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I. STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY

A. Scope:
This document establishes policies and procedures that govern (a) preparation and approval of faculty developmental narratives, (b) retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, (c) early promotion and tenure, and (d) the promotion of tenured faculty. All phases of the RTP process support faculty growth and development as well as serve as the formal means of evaluation. The policies and procedures of this document are subject to Board of Trustees policies; the California Administrative Code; the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement; and other applicable State and federal laws. Throughout this document the word “shall” indicates mandatory action; the word “may” indicates permissible action.

B. Reference to UPS 210.000

This document is understood to incorporate UPS 210.000.

C. Developmental Narratives and Portfolio.

Each faculty member, when being recommended for any personnel action, shall prepare a Portfolio. Newly appointed probationary faculty members shall also prepare Developmental Narratives during their initial year. The department shall designate at least one tenured faculty member to serve as mentor(s) for each new probationary faculty member. (See section II, p. 14) The mentor(s) will provide guidance and advice in preparing the Developmental Narratives.

1. The Developmental Narratives:

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty shall write prospective developmental narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments (s)he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated relative to the approved department standards and UPS 210.000. These narratives will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the department chair and the dean, who will each provide written feedback. The College Dean will specify a deadline for the faculty member to submit the Developmental Narratives and a timeline for feedback from the department chair and dean, with the entire process to be completed by May 1 of the faculty member’s first probationary year. These developmental narratives shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for
retention review during the second year in the tenure-track position.

During subsequent years, the developmental narratives may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

2. The Portfolio:

UPS 210.000 establishes three categories in which a candidate for retention, tenure and promotion is to be evaluated: (1) teaching performance, (2) scholarship and creative activities, and (3) professional, university and community service. The Portfolio shall include a concise self-assessment of accomplishments in each of these three areas of performance in relation to the approved department standards and UPS 210.000. The self-assessment narratives shall not exceed 1000 words for each area. The materials to be included in the Portfolio are specified in UPS 210.000. An appendix shall contain all other supporting materials. The Portfolio is the faculty member’s cumulative and representative documentation of his/her performance in these three areas of evaluation and is the basis on which evaluations, recommendations, and actions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion are made. The Portfolio is submitted per UPS 210.000 timelines.

The following standards apply to the Portfolio and are in accordance with the requirements of UPS 210.000, the entire text of which, in the most recent version, is considered part of these standards. Any faculty member under consideration for personnel action shall read and understand UPS 210.000 thoroughly. Any questions regarding these procedures should be addressed to the Chair and Faculty Mentor(s).

These personnel standards describe all indicators and criteria on which the portfolio shall be evaluated, thus assuring the impartial application of uniform standards to all faculty. The standards provide a context for evaluation and interpretation of data and summary statements for subsequent levels of review.

The current document specifies minimum performance standards for retention, tenure, and promotion. Beyond these minimum standards, quality of performance in the various categories is more important than the number of entries under each category. The DPC evaluates each candidate’s performance for the information of the candidate and for subsequent levels of review in the personnel process.

D. Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty

All levels of review evaluate the Portfolio of tenured and tenure-track faculty in each of the three areas, teaching performance, scholarly and creative accomplishments and professional/service activities, according to the standards established for the personnel action under consideration, and present an overall
rating of “superior,” “good,” or “unsatisfactory.” See attached Department of Modern Languages and Literatures Composite Evaluation Checklist.

1. Retention

Retention of probationary faculty is based on demonstrated progress toward tenure as judged in relation to the approved Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000. A probationary faculty member must show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of assessment. An “unsatisfactory” rating in Teaching for any review cycle during the probationary period shall be a basis not to recommend retention. An “unsatisfactory” rating in two successive review cycles during the probationary period in Scholarly/Creative Activities shall be a basis not to recommend retention. An “unsatisfactory” rating in two successive review cycles during the probationary period in Professional / University / Community Service shall be a basis not to recommend retention. The probationary faculty member must explicitly address any weaknesses identified in earlier review cycles and show appropriate improvement in those areas. The decision to retain (reappoint) a probationary faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

2. Tenure

Probationary faculty who have met the standards of UPS 210.000 and each of the approved department standards and who receive a “good” or “superior” rating in the three areas of assessment are eligible to be recommended for tenure, normally during their sixth probationary year, for tenure to become effective at the beginning of the seventh year of service, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed.

