

Department of Languages and Cultures Retention Tenure Promotion Standards for 2022/2023

Important Resources

- [Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures \(FPPP\)](#)
- Unit 3 (Faculty) [Collective Bargaining Agreement \(CBA\)](#)
- [2022/23 RTP Calendar](#)

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Languages and Cultures (LANC) will evaluate faculty performance based on the standards outlined in this document. These standards serve as a guide to candidates and evaluators regarding the inclusion of appropriate evidentiary materials in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). In accordance with the FPPP, all evaluations and assessments of faculty performance in the RTP process will be entirely and exclusively based on documented evidence contained in the candidate's WPAF. Faculty who are under review will submit a dossier of evidence to the WPAF to aid RTP committees in the evaluation of their performance.

The Department of LANC values teaching, scholarship, and service. While each candidate will develop their strengths within and among these categories, as a successful career at a comprehensive university such as CSU, Chico requires efforts 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 10.1.3. Among these categories, however, teaching stands out as the most important.

Department rankings are based on a developmental model whereby candidates are assessed based on their current stage. Rankings thus reflect accomplishments expected by the candidate's level of review in the tenure cycle. They therefore do not necessarily indicate that the same ranking would be conferred were this the final dossier submitted for tenure and promotion.

Each faculty member under review in a given academic year will submit a dossier. Work assignments and therefore also dossier requirements differ for tenure-track/tenured faculty and for lecturer faculty. These requirements are described separately in sections I.E and II.C below.

CONTENTS

PART I: Evaluation of Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

A. Categories of Evaluation

A1. Instruction

Evaluation of Instruction

A2. Professional Growth and Achievement

Provisional Standard Approved 9-1-22 for AY 22/23 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 9-1-22 memo and attachments.

Page 1

Standards must be compliant with the CBA and the FPPP. Conflicts between these standards and the CBA or the FPPP will be resolved pursuant to the CBA and then FPPP.

Evaluation of Professional Growth and Achievement
A3. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the
Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community

Evaluation of Service

- B. Early Tenure and Promotion
- C. Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor
- D. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
- E. The Dossier (Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty)

PART II: Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty

A. Categories of Evaluation

A1. Teaching Excellence

Evaluation of Teaching

A2. Professional Growth and Development to Demonstrate Currency in
the Field (optional)

Evaluation of Professional Growth and Achievement

A3. Service (optional)

B. Range Elevation

C. Dossier (Lecturer Faculty)

I. EVALUATION OF TENURE TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

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 follows: meets expectations, exceeds expectations, or does not meet expectations. See FPPP 10.3.3.

A. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

A1. INSTRUCTION

Teaching effectiveness is the minimum and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Languages and Cultures. Effective teaching practices involve the creation and support of innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environments and inclusive pedagogy. Such learning environments encourage faculty-student contact, cooperation among students, respect for diversity, and active learning. Additionally, the candidate is expected to contribute to curriculum and program innovation and development.

In language courses, teaching effectiveness also includes adoption of a communicative approach to language instruction. While a communicative approach can take many forms, it shares

these common elements: maximum use of the target language at all levels of instruction, the provision of level-appropriate comprehensible input, and a classroom environment that is conducive to producing a low affective filter in learners.

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Candidates demonstrate effective teaching through such evidence as course syllabi, samples of graded student work and teaching materials, SFOTs, peer evaluations, evidence of course revision and updates, examples of inclusive pedagogy, contributions to improving graduation rates, and through narratives in the Dossier. SFOT data will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness. Using this evidence, the committee will assess the degree to which the candidate has supported and contributed to student learning in the context of their teaching assignment and the department mission.

Candidates **meet expectations** for reappointment with:

- a satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy that aligns with the mission and objectives of the department;
- syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student expectations
- sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching, appropriate feedback, and student learning;
- evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness;
- SFOT scores of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses. Patterns of SFOT scores below 4.0 and patterns of student suggestions for improvement to teaching are addressed in the narrative and the candidate offers a plan for improvement to instruction in these areas.
- satisfactory peer evaluations of instruction. Peer suggestions for improvement are addressed in the narrative and the candidate offers a plan for improvement to instruction in mentioned area(s).

Candidates **meet expectations** for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor with:

- a satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy that aligns with the mission and objectives of the department and demonstrates an understanding of the particular needs of our student population;
- syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student expectations;
- sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching, appropriate feedback, student learning, and the achievement of course goals;
- SFOT scores of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses and/or evidence of changes to improve patterns of scores below 4.0;
- satisfactory peer evaluations of instruction;
- evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness.

