

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION  
COMMITTEE  
DEPARTMENT STANDARDS  
2025-2026**

*Approved by English Department 7 February 2025*

The Department of English will evaluate faculty performance based on the standards outlined in this document. The department's Personnel Committee is charged with conducting faculty evaluations for the department. In accordance with the department's bylaws, the Personnel Committee will be comprised of at least four, but preferably five tenured professors in the English Department; whenever possible, all committee members will be at the rank of Professor. Membership of the department's Personnel Committee is confirmed by departmental vote.

The Department of English values faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service. While acknowledging that each candidate will develop their strengths within and among these categories, we also expect full-time faculty to demonstrate success in each category. To some extent, exceptional performance in one area of review may compensate for lesser contributions in other areas of review, as indicated in the FPPP. Among these three categories, however, teaching stands out as the most important. The bulk of the time and effort in our department is spent preparing for classes, responding to student work, researching for the purpose of teaching, meeting with students, and spending time in the classroom. Therefore, candidates and the committee need to pay special attention to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

These standards provide candidates and evaluators with descriptions of the types and locations of evidence to include in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The Personal Action File (PAF) is the instructor's permanent employment file maintained by the Dean's Office, while the dossier is composed, compiled and submitted by the faculty member under review. In accordance with the FPPP, all evaluations and assessments of faculty performance in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process will be entirely and exclusively based on documented evidence contained in the candidate's PAF and dossier.

The English Department uses a developmental rather than absolute lens when assessing our colleagues. When performance rankings are given (typically at years two and four, and whenever tenure and/or promotion decisions are being made), they reflect a level of accomplishment expected by candidates at their level of review in the tenure and promotion cycles. Candidates are therefore expected to show continued growth in the categories between reviews.

Work assignments differ for tenure-track/tenured faculty and for temporary faculty (lecturers), and the dossier requirements outlined below in Parts I and II reflect those differences.

## **PART I. TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY**

### **Introduction**

This document has two audiences: the English Department candidate under review, and those who conduct the review(s) of the candidate (i.e., the English Department Personnel Committee, the English Department Chair, the HFA Personnel Committee, the Dean of HFA, and the Provost). For the candidate, these standards make clear the expectations of the department for retention, tenure, and promotion, and they clarify the RTP process so that the candidate understands why it is necessary to provide the committee with the documentation of their performance.

For the reviewers, this document establishes the English Department standards by which to assess a candidate's performance. Our standards comply with the governing policies in the CBA and FPPP; candidates and the committee should carefully review the FPPP each year before the evaluation process begins.

### **Procedures**

This section outlines the process of reviewing candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion.

Each fall, candidates and the Personnel Committee receive a calendar that includes the names of the candidates under review, the level of the review, the due dates for the submission of the candidate's materials, and the due dates for the committees' review reports. The steps in the review process are the following:

1. Candidates prepare their dossiers (WPAF). Instructions about putting together the dossier are included below. Because the English Department is an assemblage of subdisciplines, the dossier plays a critical role in providing candidates an opportunity to contextualize their contributions to a committee composed of faculty from a variety of subjects within English Studies.
2. The department Personnel Committee arranges for a classroom visit, and a classroom visit report will be submitted to the candidate's PAF, with a copy provided to the candidate. This report will be provided a minimum of one week before the date when the dossier is due. If the Department Chair is not serving on the Personnel Committee, the Chair may also conduct a class

- observation and submit a separate report to the PAF, with a copy provided to the candidate at least one week prior to the dossier's due date.
3. Once the dossier is submitted, the Personnel Committee thoroughly examines the dossier and prepares to draft the report.
  4. Prior to the report being drafted and finalized, the chair of the committee, along with at least one other member and the department chair, conducts an interview with the candidate to discuss the committee's preliminary findings. The interview's purpose is to ensure that the information in the dossier is accurate and complete, and to discuss formally the candidate's performance in the department.
  5. Following the interview, the committee will draft, finalize, and submit its final report to the Dean's Office, who makes the report available to the candidate.
  6. Next, the Department Chair, if not a member of the Personnel Committee, conducts an independent review of the candidate, writes a report, and submits it to the Dean's Office, which makes the report available to the candidate.
  7. Once the Department level reports are written and provided to candidates, they have a 10-day period in which to respond in writing to the report(s), should they feel a need to do so. Candidates undergoing Performance Review will have their reports and dossiers forwarded for review by the College Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the Provost; candidates undergoing Periodic Review will have their reports forwarded for review to the Dean.