3. Promotion

A probationary faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate Professor and shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time that (s)he is considered for tenure. Promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally be considered during his or her fifth year in rank, with promotion effective at the beginning of the sixth year. An associate professor who has met the standards of UPS 210.000 and the approved department standards and receives an overall “good” or “superior” rating in each of the three areas of assessment shall be promoted to professor.

4. Early Tenure

Probationary faculty members may be granted tenure at any time after the first year of appointment. Early Tenure during the probationary period requires
that all the standards of UPS 210.000 and the approved Department Personnel Standards for tenure have been met and that standards in all three areas of performance have been exceeded, as indicated by a rating of “superior” in all three areas.

5. Early Promotion to Associate Professor,

Early Promotion to Associate Professor during the probationary period requires that all the standards of UPS 210.000 and the approved Department Personnel Standards for promotion have been met and that standards in Teaching and one other area of performance have been exceeded, as indicated by a rating of “superior” in those areas. The remaining area of performance shall not be rated lower than “good.” Promotion effective prior to having completed five years in rank, including service credit, shall be defined as “early.”

6. Early Promotion to Professor

Early Promotion to Professor during the probationary period requires that all the standards of UPS 210.000 and the approved Department Personnel Standards for promotion have been met and that standards in teaching and one other area of performance have been exceeded, as indicated by a rating of “superior” in those areas. The remaining area of performance shall not be rated lower than “good.” Promotion consideration effective prior to having completed four years in rank, including service credit, shall be defined as “early.”

E. Criteria for ratings of “Superior,” “Good,” or “ Unsatisfactory”

A faculty member being recommended for tenure and/or promotion must show appropriate accomplishments, growth and potential in each of the three areas of assessment.

1. Teaching Performance:

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures reaffirms that teaching performance at all levels must be of continuously high quality and is the most important criterion to be considered in evaluating a faculty member. Evidence of this performance must be documented by (1) the teaching narrative, (2) regularly administered and approved uniform student opinion forms (see attached sample), (3) statements of evaluation made by members of the DPC after class visitations (see attached classroom observation form) and (4) other supporting documents and materials in the appendix that give evidence of contributions toward teaching performance. Based on an assessment of these areas, the Departmental Personnel Committee will reach an overall assessment of teaching. The assessment will be expressed in terms of “superior,” “good,” “unsatisfactory.”

(a) Teaching Performance Indicators
(i) The Self-Assessment Teaching Narrative

The self-assessment teaching narrative shall be 1000 words or less and shall contain an assessment of the instructor’s teaching by discussing

- pedagogical approach and methods, expectations regarding student achievement,
- the courses taught and accompanying mean student evaluations for the period of review,
- student response to instruction,
- an explanation or rebuttal of negative comments,
- grade distribution summaries,
- ongoing professional development as a teacher,
- ongoing professional development in the discipline,
- other teaching activities and their value,
- plans for future teaching activities.

If service credit years were granted, the self-assessment teaching narrative shall also address teaching performance during that period.

(ii) Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Forms

Statistical summaries of the student opinion forms shall be based on the instructor’s mean evaluation for the period under evaluation. All tenured and tenure-track faculty student opinion forms shall be processed and statistically analyzed separately from part-time faculty evaluations. The DPC may make comparative observations about the highest and lowest semester mean of the individual faculty member as well as compare the individual faculty member’s mean with the departmental mean for tenured and tenure-track faculty. They may also make observations about the level taught, the frequency of teaching particular courses, and the relationship of the courses to the instructor’s primary field.

Overall Teaching Performance shall be rated as “unsatisfactory” if the statistical summaries of student opinion forms have an “unsatisfactory” rating. Standards for the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures for statistical summaries of student opinion forms are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>(3.50 to 4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>(2.9 to 3.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>(0.0 to 2.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) Student Comments:

A written composite evaluation shall be made by the DPC after reading all student comments. The predominant tone of the comments shall be the determining factor in assigning a “superior,” “good,” or “unsatisfactory” rating to this area.