Candidates **meet expectations** for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor with:

- a satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy that aligns with the mission and objectives of the department and demonstrates an understanding of the particular needs of our student population;

- syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student expectations;
- sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching, appropriate feedback, student learning, and the achievement of course goals;
- SFOT scores of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses and/or evidence of changes to improve patterns of scores below 4.0;
- satisfactory peer evaluations of instruction;
- evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness;
- demonstrated contributions to curriculum development within the program.

A2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

It is critical to the viability of a university that all faculty maintain and demonstrate disciplinary currency. Professional achievement at a comprehensive university may take many forms. However, any demonstration of scholarly currency shares the following traits: (a) originality, (b) verification and validation through impartial critical processes, and (c) communication to others through available channels of publication. These forms of professional growth and achievement may include any or all of the following:

1. teaching and learning in their multiple interpretations and relationships;
2. the processes of discovery, critical inquiry, and/or analysis;
3. artistic creativity, both according to established canons and the spirit of innovation;
4. integration, application, popularization, and dissemination of various forms of knowledge.

The Department recognizes the diverse means by which the results of scholarly growth and development may be communicated. The Department further recognizes that rapid developments in information technology are opening up venues for professional activity beyond the well-worn, traditional pathways for public dissemination of knowledge. Faculty may also demonstrate scholarly competence in more than one area of growth and achievement.

Examples of such scholarly activity include, but are not limited to:

- publication or acceptance for publication of monographs, textbooks, book chapters, journal articles, scholarly interviews, anthologies, translations, teaching materials, book reviews, or creative works in the candidate's area of specialization;
- delivery of research presentations at professional meetings, invited lectures, performances of creative work, and other public presentation of work;
- extending one's professional knowledge by attending professional conferences, workshops, panels, or retreats;
- public and/or official recognition of meritorious achievement in one's area of scholarly specialization, receiving an award or honor, earning a fellowship or grant related to the field of expertise, activity as a consultant in a professional nature.

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Evaluation of the quality of scholarship and creative activity will consider the following:

- the importance of the forum of publication/dissemination of the work;
- the timeliness and importance of the work within the colleague's field;
- the availability of forums for the colleague's work;
- the relationship between the scholarship/creative activity and teaching duties or job description;
- the amount of productivity;
- the range of productivity.

These criteria will inform the committee's evaluation of the relevance of scholarly/creative activities in each of the categories below.

Candidates **meet expectations** for reappointment with:

- at least two instances of relevant scholarly/creative activity as described above in each probationary year;
- at least one peer-reviewed publication, whether published or forthcoming, that represents original contributions to the field within the first three years of the probationary process;
- beyond the third year, documented evidence of sustained progress in the faculty member's research trajectory which may include the continued publication of peer-reviewed articles, the presentation of new research at conferences, the development and submission of grant proposals, the development of a book proposal, etc.

Candidates **meet expectations** for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor with:

- evidence of two instances of relevant scholarly/creative activities in each year since tenure and promotion;
- the publication of a significant book project *or* two peer-reviewed publications in print that represent original contributions to the field and sustained progress on a third project.

Candidates **meet expectations** for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor with:

- evidence of two instances of relevant scholarly/creative activities in each subsequent year after promotion to Associate Professor, such as the presentation of new research at conferences, the development and submission of grant proposals, etc.
- documentation of sustained progress in the faculty member's research trajectory which may include the publication of a book, at least two peer-reviewed articles, or comparable work.

A3. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY AND TO THE COMMUNITY

Refer to the university, college, department, and program strategic plans and statements of goals.

The Department of Languages and Cultures recognizes good service in the five areas designated below as an integral part of the professional life of its faculty and therefore subject to review in the RTP process. The listed types of activities are **representative** of those that a productive and contributing faculty member in the Department of Languages and Cultures might undertake. However, a faculty member would **not necessarily contribute in every area every year**.

- a. Program and department, e.g., regular participation in department meetings, service on department committees, student major, minor, credential, MA, and study abroad advising; service on an MA student committee; participation in program assessment efforts; participation in and support of student organizations, student mentoring, and other student-centered activities; planning department-sponsored events; participation in recruitment and retention efforts and events; participation in commencement activities;
- b. College of HFA, e.g., service on College committees, service by dean appointment;
- c. University, e.g., participation in university committees, service as a CFA representative, service as an Academic Senator or CAB member, participation in committees of other departments;
- d. Profession, e.g., duties performed for or offices held in professional organizations; membership in professional associations; editorial services performed for professional associations and publishers;
- e. Community outreach, e.g., outreach to K-12 schools, community colleges, other CSUs, translation or interpretation, participation in community groups.

