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DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
Ad Hoc Committee on Department Personnel Standards  

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS  
2/10/17  

I. Preparation of the Prospectus, the Portfolio, and its Appendices  

During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write prospective developmental narratives for Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives, which comprise the Prospectus (UPS 210.000, III.A), shall describe the faculty member's professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and accomplishments the faculty member expects to achieve in each of the three areas in order to meet the requirements of these Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, who will each provide feedback on a timetable to be determined by the Dean, with a final draft to be completed prior to May 1. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member's Portfolio that is submitted for retention reviews during the second and subsequent years in the tenure-track position. The Department shall assist probationary faculty members in the preparation of a Prospectus that meets the standards and provisions set out in this document and UPS 210.000. Specifically, the Department Chair, in consultation with the probationary faculty member, shall provide guidance, advice, and support for the faculty member during the probationary period, especially in terms of preparing the Prospectus. The Department Chair may appoint a mentor at any time that the probationary faculty member makes such a request.  

The Prospectus will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean as provided for in UPS 210.000. The probationary faculty member may revise the Prospectus in response to comments from any of those who evaluate it, and to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.  

For those faculty who have an approved Prospectus, progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion will be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Standards (UPS 210.000, IV.A-K).  

The Portfolio and its Appendices are the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File. They are a cumulative record that shall contain evidence of performance specified in Sections III, IV, and V of this document, for all of the years under review, and various forms. The Portfolio and its Appendices are compiled by the faculty member to be evaluated. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be sure the Portfolio and its Appendices are current and complete before they are submitted to the Department Chair or Dean. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review.
II. Recommendations in the RTP Process

A. To be recommended for retention during the probationary period, a Candidate must receive at least a "Meet Expectations" rating in all three broad evaluative categories described in this document: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service to the Department and University, to the Profession, and the Community.

B. To be recommended for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a Candidate must be rated as at least "Meets Expectations" in all three evaluative categories.

C. To be recommended for early tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a Candidate must be rated "Exceeds Expectations" in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activities, and at least "Meets Expectations" in Service to the Department and University, to the Profession, and the Community.

D. To be recommended for promotion to Professor, a Candidate must be rated at least "Meets Expectations" in all three evaluative categories.

E. To be recommended for early promotion to Professor, a Candidate must be rated "Exceeds Expectations" in all three evaluative categories.

F. Full Performance Reviews and Abbreviated Reviews will take place according to the cycles set forth in UPS 210.000, I.K.

III. Teaching

A. The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures reaffirms that teaching performance at all levels must be of continuously high quality. Best teaching practices include setting clear course goals and objectives, presenting course materials clearly and in a well-organized manner, establishing and maintaining a supportive and constructive learning environment in the classroom, and providing regular and helpful feedback on examinations, paper drafts, revisions, and class participation.

B. Evidence of this performance must be documented by (i) a Self-Assessment Teaching Narrative and the following Teaching Performance Indicators: (ii) a list of courses taught and accompanying means of the student evaluations for the review period, (iii) regularly administered and approved uniform Student Opinion Questionnaires (see attached sample), (iv) grade distribution summaries, (v) statements of evaluation made by members of the DPC or their designees after class visitations (see attached classroom observation form), and (vi) other supporting documents and materials in the appendix that give evidence of 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 "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets
Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” (see III.D.1-3 in this doc-
ument).

C. Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance and Teaching Performance Indi-
cators

1. Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance

The Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance shall be 1000 words or
less and shall contain an assessment of the instructor's teaching by discuss-
ing:

a. pedagogical approach and methods.

b. expectations regarding student achievement.

c. number and nature of courses taught.

d. student response to instruction.

e. an explanation or rebuttal of negative comments.

f. grade distributions of courses taught, commenting on the range of grades
with regard to the level and/or type of instruction (undergraduate, gradu-
ate, internship, etc.).

g. ongoing professional development as a teacher.

h. ongoing professional development in the discipline.

i. other teaching activities and their value.

j. plans for future teaching activities.

If service credit years were granted, the self-assessment teaching narrative
shall also address teaching performance during that period. The DPC may
holistically evaluate the narrative for completeness and persuasiveness.

2. Summary of list of courses taught

Courses and their accompanying means shall be listed for the designated re-
view period. The DPC may make a statement summarizing the number and
variety of courses taught during the review period.

3. Student Opinion Questionnaires

Statistical Summaries of Student Opinion Questionnaires
Statistical summaries of the student opinion questionnaires shall be based on the instructor's mean evaluation for the period under evaluation. Different forms will be used for supervision courses. All tenured and tenure-track faculty student opinion questionnaires 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(s) taught, the frequency of teaching particular courses, and the relationship of the courses to the instructor's primary field.