(iv) Peer Evaluations:

Peer evaluations shall be based on ratings completed by DPC members, or colleagues designated by the DPC, on the basis of unannounced class visitations (see attached classroom observation form). New faculty members shall be visited at least once a semester in classes and at times determined by the DPC until they have been granted tenure. When a tenured faculty member is being evaluated for recommendation for promotion, (s)he shall be visited by a member of the DPC or a designee at least one time during the review period in a class and at a time to be determined by the DPC. In addition, the faculty member may choose to include one or more additional evaluations by one or more colleagues of his/her choice. Such evaluations shall be written on approved classroom observation forms. A rating of “superior,” “good,” or “unsatisfactory” will be assigned by the peer evaluator based on the following criteria:

- Superior: Demonstrates most or all of the activities listed on the classroom observation form as appropriate to the class(es) observed
- Good: Demonstrates some or many of the activities listed on the classroom observation form as appropriate to the class(es) observed
- Unsatisfactory: Demonstrates few or none of the activities listed on the classroom observation form in the class(es) observed

(v) Other Supporting Documents and Materials:

Syllabi for each separate course taught during the period of review, including any service credit years, shall be included. Other documents and materials which may be submitted as evidence of contributions toward teaching performance may include class handouts, project assignments, and tests. Further possible materials are reports of peer collaboration, signed unsolicited letters from students and colleagues, classroom-oriented materials, computer applications to teaching, curriculum development materials, and evidence of attendance at conferences which can enhance teaching. The overall assessment of the quality of submitted materials will be expressed in terms of “superior,” “good,” or “unsatisfactory.”

(b) Requirements for Retention:
In order to be retained, candidates shall achieve an overall rating of “superior” or “good” in the area of Teaching in every review cycle.

(c) Requirements for Tenure and Promotion:

In order to be tenured and/or promoted, candidates shall achieve an overall rating of “superior” or “good” in the area of Teaching.

2. Scholarly and Creative Activities:

A successful faculty member shall establish a record of appropriate scholarly/creative accomplishments and activities. Quality is a more important consideration than quantity. The Portfolio shall include a detailed “Scholarly and Creative Activities Narrative” and documentation of scholarship in an appendix.

The Scholarly/Creative Activities Narrative shall describe in no more than 1000 words the faculty member’s research for the period under review including research focus, agenda, timelines, and accomplishments. It shall:

- describe (in English) the content of each work (this is of particular importance for works published or presented in a modern language);
- describe the significance of each work;
- distinguish between peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed works;
- describe the peer-review process for each peer-reviewed publication or presentation.

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures requires documentation of Scholarly/Creative activities to be filed in the Appendix. For each work, include 1) a cover sheet identifying the basic characteristics of the work, e.g., the title, the publisher, the month and year of publication, whether the work is co-authored, what percentage the candidate produced, and a brief summary, especially if the work is not in English (See attached cover sheet.); 2) a copy of the scholarly/creative work (or final version/galley proofs of the work); 3) documentation of the peer review process (e.g., copies of letters of acceptance with expected date of publication [if the work is not yet published], letter from the editorial review board, a description of the review process, the ratio of articles submitted and articles published, a copy of a book review which assesses the work, critiques by reviewers, descriptive entries from relevant indexes and directories such as the MLA Directory of Scholarly Presses, the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, the ERIC Database [clearly distinguishing between non-peer-reviewed “ED” and peer-reviewed “EJ” entries], journal websites describing the editorial process, etc.)
(a) Scholarly/Creative Activity Indicators:

(i) Published Works:

- Books published (or accepted for publication without further revisions with galley proofs and letters from the publisher indicating date of publication)
- Journal articles published (or accepted for publication without further revisions with a letter from the editor indicating publication date)
- Book chapters published (or accepted for publication without further revisions with a letter from the editor indicating publication date)
- Creative works published (or accepted for publication without further revisions with a letter from the editor indicating publication date)
- Multi-media works (e.g. computer software, CD ROMs, web sites, etc.)
- Ancillaries (e.g. Teacher’s Guides, Videos, etc.)
- Published conference proceedings
- Translations or critical editions published
- Interviews published
- Published results of research grants
- Copies of letters of acceptance for completed works that are “in press” or otherwise in the process of publication.
- Other significant published accomplishments

(ii) Other Accomplishments:

- Papers accepted by peer review for presentation at professional meetings
- Book reviews
- Invited lectures
- Outlines, handouts, and/or scripts of conference presentations
- Works in progress
- Exhibits, recitals, and/or performances
- Research grants awarded
- Other significant non-publication accomplishments

(b) Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Accomplishments:
Each scholarly and creative accomplishment shall be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee and categorized according to one of the following types: “A,” “B,” or “C.” This evaluation shall be based on one or more of the following criteria:

- selectiveness of the peer-review process;
- quality and originality of content;
- length and/or scope of accomplishment.