### **Preparing the Dossier**

Each candidate undergoing review compiles a dossier that documents the candidate's activities and accomplishments over the period of review, and submits it via the adopted campus protocols. Currently, the dossier is organized into six numbered folders with the contents detailed below:

1. Department Standards: The dossier must include a copy of the department standards to be used in the review in this folder. Probationary faculty may use the current standards, or opt to use the standards in place at the time of their hire. If candidates choose to use an earlier set of standards, the FPPP's current ratings system of Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, or Does Not Meet Standards (see Reports section below) will override the prior rating system of Superior, Effective, Adequate, and Inadequate.
2. Curriculum Vitae: The dossier must include an up-to-date copy of the candidate's CV in this folder. Candidates are encouraged to arrange the CV's categories to match the categories of review: Instruction; Professional Growth and Achievement; Service.
3. Narrative: The narrative should be a single file, typically around five pages in total, that distills and demonstrates the candidate's achievements in instruction, scholarship, and service. The narrative should include the following elements:

- a. Introduction. Provide a short introduction to the dossier and its contents and organization. Including a bulleted list of highlights or achievements can help orient the reader to the contents that follow.
  - b. Teaching Philosophy: Provide a reflective statement on your teaching philosophy, instructional strategies, and general disciplinary objectives and how these have impacted your teaching. Include information on the ways your approaches to instruction address issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. How are these principles evidenced in your classes, assignments, and other learning experiences you provide students?
  - c. Professional Growth and Achievement: Provide a reflective statement on your professional growth and achievement, including your research interests and/or creative activities, current and future projects, and relevant context (e.g., where your work fits within your specialization and/or within the larger scope of English studies). A discussion of the connections between your professional work and your instruction is particularly welcome.
  - d. Service to the Department, College, University, and Community: Provide a reflective statement on the approach you take to service commitments on campus and beyond (e.g., in the community or profession). How do you see your service choices as reflecting your strengths and interests as an academic? How do you see your service choices connecting to your instructional duties and/or scholarly pursuits? How do you see your service choices helping the university meet the goals outlined in its current strategic planning and mission-focused documents?
4. Support Materials
- a. Instruction
    - i. Summary of Student Feedback on Teaching (numeric). Provide summaries of numeric scores for the courses you teach. It may be useful to organize these by course, or to offer a numerical average across multiple sections of a course. Do not include copies of the SFOT files, as they are already included in the PAF.
    - ii. Summary of Student Feedback on Teaching (written comments). Provide a brief narrative summary that captures written comments by students, including representative quotes.
    - iii. Summary of Peer Evaluations of Teaching. Provide a brief narrative summary of feedback you have received from peer observations of your teaching, identifying strengths and areas of growth as appropriate.
    - iv. Reflections on SFOTs and Peer Evaluations. Provide a brief narrative that reflects on the feedback you have received on

your teaching. What have you learned from the process? What changes have you made and/or do you plan to make as a result of the feedback?

- v. List and/or describe any supervisory instructional projects you have overseen (e.g. independent studies, internships, undergraduate or graduate theses or projects, etc.)
- vi. List the courses you have taught at Chico State during the period of review. Please provide a table of courses you have taught, including the semester(s), and if the course is a new preparation.

Course Number	Course Title	Year/Semester Taught	New Course? y/n	New Syllabus? y/n

- b. Professional Growth and Achievement
  - i. Publications. Provide a list of your publications, and note whether they are peer-reviewed as appropriate. Include page numbers for print articles, and links for online publications.
  - ii. Conferences. Provide a list of conference presentations, including date and location.
  - iii. Keynotes, invited talks, and guest lectures. Provide title, dates, and context for these.
  - iv. Grants and contracts. Provide proposal title, funding source(s), funding status, dates, and amounts.
- c. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (also referred to as “Service”)
  - i. Provide a list of service activities, including dates and roles played. You may include context and descriptions of duties performed to help the reviewers understand your contributions.
  - ii. Include notes to indicate high-engagement service commitments (e.g. Academic Senate, Curriculum Advisory Board, etc.).
  - iii. Identify, where appropriate, connections between service activities and the university’s strategic plan and mission

5. Index to Supplemental Materials

- a. Provide an index to the Supplemental Materials found in folder 6, described below.
  - i. Note: Supplemental materials are provided to reviewers at the discretion of the candidate, and while not mandated are highly recommended. The Supplemental Materials folder provides the candidate the opportunity to include for review additional

documentation of and context for the candidate's activities in instruction, scholarship, and service.

6. Supplemental Materials

a. Supplemental materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:

i. Instructional materials

1. Course syllabi
2. Course assignments
3. Samples of student work
4. Samples of feedback provided to students

ii. Professional Growth and Achievement

1. Copies of articles, chapters, proposals, conference programs, etc.
2. Correspondence with editors, conference organizers, funders, etc., for works under review or in pre-publication
3. Award letters, reports, and other grant-related documentation
4. Other relevant documentation of professional growth and achievement

iii. Service

1. Appointment documents, agendas, etc., for committee work
2. Correspondence, awards, commendations, etc., related to services rendered
3. Recommendation letters and forms, and other similar documents completed for current and former students

## **Report**

The committee will examine the dossier and the support materials in order to prepare a written evaluation of the candidate. This evaluation includes the sections listed below. Candidates should pay close attention to the criteria for each section in order to ensure that the committee has the appropriate information to make an informed evaluation. For those candidates undergoing a performance review, each section will be ranked as Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations; see the FPPP for definitions of those rankings. For candidates undergoing review for tenure and/or promotion, rankings of "Meets Expectations" or higher in each category listed below are required to receive tenure and/or promotion.