Note: Some committee appointments last more than one academic year. In such cases, the faculty member can count each year as a separate service activity.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Candidates **meet expectations** for reappointment when:

- in the first three probationary years the faculty member is solely or primarily engaged in program- and department-level service. The faculty member engages in two instances of departmental service per probationary year and may optionally engage in professional and community service activities;
- by the end of the fourth probationary year, the faculty member has served on at least one college- or university-level committee;
- by the end of the fifth probationary year, the faculty member has served on at least two college- or university-level committees *or* has additionally engaged in professional or community service.

Candidates **meet expectations** for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor when:

- the faculty member engages in two instances of departmental service for every probationary year;
- the faculty member has served on at least two college- or university-level committees;
- the faculty member has engaged in at least two instances of professional or community service.

Candidates **meet expectations** for Promotion from Associate to full Professor when:

- the faculty member consistently engages in two instances of departmental service for each subsequent year after tenure and promotion
 - the faculty member has served on three college- or university-level committees following tenure and promotion
 - the faculty member has engaged in at least three instances of professional or community service
-

B. EARLY TENURE AND PROMOTION

In order to qualify for early tenure and promotion, a faculty member must **exceed expectations** and exhibit exceptional performance in all areas of review and demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. (FPPP 10.5.3)

C. ACCELERATED PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor, a faculty member must **exceed expectations** in all three categories of evaluation, and document substantial professional recognition beyond the university itself. (FPPP 11.1.3)

D. PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member's effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to periodic evaluation. The focus of this review is the provision of developmental feedback and encouragement to maintain a positive level of performance. The process is governed by procedures outlined in FPPP 11.2.

E. THE DOSSIER (Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty)

The Dossier of tenure track and tenured faculty shall include:

1. a copy of these Department Standards;
2. a current curriculum vita (CV) as follows:
 - a. Organized in backward chronological order with the year at the left. The most recent information should appear at the top of each category.

- b. Structured by category, one for each section – Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service – and with applicable subsections therein, e.g., Courses Created Since Last Review; Publications in Print Since Last Review, etc.
- c. Titles in languages other than English should be followed by the translation in English.
- d. Include the page numbers of your articles, chapters, etc. If word count is more appropriate for a given publication, give the number of words.
- e. Use as many pages as necessary.

3. Narratives

Summaries should reference only those courses and items relevant for the current period of review.

- a. **Teaching philosophy:** A reflective statement of the candidate’s **teaching philosophy/strategies/objectives** and how these have impacted the candidate’s teaching as evidenced in classes, assignments, and other learning experiences provided for students, including goals set for students and how the candidate helps students achieve them.
- b. A **summary** and **reflective statement** on SFOTs and peer evaluations of teaching, indicating what the candidate has learned from the evaluation process and how these evaluations have resulted in changes to teaching.
- c. A **summary of scholarship/creative activity** that describes professional activities and products and contextualizes the value of the candidate’s work for an audience who may be unfamiliar with the field. In addition to the summary, include as applicable:
 - i. a list of publications, projects, and/or creative work that the candidate has authored or co-authored with a brief abstract or qualitative description of each. Indicate whether the publication is peer reviewed and contextualize the significance of the publication within the discipline and the significance of the publication venue, where relevant.
 - ii. a list of research presentations delivered at professional meetings, invited lectures, and other public presentations of work. Contextualize the significance of each presentation within the discipline.
 - iii. summary list of participation in professional conferences, panels, workshops, retreats, etc.
 - iv. evidence of public and/or official recognition of meritorious achievement in one’s area of scholarly specialization.
- d. A **summary of the candidate’s service activities**, indicating any chair, supervisory, and mentoring positions held, and a **brief (1-2 sentence)**

description of any personal contributions and accomplishments in committee service, where applicable.

4. Support Materials:

Candidates should share documentation of the activities named and discussed in their CV and narratives. The following are examples of appropriate and relevant support materials.

INSTRUCTION

All candidates should include:

- a. a **list of courses** taught at CSU, Chico during the review period, including the following information:

Course Number	Course Title	Year/Semester Taught	New Course? Y/N	Course Redesign? Y/N

- b. the most recent syllabus for each course taught and any additional syllabi that demonstrate evolution of teaching. Syllabi should include **a statement of course goals and objectives**, a calendar of assignments and tests, and an indication of how the course meets its objectives and follows disciplinary standards.
- c. representative evidence of instructional effectiveness and student learning, such as: original teaching materials; student work, projects, or assessments with instructor feedback; recognition, honors, or awards for excellence in teaching.

If applicable:

- d. evidence of contributions to curriculum development.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

As relevant: copies of or links to published work, communications with publishers, conference programs, etc.