A successful faculty member shall establish a record of appropriate scholarly/creative accomplishments and activities. Quality is a more important consideration than quantity.

The following examples represent typical accomplishments of the three types: “A,” “B,” and “C.”

- “A”: An article or book chapter published in a selective, peer-reviewed publication; a peer-reviewed book (including a textbook that makes an original contribution to the field) published by a reputable press; a software program produced by a reputable company.
- “B”: A publication in a peer-reviewed venue of local or regional importance; a peer-reviewed conference paper (with full text); a textbook ancillary.
- “C”: A peer-reviewed article, chapter, or book accepted for publication (with accompanying letter of acceptance), a non-peer reviewed article; a local conference paper; an invited lecture; a recital.

(c) Requirements for Retention:

In order to be retained, candidates shall not achieve a rating of “unsatisfactory” in the area of Scholarly/Creative Activities in any two successive review cycles. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- “Superior:” Candidate exceeds expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.
- “Good:” Candidate meets expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.
- “Unsatisfactory:” Candidate does not meet expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.”

(d) Requirements for Tenure and Promotion:

(i) Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:
In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must achieve a rating of at least “Good” in the area of Scholarly/Creative Activities. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- “Superior:” Five accomplishments, of which three must be “A” and two others must be at least “B.”
- “Good:” Four accomplishments, of which two must be “A” and one other must be at least “B.”
- “Unsatisfactory:” Any performance that falls below the minimal requirements for “Good.”

(ii) Requirements for Promotion to Professor:

In order to be recommended for promotion to Full Professor, candidates must achieve a rating of at least “good” in the area of Scholarly/Creative Activities completed since appointment to Associate Professor. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- “Superior:” Five accomplishments, of which three must be “A” and two others must be at least “B.”
- “Good:” Four accomplishments, of which two must be “A” and one other must be at least “B.”
- “Unsatisfactory:” Any performance that falls below the minimal requirements for “good.”

3. Professional, University and Community Service:

A successful faculty member shall establish a record of appropriate professional and service activities. The activities documented in this area shall contribute to the faculty member’s professional objectives and growth as well as to the needs of the profession, the community or the University. The portfolio shall include a detailed “Professional Service / University and Community Service Activities Narrative” which shall describe in no more than 1000 words the faculty member’s activities in this category for the period under review.

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures requires documentation in the appendix of both professional activities and service to the department, university and community through appropriate means (certifications of honors or awards received, nomination letters, membership certificates, lecture invitations, minutes of significant meetings attended, verified list of committee service to department and university, etc).

(e) Indicators of Professional Service / University and Community Service Activities:
The faculty member’s performance in the area of professional and service activities shall be measured by a number of indicators, listed below in two categories: “professional service” and “university and community service”. The following indicators in each category are ranked by weight of importance, starting with the most important.

(i) Professional Service Indicators

- Receipt of professional awards or honors
- Positions of leadership in professional activities (e.g., coordinating programs, chairing committees, organizing symposia and/or conferences, etc.)
- Holding office in international, national, regional and/or local, professional organizations
- Reviewer for a professional journal or publisher
- Involvement in a professional capacity with civic organizations
- Membership in international, national, regional and/or local organizations, with regular attendance at meetings.
- Other significant professional service

(ii) University and Community Service Indicators:

- Positions of leadership in service activities (e.g., coordinating programs, chairing committees, organizing symposia and/or conferences, etc.)
- Service on College or University Committees
- Receipt of service awards or honors
- Service as mentor for probationary faculty members
- Lectures and addresses given to University and public groups
- Sponsorship and advisement to organized student or civic groups
- Service on Department committees
- Other significant university or community service
- Regular attendance at departmental meetings, program meetings, and departmental functions, as well as Commencement and Department sponsored activities.

(f) Evaluation of Professional Service / University and Community Service Activities Indicators:

Each Professional Service and University / Community Service activity shall be evaluated by the DPC in terms of its significance and scope and
placed in one of the following types: “A,” “B,” or “C.” The following examples represent typical accomplishments of the three types: “A,” “B,” or “C.”

