’s editorial board, for which I have been doing work since Spring.

2. *Progress toward attainment of professional recognition as a scholar by presenting research in local, state, regional, national and/or international professional conferences; leading workshops or panels at such conferences also demonstrates scholarship.*

My CV documents my presentations at conferences from the national scale (CWPA, Student Success in Writing Conference, Eaton) to the regional (C5) and local (TWU Regional Supplemental Instruction). Future presentations are likely to focus increasingly on core curriculum assessment, as the last two have.

3. *Submit applications for internal or external grants. Related to university requirement to Seek internal or external funding, as appropriate to the field.*

As table 2 notes, I have applied for five internal grants since 2011, two of which have been granted (totaling \$1,458) and three external grants, one of which has been granted (for \$1,750, from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). The three grants have funded work on two ongoing collaborative research projects, one with Jennifer Danley-Scott on the role of adjunct faculty in academic assessment and the other with Jamie Jones on the mitigation of stereotype threat in writing students. The data we have collected from both projects has armed us not only for possible publications but also for larger grant applications. In particular, I might steer at least one of the collaborations toward another attempt at a Spencer Foundation education grant, having learned from the 2013 (\$49,955) effort and having expanded my potential assessment base from composition students to all students in the core curriculum.

4. *Develop a program of scholarship/scholarly inquiry.* Related to university requirement to *Share the results of the scholarly work in peer reviewed forums.*

Readers can get a sense of my productivity from table 2, the paragraph below it, and my CV. They can look over many of my publications in the flash drives or the public folder I created (see link earlier). What is missing from those details are a sense of the larger research agenda that I am pursuing and a sense of the ways that my actions as FYC director contribute to that agenda, even if they are not reflected in the table. In truth, my agenda has experienced three stages of evolution since my arrival at TWU. These stages are described in detail in Appendix J: An Evolving Research Agenda, but the abridged version is that my interest in empirical studies in composition was shouldered aside by research I needed to do to support the FYC program, which in turn led to a focus on assessment that has characterized my past few years at TWU.

My assessment-related research agenda, though it has several threads, is unified in a common goal: I am interested in identifying confounds to assessment that can throw off interpretations of collected data. For instance:

- Stereotype threat triggers in assessment materials may lead to apparent deficiencies that have nothing to do with the quality of instruction. (A detailed explanation of this work appears in Appendix J.)
- Failure to include contingent faculty – who teach the lion’s share of general education classes – in the planning, analysis, and interpretation of assessments may result in misinformed interpretations of the resulting data. (See my studies with Jennifer Danley-Scott on this subject.)
- Both students who fail to learn and students who cheat have been studied, profiled, and analyzed – but almost always, those populations have been studied separately. There are good reasons to imagine that students described as “academically adrift” may not be engaging honestly in the learning process, and thus may be failing to learn. However, because cheating studies do not look at learning impacts and learning studies do not gauge academic integrity, this possibility remains under-explored. (See my article “The 36% Problem” for more on this subject.)
- In both FYC and TWU core assessments, a clear pattern has emerged in the differences between Fall and Spring data – students do not do as well and do not improve as much in Spring term. Assessments that fail to account for term effects – what I call the “Fall Forward, Spring Back Effect” – may arrive at erroneous conclusions.

I refer to the threads above as my “suicide by assessment” agenda, in that programs that fail to consider such possibilities might be forced by the assessment process, which requires proposed changes, to make bad changes. My intent is that at some point these threads will braid into a collection sufficient for a book.

Throughout all three stages of my research agenda, I have continued working for Bedford/St. Martin’s on textbook materials, in large part because that is the textbook that our program has been using, and I felt it was important to retain a say in its content. However, my past textbook work and my ongoing “Suicide by Assessment” agenda may now be converging. Rise Axelrod, Wallace T. Cleaves, and I just this summer started exploring the creation of a *St. Martin’s Guide* spin-off textbook that would draw on my knowledge of assessment and the Carol Sager model that I described in a TEDx talk in March 2016 (<http://bit.ly/2b1TR58>). We plan to create a proposal for Bedford/St. Martin’s this Fall.

Service

Academic Year	FYC Faculty Committees (Creator & Advisor)	Dept. Committees (including searches)	Univ. Councils & Committees	Univ. Fellow Positions	Workshops & Conferences Attended on Behalf of Univ.	Workshops Presented	Service to Community (# of Activities)	Service to Profession (# of activities)
2011	1	5*	0	0	0	2	1	0
2012	1	4*	2	0	0	3	1	1
2013	2	4*	3	0	2	2	1	1
2014	2	5**	4*	1	0	13	1	0
2015	3	6**	5*	1	0	12	1	1

* For every asterisk in a cell, I held a chair role on one of the committees. Table does not include student research or exam committees, which are covered in the Teaching section.