SERVICE

Support materials shall include evidence that is **representative** of the candidate’s range of service activities **and does not need to include documentation for every activity**. Such evidence may include letters acknowledging participation in community outreach, proof of official role in professional or student organizations, examples of specific contributions to committee work, etc.

- 5. Index. FPPP 7.0.14 requires that the dossier have an index.

II. EVALUATION OF LECTURER FACULTY

The Department of Languages and Cultures recognizes that teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum and indispensable requirement for the appointment, reappointment, and range elevation of Lecturer Faculty (FPPP 9.1.2.a).

Activities that support maintaining currency in the field and service activities that contribute to the strategic plan and goals of the Department shall also optionally be documented. While evidence of disciplinary currency is not a required part of the dossier for temporary faculty, such evidence is a necessary part of the evaluation of eligible lecturer faculty for range elevation. (FPPP 12.1.2.d) The Department therefore recommends that the candidate document such activity on a regular basis.

The criteria and basis for evidentiary data for the dossier therefore include the following categories:

A. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

A1. TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Teaching effectiveness is the minimum and indispensable requirement for reappointment in the Department of Languages and Cultures. Effective teaching practices involve the creation and support of innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environments and inclusive pedagogy. Such learning environments encourage faculty-student contact, cooperation among students, respect for diversity, and active learning.

In language courses, teaching effectiveness also includes adoption of a communicative approach to language instruction. While a communicative approach can take many forms, it shares these common elements: maximum use of the target language at all levels of instruction, the provision of level-appropriate comprehensible input, and a classroom environment that is conducive to producing a low affective filter in learners.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Candidates demonstrate effective teaching through such evidence as course syllabi, samples of graded student work and teaching materials, SFOTs, peer evaluations, evidence of course revision and updates, examples of inclusive pedagogy, contributions to improving graduation rates, and through narratives in the Dossier. SFOT data will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness. Using this evidence, the committee will assess the degree to which the candidate has supported and contributed to student learning in the context of their teaching assignment and the department mission.

Candidate performance will be deemed **satisfactory** based on:

- a satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy that aligns with the mission and objectives of the department;
- syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student expectations;

- sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching, appropriate feedback, and student learning;
- evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness;
- SFOT scores of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses. Patterns of SFOT scores below 4.0 and patterns of student suggestions for improvement to teaching are addressed in the narrative and the candidate offers a plan for improvement to instruction in these areas.
- satisfactory peer evaluations of instruction. Peer suggestions for improvement are addressed in the narrative and the candidate offers a plan for improvement to instruction in mentioned area(s).

A2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT TO DEMONSTRATE CURRENCY IN THE FIELD (optional)

All activities listed above under part I.A2. *Professional Growth and Achievement* for tenure track and tenured faculty are evidence of currency in the field. In general, the Department adheres to and supports the following: “A variety of means may be used to support currency, including, but not limited to, continued education, research (broadly defined, including applied research in education), scholarship, and other creative and professional activities. Expectations for activities supporting currency must be consistent with the candidate’s *Range* classification and responsibilities.” (FPPP, 9.1.2.c.3)

A3. SERVICE (optional)

The Department fully embraces the idea that any faculty member shall become part of and enhance our teaching and learning community, not only through instruction but also through service in the area of languages, linguistics, literatures, and cultures. Evidence for this category includes any contributions to the Strategic Plan and Goals of the Department. “Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, and civic engagement, and service to the North State” (FPPP, 9.1.2c.4)

B. RANGE ELEVATION

Lecturer faculty are strongly urged to read FPPP 12.0 before applying for Range Elevation and to consult with the department chair and/or members of the department personnel committee. Criteria for range elevation include professional growth and development which in Lecturer range is defined as “*teaching excellence* and *maintaining currency in the field*.”

FPPP 12.1.2.d.1 stipulates that “accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered ‘teaching excellence’ sufficient for *range* elevation.” **Teaching excellence** for the purposes of range elevation shall be determined based on the following criteria:

- a satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy that aligns with the mission and objectives of the department and demonstrates an understanding of the particular needs of our student population;
- syllabi that clearly communicate learning objectives and student expectations;
- sample teaching materials and/or graded student work that demonstrate effective teaching, appropriate feedback, student learning, and the achievement of course goals;
- SFOT scores of 4.0 or above in the majority of categories across courses;
- satisfactory peer evaluations of instruction;
- evidence of ongoing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness.

Candidates for range elevation must also document **professional growth and development to demonstrate currency in the field**. FPPP 9.1.2.c.3 stipulates: “A variety of means may be used to support currency, including, but not limited to, continued education, research (broadly defined, including applied research in education), scholarship, and other creative and professional activities.” Examples of such documentation are provided below in the dossier description for lecturer faculty.