In the area of Professional Service activities:

- **“A”:** National or international professional honor or award; office held in a national or international professional organization; organization/chairing of a session at a national or international professional meeting;
- **“B”:** Regional or local professional honor or award; office held in a regional or local professional organization; organization/chairing of a session at a local or regional professional meeting; record of regular attendance at meetings of professional organizations;
- **“C”:** Record of occasional attendance at meetings of professional organizations or events; membership in professional organizations.

In the area of University and Community Service activities:

- **“A”:** Assuming leadership roles at the department, college, or university level; service on a college or university committee; symposium or conference organizer; program coordinator; strong record of involvement in or sponsorship of community or student activities; record of extensive professional involvement with civic organizations.
- **“B”:** Service on department committees; presentations for campus, student, or other organizations; strong record of attendance at department faculty and committee meetings; faculty or student mentoring; record of professional involvement with civic organizations.
- **“C”:** Attendance at convocations, commencements, student activities, and events; on-campus symposia attendance; attendance at civic functions.

(g) Requirements for Retention:

In order to be retained, candidates shall not achieve a rating of “unsatisfactory” in the area of Professional, University, and Community Service in any two successive review cycles. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- **“Superior:”** Candidate exceeds expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.
- **“Good:”** Candidate meets expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.
- **“Unsatisfactory:”** Candidate does not meet expectations of cumulative progress toward a positive tenure decision.
(h) Requirements for Tenure and Promotion:

(i) Requirements for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must achieve a rating of at least “good” in the area of Professional/Service Activities. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- “Superior”: at least four indicators, encompassing both Professional Service and University / Community Service activities, are required, at least one of which shall be of type “A” and three others of at least type “B.”
- “Good”: at least three indicators, encompassing both Professional Service and University / Community Service activities, are required, which shall be of type “A” or “B.”
- “Unsatisfactory”: any performance that falls below the minimal requirement of “good.”

(ii) Requirements for promotion to Professor:

A greater emphasis is placed on service and demonstration of leadership qualities for promotion to full professorship than at lower ranks, where more emphasis is placed on teaching and scholarly performance.

In order to be recommended for promotion to full professor, candidates must achieve a rating of at least “good” in the area of Professional Service and University / Community Service activities accomplished since appointment to Associate Professor. The quality of the performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- “Superior”: at least five indicators, encompassing both Professional Service and University / Community Service activities are required, at least two of which shall be of type “A” and three others of at least type “B”.
- “Good”: at least four indicators, encompassing both Professional Service and University / Community Service activities, are required, all of which shall be of type “A” or “B”
- “Unsatisfactory”: any performance that falls below the minimal requirement of good.

II. SELECTION AND ROLE OF THE FACULTY MENTOR(S)

A. Selection of the Faculty Mentor(s)

1. The department chair will assign at least one tenured faculty member to consult with each new probationary faculty member. The process for the selection of a faculty member shall be in accordance with the guidelines
established in UPS 210.000. At any time subsequent to the designation of the faculty mentor(s), the probationary faculty member may request the department chair to make a change of assignment.

B. Role of the Faculty Mentor(s)
   1. The primary role of the mentor(s) is to provide guidance, advice and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation and revision of the Developmental Narratives. The mentor(s) and the probationary faculty member shall meet periodically during the first semester of the probationary faculty member’s first year to draft a Developmental Narratives and thereafter until tenure is obtained.

III. CONSTITUTION AND PROCEDURES OF THE DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (DPC)

   A. Election of the DPC
      1. The DPC shall be elected during the annual election cycle held in the spring.

   B. Make-up of the DPC
      1. The DPC shall consist of 5 members and 2 alternates, elected from among the tenured faculty of the department. If possible, three or more language areas (including TESOL) will be represented.

   C. Responsibilities of the DPC in the RTP process
      1. To review and evaluate in writing the Portfolio of each faculty member to be considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. In this evaluation, the DPC shall comment upon the candidate’s qualifications under each of the categories of evaluation relative to the approved department standards and UPS 210.000. The evaluation report shall incorporate a discussion of all points of view held by members of the committee.

      2. To receive and review the chair’s evaluation.

      3. To formulate a recommendation stating in writing the reasons for the recommendation. The evaluation report and the recommendation report shall be approved by a simple majority vote of the DPC and signed by all members of the DPC. The vote tabulation shall be recorded on the recommendation form.

      4. To sign the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of the signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.

      5. To return the entire file, including the evaluation and recommendation, to the chair.

      6. To meet and confer with the relevant committee if different recommendations occur.