### ***I. Instruction***

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion. Candidates may provide the following as evidence of effective teaching:

- Student Evaluations of Teaching/Student Feedback on Teaching. In accordance with the FPPP, SET/SFOT data will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness. The department further recognizes that surveys like the SFOTs are an imperfect tool for assessment, with results that may reflect biases based on such things as gender, race, ethnicity, first language, sexual orientation, neurodiversity, and disability, and will interpret SFOT data accordingly
- against women, people of color, members of the LGBTQ+ community, the neurodiverse, and the differently abled, and will interpret SFOT data accordingly.
- Peer evaluations
- Course materials such as syllabi, selected student work, course assignments, sample instructor feedback, etc.
- Commentary and reflection in the narrative section on teaching in their dossier.

In addition to teaching in the classroom, candidates should document and discuss their roles as chairs or members of Honors and Masters' thesis committees, as well as supervising students in internships and independent studies. Using this evidence, the committee will assess the degree to which students learned important knowledge and practices of the candidate's field.

### ***Evaluation***

At a minimum, all faculty must demonstrate:

- An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and professional roles in and out of the classroom
- Competence in the subject matter being taught
- Effective and professionally appropriate interactions with students in and out of class
- Use of course content, materials, and technology that reflect the course's description and goals
- Application of expectations for content, assignments, and assessment relevant to the course level and subject matter

Failure to reasonably meet any of the above minimum criteria, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, and/or Department Chair, may result in a rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

**Meets Expectations:** In addition to the above minimum standards, the standards for each of the following levels of evaluation apply:

- 1) Reappointment (probationary faculty)

- a) A cogent teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the mission of the department
  - b) Syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student outcomes
  - c) Representative instructional materials (e.g. assignments, study guides, graded student work with instructor feedback, etc.) that demonstrate effective teaching practices
  - d) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
  - e) SFOT results that are discussed thoughtfully and thoroughly in the dossier, including identifying any prominent themes raised by students
  - f) Peer evaluation reports that primarily describe effective teaching practices; recommendations by peer observers are addressed within the dossier
  - g) As applicable, areas of concern arising from significant patterns in SFOT scores, student written comments, and/or areas identified for improvement in peer observations are directly addressed by the candidate, and include plans for improving instruction in these areas
- 2) Tenure:
- a) A cogent teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the mission of the department
  - b) Syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student outcomes
  - c) Representative instructional materials (e.g. assignments, study guides, graded student work with instructor feedback, etc.) that demonstrate effective teaching practices
  - d) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
  - e) SFOT results that are discussed thoughtfully and thoroughly in the dossier, including identifying any prominent themes raised by students
  - f) Peer evaluation reports that primarily describe effective teaching practices; recommendations by peer observers are addressed within the dossier
  - g) As applicable, areas of concern arising from significant patterns in SFOT scores, student written comments, and/or areas identified for improvement in peer observations are directly addressed by the candidate, and include plans for improving instruction in these areas
  - h) Evidence of teaching practices adopted, modified, or otherwise implemented to specifically meet the educational needs of the Chico State student population
- 3) Promotion to Associate Professor:
- a) A cogent teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the mission of the department
  - b) Syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student outcomes



- c) Representative instructional materials (e.g. assignments, study guides, graded student work with instructor feedback, etc.) that demonstrate effective teaching practices
  - d) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
  - e) SFOT results that are discussed thoughtfully and thoroughly in the dossier, including identifying any prominent themes raised by students
  - f) Peer evaluation reports that primarily describe effective teaching practices; recommendations by peer observers are addressed within the dossier
  - g) As applicable, areas of concern arising from significant patterns in SFOT scores, student written comments, and/or areas identified for improvement in peer observations are directly addressed by the candidate, and include plans for improving instruction in these areas
  - h) Evidence of teaching practices adopted, modified, or otherwise implemented to specifically meet the educational needs of the student population
  - i) Participation in pedagogy-focused trainings, workshops, conferences, or similar professional development offerings, either on campus or through appropriate professional organizations
- 4) Promotion to Full Professor:
- a) Brief but cogent teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the mission of the department
  - b) Syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student outcomes
  - c) Representative instructional materials (e.g. assignments, study guides, graded student work with instructor feedback, etc.) that demonstrate effective teaching practices
  - d) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
  - e) SFOT results that are discussed thoughtfully and thoroughly in the dossier, including identifying any prominent themes raised by students
  - f) Peer evaluation reports that primarily describe effective teaching practices; recommendations by peer observers are addressed within the dossier
  - g) As applicable, areas of concern arising from significant patterns in SFOT scores, student written comments, and/or areas identified for improvement in peer observations are directly addressed by the candidate, and include plans for improving instruction in these areas
  - h) Evidence of teaching practices adopted, modified, or otherwise implemented to specifically meet the educational needs of the student population
  - i) Participation in pedagogy-focused trainings, workshops, conferences, or similar professional development offerings, either on campus or through appropriate professional organizations

- j) Demonstrated contributions to curriculum development within the department's programs

**Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to achieving the standards described for each level of evaluation noted above, the candidates whose record demonstrates meeting at least three instances of the standards listed below during the period of review will be evaluated as exceeding expectations. Standards 3-8 below may be counted more than once.