C. THE DOSSIER (Lecturer Faculty)

The Dossier of lecturer faculty shall include:

1. a copy of these Department Standards
2. a current curriculum vita (CV)
3. narratives

Narratives should reference only those courses and items relevant for the current period of review.

- a. **Teaching philosophy:** A reflective statement of the candidate’s **teaching philosophy/ strategies/objectives** and how these have impacted the candidate’s teaching as evidenced in classes, assignments, and other learning experiences provided for students, including goals set for students and how the candidate helps students achieve them.
- b. A **summary** and **reflective statement** on SFOTs and peer evaluations of teaching, indicating what the candidate has learned from the evaluation process and how these evaluations have resulted in changes to teaching.

4. Support Materials:

Candidates should share documentation of the activities named and discussed in their CV and narratives. The following are examples of appropriate and relevant support materials.

INSTRUCTION

All candidates should include:

- a. a **list of courses** taught at CSU, Chico during the review period, including the following information:

Course Number	Course Title	Year/Semester Taught	New Course? Y/N	Course Redesign? Y/N

- b. the most recent syllabus for each course taught and any additional syllabi that demonstrate evolution of teaching. Syllabi should include a **statement of course goals and objectives**, a calendar of assignments and tests, and an indication of how the course meets its objectives and follows disciplinary standards.
- c. representative evidence of instructional effectiveness and student learning, such as: original teaching materials; student work, projects, or assessments with instructor feedback; recognition, honors, or awards for excellence in teaching.

If applicable:

- d. evidence of contributions to curriculum development.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT TO DEMONSTRATE CURRENCY IN THE FIELD (optional for RTP review, but required for range elevation)

Candidates should document their engagement in the discipline beyond the classroom, contextualizing their work for an audience who may be unfamiliar with the field. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to:

- completing additional graduate coursework in the field, including the pursuit of a terminal degree (not required, but is considered for range elevation);
- publishing in recognized local, state, national, international, or online venues in the candidate's area of specialization;
- presenting research at local, state, national, or international professional meetings, invited lectures, performances of creative work, and other public presentations of work;
- attending or leading professional development programs related to the candidate's teaching assignment;
- extending one's professional knowledge by attending conferences, workshops, panels, retreats, webinars, seminars, or courses;
- active membership in professional organizations, subscriptions to relevant publications.

Appropriate consideration shall be given to the extent of the lecturer appointment and the availability of department support for professional growth and development.

SERVICE (optional)

Candidates may document their contributions, via service, mentoring, advising, outreach, recruitment, event planning, service on MA thesis or exam committees, etc., and contextualize the relevance of these activities to work assignment(s) and role(s) in the Department of Languages and Cultures.

See above I.A3. *Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community* for examples of activities that belong in this category.

5. Index. FPPP 7.0.14 requires that the dossier have an index.



Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

- a) Department votes, if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review and approval;
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean approved Word document to OAPL via email for review;
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the dean, then forwards OAPL approved document to Provost for approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns approved document to OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footnote to page 1 of the document:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Standard for signatures via Adobe Sign,
 - b. Uploads document to OAPL Department Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to OAPL website location.

Approvals:

Chair/Director: <u>Christine Goulding</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Dean: <u>Tracy Burt</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
OAPL: <u>Mahalley D. Allen</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: Sept. 1, 2022

TO: Christine Goulding, Department Chair

CC: Tracy Butts, Dean

FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of LANC Department RTP Standards

Thank you for submitting revised department RTP standards incorporating the [three new evaluation ratings](#) in each area of faculty performance.

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

- Provide a definition of the period of review pertinent to the dossier and the evaluators' review or refer to the appropriate section of the FPPP. Include how service credit is being handled in the review.
- Provide information (membership, procedures, confidentiality, etc.) about the department personnel committee.
- Provide a definition for the word "satisfactory." For example, what features are you looking for in a statement of teaching philosophy that would characterize the word satisfactory?
- Strengthen the criteria for meeting expectations for associate to full.
- Provide criteria for exceed expectations and for does not meet.
- Document does not specify the ratings required in each area for tenure and/or promotion. Same comment for lecturers.
- Miscellaneous comments are provided to improve the document.

Based on our review of recently submitted department standards, we offer these general observations, which we highly recommend departments consider as they work on revising their provisionally approved standards.

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding

expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.
4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

Our office will route for signatures your provisionally approved department standards in Adobe Sign and will post them to the [Department Standards page](#). You may now provide these provisionally approved standards to faculty in your department.