1. *Provide active participation in service to department, college, university, profession, and/or community.*

“This year has proven to be far more service intensive than either Dr. Scott or I imagined,” begins the Service section of my 2012 APR evaluation by department chair Dr. Genevieve West. “It is clear that Dr. Scott has engaged in significant, impactful and visible service at the department and university levels, and he’s taken on far more than the average new faculty member.” Dr. West’s evaluation alludes to changes and challenges within the FYC program that I have described in Appendix J: An Evolving Research Agenda and in my APR statements for 2013 and 2014, including state-mandated changes to university core curricula, core assessment, and placement of first-year students in developmental courses. (I am eternally grateful that Dr. West not only noted in the evaluation that I would need additional release time and obtained it for me, but that the following year, she

assigned a new hire, Dr. Gretchen Busl, to help part-time as assistant director of the writing program, a new position.) The following year, the Peer Review Committee wrote that my service activities “are almost too many to mention here, a sign that his service activities are herculean, and by all accounts, he does them very well indeed.” In every year since my arrival, the department chair has rated my Service work **outstanding** and the dean’s evaluations – when they make a formal designation – have concurred. My service activities have gone well beyond running the First-Year Composition program. As the subsections below will show, I have been an active and enthusiastic participant in service at all levels.

2. *Support departmental activities and organizations.*

My work running the writing program has, as noted above, required carrying out a number of both internally desired and state-mandated changes and challenges, some described in Appendix J. Appendix K lists a series of additional challenges that I had to navigate while running the FYC program—challenges not listed elsewhere in this document.

In addition to running the department’s writing program, I have spoken twice at Professor’s Corner (2011, 2016), a series of talks produced by our department’s Dr. Stephen Souris and have attended talks by two other department members. I have addressed the Write Site staff, on invitation of the center’s director, Dr. Jennifer Phillips-Denny, multiple times a year over the past three years. I am one of several regular contributors to the department’s Facebook page, led by Dr. Dundee Lackey and regularly contribute material to our Blackboard site for English majors. As one of my APR reviews by Dr. West notes, my contributions to the Facebook and Blackboard sites involve information about jobs: job announcements, possible professions to explore, job projections from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and so forth. I often communicate with our university’s Career Services office to get leads on opportunities for our majors. Finally, I am a regular participant in the department’s honors and awards ceremonies each April.

3. *Serve as a mentor to students/student organizations.*

In addition to running the First-Year Composition program, a role that inherently involves mentoring graduate teaching assistants (typically around a dozen each term) in their roles as teachers, I have broadened opportunities for graduate-student and adjunct service within the writing program by creating several multiple committees. Although one graduate-student committee, a book-selection team, was temporary, the others have

become fixed: an assessment committee, in charge of selecting readings for use in our assessments and revising our assessment instruments as needed; an essay contest committee, in charge of the student essay contest described under item 4 in the Teaching section; and a scheduling committee, in which senior GTAs gain experience matching teacher's schedule preferences with the program's classes for upcoming terms. In the latter case, students create the first draft of the teaching assignments for the term and then have a front-row seat as the draft undergoes the inevitable changes as adjuncts contact us to say they have a full-time job elsewhere (a happy disruption) and news trickles in about unexpected developments in enrollment. Each of these committees has been my creation, though I have mentored them jointly with the assistant director since her arrival.

4. *Contribute positively to the mission of the department, college, and university.*

At the university level, in addition to serving on Strategic Planning and Book-in-Common activities, and in addition to serving as a faculty fellow in both Undergraduate Studies and Academic Assessment, I have belonged to the Undergraduate Council since Fall 2012, where I have played multiple critical roles:

- During the mandated revision of our university's core curriculum, I worked with the assessment committee to create the council's proposal for which courses should be part of the core and how they should be assessed. My contributions in this area were significant enough that in Fall 2014 I was made the committee's chair, a position which I continue to hold today.
- Since Fall 2014, I have also been a member of the Council's Executive Committee.
- In Spring 2014, I also was the only faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences to join a four-person ad-hoc bylaw committee charged with revising the Council's bylaws, a critical operation with lasting impacts. Due to new changes in the core curriculum, the very process by which members were appointed to the council would have to change. The final proposal, a synthesis of several ideas within the committee, was my own. I drafted the bylaw amendment, edited it with other committee members, and presented it for a vote to the Council, where it was accepted.
- Appendix L: Letter from Karen Petty, written by the chair of Undergraduate Council, attests to my contributions to the Council as of Spring 2014—before I chaired the assessment committee.