- 1) Positive peer evaluation reports that describe exemplary teaching practices
- 2) SFOT scores averaging in the 4.0 range or higher across categories and courses
- 3) Served as chair or member of graduate student culminating project committee(s)
- 4) Served as chair or member of undergraduate honors student thesis
- 5) Developed and/or led professional development programs (e.g., for Faculty Development) focused on teaching
- 6) Led department curricular initiatives designed to meet specific objectives set by the department, college, or campus (e.g., increasing diversity/equity/inclusiveness of department curriculum through new course development, significant revision of current courses, revision of programs' content and sequencing, etc.)
- 7) Mentored and supervised undergraduate and/or graduate students through independent studies, teaching apprenticeships, research opportunities, etc.
- 8) Provided other exceptional teaching-related service that supports student success in the department, college, university, or discipline, as described and evidenced in the dossier

## ***II. Professional Growth and Achievement***

Scholarly and/or creative activity maintains the relevance and liveliness of the academy and serves as models for students' inquiry and study. Candidates demonstrate their effectiveness in this area through their narrative section on professional growth and achievement, and by documenting activities including, but not limited to:

- Publications:
  - Book/research monograph (author)
  - Book review
  - Conference Proceedings
  - Contributor/columnist (ongoing) for academic/professional organization (print or online)
  - Corpora/Database creation
  - Creative writing publication
  - Digital project (podcast, blog, digital story, multimodal scholarly or creative work, etc.)

- Edited academic book (editor)
- Edited book chapter (contributor)
- Educational materials (primer, orthography documentation, lesson design, etc.)
- Journal article (peer reviewed)
- Journal article (non-peer reviewed)
- Online publication (academic, creative, hybrid)
- Textbook (author)
- Translation (primary materials, academic work by scholars publishing in other languages, etc.)
- Uncategorized other publication relevant to candidate's academic position
- Significant Presentations: creative writing readings, keynotes, featured speeches, invited talks at notable national or international conferences
- Conference presentations: research or creative presentations as part of panels or workshops at international, national, state, and/or local conferences
- Workshop presentations: presentations for peers and/or the general public focused on such things as methodology, research tools, creative processes, publication strategies, or current issues related to English Studies
- Other scholarly or creative achievements:
  - Grants and Proposals (specify submission and/or funding status)
  - Editorial work on scholarly or creative materials
  - Prizes or awards from professional sources
  - Fellowships
  - Other achievements (please specify and describe)

While the committee will evaluate each candidate's merits with the understanding that professional growth and achievement may take different shapes in each area of English Studies, the candidate is encouraged to provide sufficient context for reviewers to understand the significance of their work. Such context may include information about the status of the venue of dissemination, timeliness or significance of the work in relation to developments in the field, and the relationship of the work to the candidate's teaching assignment or other work duties.

### ***Evaluation***

At a minimum, all candidates' dossiers must demonstrate and document:

- An active and ongoing research or creative agenda
- Active participation in professional communities (whether local, state, national, or international) related to their areas of expertise
- Production and dissemination (through publication or presentation) of scholarly or creative work in pursuit of their agenda

Failure to reasonably meet any of the above minimum criteria, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, and/or Department Chair, may result in a rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

**Meets Expectations:** In addition to the above minimum standards, the standards for each of the following levels of evaluation apply:

- 1) Reappointment (probationary faculty)
  - a) Candidate demonstrates at least one of the activities listed above for each year of service under review.
  - b) By the 4<sup>th</sup> year Performance Review, the Candidate has at least one substantive publication (print or online, preferably peer-reviewed) that represents original contributions to the field of study, published in a significant academic or creative journal or edited volume.
    - i) Evidence of a completed, submitted book proposal to a reputable academic or creative publisher may substitute for this requirement.
    - ii) Substantive, funded grant proposals that support the candidate's agenda may substitute for this requirement.
    - iii) Other projects, supported by the candidate's dossier narrative, may substitute for this requirement.
  - c) By the 4<sup>th</sup> year Performance Review, the candidate's dossier demonstrates ongoing progress toward the research agenda with tangible and feasible targets for future publications, presentations, etc.
- 2) Tenure:
  - a) Candidate demonstrates at least one instance of relevant professional activities per year during the review period. Of these:
    - i) At least one is a substantive publication (print or online, preferably peer-reviewed) that represents original contributions to the field of study, published in a significant academic or creative journals, edited volumes, or equivalent venues.
      - (1) Substantive, funded grant proposals that support the candidate's agenda may substitute for this requirement.
      - (2) Other projects, supported by the candidate's dossier narrative, may substitute for this requirement.
    - ii) At least one other activity is a publication (print or online), but may be less substantive (a book review, a column, etc.).
    - iii) If presentations are included in the activities, at least one is at a national or international-level conference of a significant organization related to the candidate's field of expertise.
- 3) Promotion to Associate Professor:
  - a) Candidate demonstrates at least five instances of relevant professional activities during the review period. Of these:
    - i) The candidate has at least two substantive publications (print or online, preferably peer-reviewed) that represent original contributions to the field of study, published in significant academic or creative journals, edited volumes, or equivalent venues.

- (1) A finished book project (either published, or in finalized but forthcoming form, from a recognized press) will satisfy requirement 3.a.i. in full.
- (2) Substantive, funded grant proposals that support the candidate's agenda may substitute for one of the required publications.
- (3) Two less-substantive publications (book review, column, etc.) may be counted for one of the required publications
- (4) Other projects, supported by the candidate's dossier narrative, may substitute for one of the required publications.
- ii) If presentations are included in the activities, a significant portion should be delivered at national or international-level conferences of significant organizations related to the candidate's field of expertise.
- b) Candidate's dossier effectively describes and contextualizes their research and/or creative productivity within the candidate's own professional agenda, as well as within the candidate's field of expertise, and provides a feasible, ongoing trajectory for future scholarly work.
- 4) Promotion to Full Professor:
  - a) Candidate demonstrates at least five instances of relevant professional activities during the review period. Of these:
    - i) The candidate has at least two substantive publications (print or online, preferably peer-reviewed) that represent original contributions to the field of study, published in significant academic or creative journals, edited volumes, or equivalent venues.
      - (1) A finished book project (either published, or in finalized but forthcoming form, from a recognized press) will satisfy this requirement.
      - (2) Substantive, funded grant proposals that support the candidate's agenda may substitute for one of the required publications.
      - (3) Other projects, supported by the candidate's dossier narrative, may substitute for one of the required publications.
    - ii) If presentations are included in the activities, a significant portion should be delivered at national or international-level conferences of significant organizations related to the candidate's field of expertise.
  - b) Candidate's dossier effectively describes and contextualizes their research and/or creative productivity within the candidate's own professional agenda, as well as within the candidate's field of expertise, and provides a feasible, ongoing trajectory for future scholarly work.

**Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to achieving the standards described for each level of evaluation noted above, the candidates whose record demonstrates meeting at least two instances of the standards listed below during the period of review will be evaluated as exceeding expectations. Standards may be counted more than once.

- 1) One additional substantive publication or equivalent project, as described above, beyond what is required to meet expectations.

- 2) Two additional presentations delivered at national or international-level conferences of significant organizations related to the candidate's field of expertise, beyond those used to meet expectations.
- 3) Research and/or creative project leadership activity, such as organizing and implementing research or creative project seminars or workshops for other scholars in the candidate's field, facilitating writing communities working on producing publications, and similar program design and implementation activities related to the candidate's field.
- 4) Designing and implementing research and/or creative activity programs or projects that actively engage students in the research process (project design, information and data gathering, analysis, dissemination).

### ***III. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and Other Contributions to the University and Community***

Ongoing involvement in the service activities of the department, college, university, profession, and community demonstrate the candidate's active participation in the university and academic community. Candidates demonstrate the effectiveness of their service through their narrative on service and by documenting their participation in the Supplemental Materials folder of the dossier. Because service contributions can vary widely, candidates are encouraged to provide brief descriptions of their service rather than simple lists. Candidates are encouraged as well to show connections between their service and the university's strategic planning and mission documents. Candidates may find it useful to organize service activities into the following categories:

#### *Service to the University, College, and Department*

During the course of their career, candidates should participate in all levels of university service (university, college, and department). Evidence of the candidate's professional service might include committee appointment letters, workshop evaluations, letters of commendation from committee chairs and university faculty who have attended a presentation or event organized by the candidate, and/or other materials documenting the candidate's service. Examples of university service activities include the following:

- Membership on on-going university, college, or department committees
- Membership on special *ad hoc* committees or task forces (please provide descriptions of committees)
- Major Administrative Assignment
  - Chairing the Department
  - Coordinating a program within the Department
  - Coordinating an Upper Division General Education Pathway

- Advising for a department program
- Other (explain)
- Advising a student organization
- Faculty development leadership or participation
- Repeated, ongoing participation in departmental, college, and/or campus recruitment events such as Wildcat Welcome, Wildcat Preview, and Choose Chico
- Other service activities related to the candidate's academic position

### *Service to Local and Professional Communities*

The English Department also values service to the candidate's profession and to the various publics in which academics participate. Local and professional service examples include, but are not limited to:

- Local presentations
- Participation in the local community through readings, workshops, speeches, debates, panels, and media presentations
- Membership on professional boards and consultancies
- Serving as an officer, chairing or serving on a committee/advisory board/leadership team, or similar for a local, regional, national, or international professional or academic organization related to the candidate's field of study
- Serving as a peer reviewer or conference organizer for a local, regional, national, or international professional or academic organization related to the candidate's field of study
- Other activities not already addressed in regard to service, particularly contributions serving the university's overall goals as articulated in strategic planning and mission-related documents

### ***Evaluation***

At a minimum, all faculty must demonstrate:

- Participation in a variety of ongoing service activities, as described above, serving one or more stakeholder communities
- A reflective statement within the dossier wherein the candidate describes the relationship of the service work they have taken on to their discipline, their interests, and to the larger goals of the university (as expressed in strategic planning documents, mission statements, etc.)

Failure to reasonably meet any of the above minimum criteria, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, and/or Department Chair, may result in a rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

**Meets Expectations:** In addition to the above minimum standards, the standards for each of the following levels of evaluation apply:

- 1) Reappointment (probationary faculty):

- a) Candidate's record reflects at least two service activities for each year under review; serving 2-year appointments on two different committees, or 1-year appointments on four different committees, would satisfy this requirement for a 2-year performance review
- 2) Tenure:
  - a) Candidate's record reflects at least two service activities for each year under review
  - b) Candidate's record reflects variety in service activities, including at least two service activities beyond the department level
- 3) Promotion to Associate Professor:
  - a) Candidate's record reflects at least three service activities for the two most recent years under review (years 5 and 6 on the standard RTP timeline)
  - b) Candidate's record reflects an increasing depth of service engagement over time, demonstrated by serving on more college- and university-level committees during the two most recent years under review (years 5 and 6 on the standard RTP timeline)
  - c) Candidate's record reflects at least one service activity beyond the direct university community
- 4) Promotion to Full Professor:
  - a) Candidate's record reflects at least three service activities for each year under review
  - b) Candidate's record includes activities beyond the department level during the period under review
  - c) Candidate's record includes activities beyond the direct university community during the period under review

**Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to achieving the standards described for each level of evaluation noted above, the candidates whose record demonstrates meeting at least three instances of the standards listed below during the period of review will be evaluated as exceeding expectations. Standards may be counted more than once presentations for peers and/or the general public focused on such things as methodology, research tools, creative processes, publication strategies, or current issues related to English Studies.

- 1) Candidate's record reflects, on average, one additional service activity per year
- 2) Candidate's record reflects an ongoing leadership role related to a service activity, such as chairing a committee or serving as an officer in an academic or professional organization
- 3) Candidate's record reflects a temporary or event-specific leadership role, such as organizing a conference
- 4) Candidate's record reflects high-commitment service (such as Academic Senate, Curriculum Advisory Board, or special task forces)



## **Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion**

Candidates who have requested evaluation for early tenure and promotion must meet the criteria identified in the FPPP. For early tenure and promotion to associate professor, the FPPP specifies candidates must (1) achieve Performance Review rankings of “Exceeds Expectations” in all three categories, (2) demonstrate that the high level of achievement is likely to continue, and (3) have worked for at least one year under the normal conditions for full-time faculty in the department.

For accelerated promotion to full professor, the FPPP specifies candidates must (1) receive “Exceeds Expectations” rankings in all three categories of evaluation, (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and (3) clearly show substantial professional recognition from within and beyond the university. External recognition may include, but is not limited to, awards and honors from national and/or international organizations of the discipline, unsolicited requests for the candidate to serve as keynote or invited speaker in a notable event in the discipline, and unsolicited laudatory reviews documenting the innovative and impactful nature of the candidate’s published work. The granting of early tenure and/or promotion, because the standards are so much higher than they are for the regular timeline, is rare.

## **Procedures for Reviewing Tenured Faculty: Periodic Review**

The FPPP provides the policies and procedures for conducting reviews of tenured faculty: “For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member’s effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to *periodic evaluation* at intervals no greater than five years. Note that the focus of this review should be on providing developmental feedback and encouragement to maintain a positive level of performance. Where appropriate, the review provides an opportunity for those colleagues to express their appreciation to the faculty member for their continued positive contributions to the University. It is recognized that, where necessary, the review will include corrective feedback.” Tenured faculty at the rank of Professor, or tenured Assistant or Associate Professors who have not undergone a Performance Review for four years, are subject to periodic review at intervals of no more than 5 years.