At the college level, I worked in Fall 2012 with the History & Government departments and the College of Arts and Sciences to create a Debate Watch event, and as noted in the third bullet above, I represented the

College in the revision of bylaws for Undergraduate Council. At the department level, I have contributed through participation in several search committees and by taking a leadership role in departmental assessment.

5. *Participate actively in recruitment, advising, and mentoring of students.*

As noted in part 4 of the Teaching section and part 3 of the Service section, I have been an active mentor to students, particularly at the graduate level, even to the point of actively collaborating with graduate students on articles and grant applications. In 2013, I also served as a faculty sponsor of undergraduate Erin Russell's microgrant application (sadly unfunded).

6. *Establish collegial, and often interdisciplinary, relationships to strengthen professional service.*

This narrative has elsewhere detailed my interdisciplinary work, particularly at university levels. However, I would like to describe some steps I took to maintain morale during a period of massive change, particularly the period from Fall 2012 through Spring 2014, though I have continued each of these practices.

First, I broadened our Fall awards program. Previously, it had only recognized one outstanding GTA each year (through the J. Dean Bishop Excellence in Teaching Award). I added an annual recognition of excellent adjunct faculty, as well as what I called "intersectional teaching honors." The idea behind the latter started with the observation that it is unusual to earn high teaching evaluations while also maintaining tough grades, yet some faculty manage to do it. Similarly, some faculty earn higher-than-average assessment gains while also earning high teaching evaluations. So I started making note of faculty who manage to accomplish any two of these three feats: 1) higher-than-average teaching evaluations, 2) above-average gains in assessments, 3) tougher-than-average grade distributions. Since Fall 2014, each year I have recognized faculty who meet any two of those conditions, with each intersection having its own named "club": the Tightrope teachers (high evaluations, tough grades), the True Grit teachers (tough grades, high assessment gains), and Lifelong Learning teachers (high evaluations, high assessment gains). Those who manage all three feats – typically only one or two faculty a year – I name to the Sweepstakes club. Consistently, the "clubs" have recognized teachers whose teaching observations have also been outstanding, suggesting some validity to the approach.

Second, several times a term, I would "gnome" a teacher in the program, decorating his or her desk with gnomes, a certificate identifying why he or she had been recognized (complete with bad gnome poems), and a small gift certificate for a drink (usually Starbucks). I bought all of the gnomes and cards myself, and have refused

to acknowledge being the gnomer, in part because I believe anonymous recognition adds to the fun and removes any political or manipulative interpretations. Everything I have heard suggests that both moves have helped with morale considerably.

7. *Provide clear evidence that the past and current level of activity will continue after promotion.*

My role at the university has changed very recently, so much of what I had previously done in connection with the First-Year Composition program will be handed off to new leaders. However, with a new core curriculum assessment system in place, I will have plenty to do going forward, and it is clear to me that my new assessment role touches so many parts of the university that my role will continue to expand. For example, the university's new Center for Faculty Excellence just yesterday asked me to present on building assignments for assessment this Fall, and I plan to do it. I have recently been added to the editorial board of *Intersection*, a role I anticipate continuing for the indefinite future.

Professional Cooperation

Dean Ann Staton wrote in my 2012 APR that “Dr. Scott is a collegial faculty member who interacts well with faculty, staff, and students,” a remark that appears consistent with the department chair's reviews of me each year and by the letter by Karen Petty (Appendix L), and I hope those remarks are well-supported by the above reports about my service, my collaboration, and my mentorship.

Conclusion

For the reasons enumerated and elaborated above, I believe I have met the requirements for tenure in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Moreover, I believe I have shown evidence that I will continue to do so. In Teaching, I plan to continue refining my outcome-validation approach and helping the department develop its offerings of courses for its new writing track, and I look forward to chairing dissertation committees. In Scholarship, I have a stereotype threat study to wrap up, an agenda on assessment confounds to pursue, and an assessment-oriented textbook to propose. In Service, I am excited to be embarking on a new role on campus and hope to continue helping the department bring in students, teach them, and send them out to success in the working world. Moreover, I hope to remain helpful to the writing program—which I am very attached to—as a continuing member of the First-Year Composition committee, even if I no longer chair it.