1. The review will be governed by the policies and procedures described in the FPPP.
2. Those under review will compile materials in their WPAF showing their professional activities, teaching effectiveness, and service during the review period, as follows:
  - a. Current Curriculum Vitae

- b. Narrative (not to exceed 2 pages): provides summary and import of candidate's teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service to the University, profession, and community
- c. Evidentiary Data:
  - i. Index of Supplemental Materials
  - ii. Supplemental Materials (instructional-, scholarly-, and service-related documentation, as appropriate)
- 3. The Personnel Committee will arrange for a classroom visit and a classroom visit report will be submitted to the candidate's PAF and the candidate at least one week before the date when the dossier is due.
- 4. Once the candidate's dossier is submitted, the review committee will review and write a brief, 1-page report, which will be sent to the Dean for review. The Dean may concur with the report, or write a separate report. Once complete, the candidate will meet with the Dean and the Committee Chair to discuss the report(s), after which they will be placed into the PAF. The candidate will have a 10-day period in which to respond in writing to the report(s), should they feel a need to do so.

## **PART II. TEMPORARY FACULTY**

Temporary faculty have two kinds of evaluations, described in detail below: the review of teaching performance, and the application for range elevation. Teaching performance reviews are conducted annually or biennially for lecturers on 1-year contracts, and every 3 years for lecturers on 3-year contracts. Range elevation reviews are conducted in response to applications from eligible lecturers. Because most lecturers are assigned solely to teaching responsibilities, the English Department recognizes that teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum and indispensable requirement for the appointment, reappointment, and range elevation of Lecturer Faculty.

### **Teaching Performance Review Criteria for Evaluating Temporary Faculty**

Temporary Faculty undergoing evaluation will be alerted by the Dean's Office of their upcoming review. The review will be based on the faculty member's dossier and PAF, which will include a classroom observation report, conducted by a full-time English Department faculty member during the current or immediately prior semester. If the faculty member under review has been assigned duties other than teaching, the dossier should document the effectiveness of that work. Lecturers undergoing review are encouraged to read the FPPP's sections related to the evaluation of temporary faculty.

The Personnel Committee will write a report addressing the following categories:

- Instruction
- Professional Activity / Currency in the Field

- Non-Instructional Duties
- Other Contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (also referred to as “Service”)

The Department Chair, if not serving on the Personnel Committee, will review the Personnel Committee’s reports for all candidates. The chair may concur with the committee’s report with or without comments, or not concur with comments.

**Evaluation:**

Most candidates for review will have teaching as their sole contractual duty, and in those cases the review evaluation of either satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be based upon their instruction.

1. **Teaching.** Candidates demonstrate effective instruction through their construction of the dossier and its included materials. The narrative provides the Personnel Committee with a subjective overview of the candidate’s approach to instruction and the ways that they interpret their work, while more objective data such as peer observations, Student Feedback on Teaching scores and written comments, course syllabi, sample assignments, student work samples, and sample instructor feedback provide supporting evidence of instructional success. SFOT data will play a role, but not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of the candidate’s effectiveness. The department further recognizes that surveys like the SFOTs are an imperfect tool for assessment, with results that may reflect biases based on such things as gender, race, ethnicity, first language, sexual orientation, neurodiversity, and disability, and will interpret SFOT data accordingly. Candidate performance will be deemed **satisfactory** based on the following:

- a) A teaching philosophy that aligns with the overall and/or specific student learning outcomes of the department
- b) Course syllabi that clearly communicate course objectives and student expectations
- c) Sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching methods, appropriate feedback, and student learning
- d) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
- e) SFOT results that are discussed thoughtfully and thoroughly in the dossier, including identifying any prominent themes raised by students
- f) Peer observation(s) reflect effective teaching overall
- g) As applicable, areas of concern arising from significant patterns in SFOT scores, student written comments, and/or areas identified for improvement in peer observations are directly addressed by the candidate, and include plans for improving instruction in these areas

2. **Professional Growth and Development to Demonstrate Currency in the Field** (optional). Activities listed below in the “Preparing the Dossier” section 4.b., Support Materials, provide evidence of currency in the field.
3. **Service** (optional). Activities listed below in the “Preparing the Dossier” section 4.c., Support Materials, provide evidence of service.

### **Range Elevation**

Temporary Faculty who are eligible may apply for range elevation. The CBA and the FPPP governs lecturers’ eligibility for range elevation, and faculty are encouraged to consult with the Dean’s Office, the Department Chair, and the Personnel Committee Chair before applying. Temporary Faculty should note that the criteria for range elevation specify teaching excellence as well as maintaining currency in the field. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered sufficient for appointment at a higher level.

Temporary faculty are eligible for a range elevation when they have exhausted the salary increases within their range *and* when they have been employed for at least five years in their current range. An application for range elevation requires a much more significant review than the annual evaluation. In this sense, it more closely reflects the criteria and process of a performance review for tenure-track faculty.

For the purposes of Range Elevation, **teaching excellence** shall be determined based on the following criteria:

- 1) A teaching philosophy that aligns with the overall and/or specific student learning outcomes of the department, and demonstrates an understanding of the particular needs of the Chico State student population
- 2) Course syllabi that clearly communicate course objectives and student expectations
- 3) Sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching methods, appropriate feedback, and student learning
- 4) SFOT numerical scores averaging in the range of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses
- 5) Peer observation(s) that reflect effective teaching
- 6) Evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness, including as appropriate responses to peer evaluation recommendations and SFOT patterns of concern

For the purposes of Range Elevation, **professional growth and development to demonstrate currency in the field** will be determined by the candidate’s inclusion of relevant evidence. Such evidence, as outlined in the FPPP, includes (but is not limited to) continued education, research, scholarship, creative, and professional activities.

## Preparing the Dossier: Temporary Faculty

Below, you will find the names and numbers of the folders that will be provided to you in the electronic submission dossier. Please include the materials listed for each folder.

1. **Department Standards:** Include a copy of this document in this folder.
2. **Curriculum Vitae:** A copy of the lecturer's current CV should be placed in this folder.
3. **Narrative:** The narrative should be a single file, typically in the 2-5 page range, that articulates the lecturer's competency in instruction, addressing currency in the field / professional achievements as appropriate, and describing service to the department, college, campus, and community as appropriate. The narrative should be limited to work completed within the period under review, and should include the following elements:
  - a) **Teaching Philosophy:** Provide a brief reflective statement on your teaching philosophy, instructional strategies, and general disciplinary objectives, and how these have impacted your teaching. Include information on the ways your approaches to instruction address issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. How are these principles enacted in classes, assignments, and other learning experiences provided to students?
  - b) **Feedback on Teaching:** Provide a summary of and reflection on student feedback on teaching and peer evaluation(s) of teaching, including what the instructor has learned from the evaluation process and how these evaluations have impacted instruction.
  - c) **Currency in the Field/Professional Achievements:** List and/or describe any teaching- or profession-related accomplishments. This could include your formal qualifications (degree(s) & institution), any publications or presentations related to your work assignments, and any professional development programs you have attended. If your assignment is exclusively instructional, you may omit this section.
  - d) **Other Contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (also referred to as "Service"):** List and/or describe any service work you have done that relates to your position within the English Department. This could include serving on campus committees (at the department, college, or university level), working as an officer or other leader in a professional or community organization related to your position, or doing other work that supports the campus's strategic planning and mission documents. If your assignment is exclusively instructional, you may omit this section.
4. **Support Materials**
  - a) **Instruction:** Faculty under review should include:
    - i) A list of courses taught during the review period, including whether the courses are new assignments and/or feature redesigned syllabi

Course Number	Course Title	Year/Semester Taught	New Course? y/n	New Syllabus? y/n
---------------	--------------	----------------------	-----------------	-------------------


- ii) The most recent syllabi for each course taught
- iii) Representative evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning, such as course assignments, teaching material, and student work with instructor feedback
- b) Professional Growth and Development to Demonstrate Currency in the Field/Professional Achievements (optional for Teaching Performance Review, if assignment is exclusively instructional; required for Range Elevation): Candidates under review should include:
  - i) A list of professional development work completed during the period of review; this could include programs the lecturer participated in, either at Chico State or elsewhere, accompanied by brief explanations of the impact of the programs on instructional practices
  - ii) A list of any publications, conference presentations, workshops, talks, grants, or other related work accomplished by the candidate during the period of review
  - iii) Other professional work directly relevant to the candidate's teaching assignments; include explanatory notes as needed
- c) Service to the Department, College, University, Community, and Profession (optional, if assignment is exclusively instructional): Candidates should provide:
  - i) A list of service activities, including dates and roles played; including context and descriptions of duties performed will help the reviewers understand the value of such contributions to the candidate's work assignment

**5. Index to Supplemental Materials**

- a) Provide an index to the Supplemental Materials found in folder 6.
  - i) Note: Supplemental materials are provided to reviewers at the discretion of the candidate, and while not mandated are highly recommended. The Supplemental Materials folder provides the opportunity to include for review additional documentation of and context for the candidate's activities in instruction, currency in the field, and service.

**6. Supplemental Materials**

- a) Supplemental materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - i) Instructional materials
  - ii) Course syllabi
  - iii) Sample course assignments
  - iv) Samples of student work
  - v) Samples of feedback provided to students
- b) Currency in the Field/Professional Achievements
  - i) Certificates, correspondence, etc., that documents participation in professional development programs.

- ii) Award letters, reports, and other grant-related documentation.
- iii) Copies of articles, chapters, proposals, conference programs, etc.
- iv) Correspondence with editors, conference organizers, funders, etc., for works under review or in pre-publication.
- c) Service (if applicable to work assignment)
  - i) Appointment documents, agendas, etc., for committee work
  - ii) Correspondence, awards, commendations, etc., related to services rendered
  - iii) Recommendation letters and forms, and other similar documents completed for current and former students



## Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet


---

Process:

- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved Date* footer to the document and:
  - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
  - b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
  - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

Chair/Director Approval: 

Date: Mar 10, 2025

Dean Review:   
Tracy Butts (Mar 10, 2025 13:54 PDT)

Date: Mar 10, 2025

Provost/Designee Approval: 

Date: Mar 11, 2025