Statistical summaries shall be rated according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Mean of courses taught during review cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>2.90-3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet Expectations</td>
<td>0.00-2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Student Comments on Student Opinion Questionnaires

A written evaluation of student comments shall be made by the DPC.

The DPC shall consider the mean of courses taught during the review cycle as well as the predominant tone of the comments to assign a rating of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," or "Does Not Meet Expectations" to the Student Opinion Questionnaires.

5. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions

The Candidate shall comment in the teaching narrative on the distribution of grades assigned to students. The DPC may comment on whether or not the grade distributions appear to be appropriate depending upon the level and types of courses that have been taught.

6. Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations shall be based on ratings completed by DPC members, or colleagues designated by the DPC on the basis of class visitations (see attached classroom observation form). Faculty members to be observed shall be provided a notice of a three-week time frame during which the class visitation is to take place. This notice shall be provided at least five business days prior to the first day of the three-week time frame. There shall be consultation between the faculty member to be evaluated and the colleague visiting his/her class to determine dates within the three-week time frame on which
instruction will be taking place (as opposed to exams, student presentations, etc). Probationary faculty members shall be visited at least once a semester in their classes during the first two years and then at least once a year thereafter until they have been granted tenure, unless more visits are deemed necessary by the DPC. In subsequent years, the annual observation is to take place in the fall. 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 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 “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” will be assigned by the peer evaluator based on the following criteria:

a. “Exceeds Expectations”: Demonstrates most or all of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form as appropriate to the class(es) observed.

b. “Meets Expectations”: Demonstrates some or many of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form as appropriate to the class(es) observed.

c. “Does Not Meet Expectations”: Demonstrates few or none of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form in the class(es) observed.

7. 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 that may be submitted as evidence of contributions toward teaching performance may include:

a. Class handouts or exercises.

b. Project assignments.

c. Quizzes and/or tests.

d. Computer applications to teaching such as websites, CD-ROMS, PowerPoint presentations, multimedia projects, online course development, etc.

e. Curriculum development materials.

f. Grant proposals designed to develop or revise courses.

g. Evidence of attendance at workshops, conferences, symposia, or the like, to enhance teaching and/or assessment.

h. Reports of team-teaching or interdisciplinary collaborative teaching pro-
jects.

i. Course readers or anthologies designed for classroom use.

j. Service-learning assignments.

k. Unsolicited correspondence from students and colleagues.

The DPC's overall assessment of the quality of submitted materials will be expressed in terms of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," or "Does Not Meet Expectations."

D. Evaluation of Teaching

Method of Assessment: In determining a Candidate's effectiveness in Teaching, the DPC shall rate the evidence presented in the Teaching section of the Portfolio with the following ratings:

1. A Candidate for Retention shall be rated as:

   a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in the category of Student Opinion Questionnaires and one of the following: Peer Evaluations or Supporting Documents and Materials. The remaining category must be rated at least "Meets Expectations."

   b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated at least as "Meets Expectations" in the categories of Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and Supporting Documents and Materials.

   c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one or more of the categories: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, or Supporting Documents and Materials.

2. A Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor shall be rated as:

   a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in the category of Student Opinion Questionnaires and one of the following: Peer Evaluations or Supporting Documents and Materials. The remaining category must be rated at least "Meets Expectations."

   b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated at least as "Meets Expectations" in the categories of Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and Supporting Documents and Materials.

   c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one or more of the categories: Student
Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, or Supporting Document and Materials.

3. A Candidate for Promotion to Professor shall be rated as:

   a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the Candidate has been rated as “Exceeds Expectations” in the category of Student Opinion Questionnaires and one of the following: Peer Evaluations or Supporting Documents and Materials. The remaining category must be rated at least “Meets Expectations.”

   b. “Meets Expectations” when the Candidate has been rated at least as “Meets Expectations” in the categories of Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and Supporting Documents and Materials.

   c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the Candidate has been rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or more of the categories: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, or Supporting Documents and Materials.

IV. Scholarly and Creative Activities

A. Expectations: Scholarship is a fundamental and necessary component of ongoing faculty intellectual development. Through engaging in scholarly and creative activities, faculty members create new knowledge and enhance their research and analytical skills. Research also is a means by which faculty members remain current with the literature in their field, thereby enhancing teaching and learning. Because the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures recognizes the importance of scholarship, it expects all Candidates seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion to offer evidence of ongoing scholarly and creative activities that periodically yield published results. Additionally, the Department expects faculty members to have an active research agenda that may include application for research grants, publication of book reviews, and scholarly presentations, including papers, posters, and/or participation in panels at professional conferences.

B. Definitions

1. “Scholarly works” shall be defined as (but are not limited to) monographs, first editions of textbooks, subsequent editions containing substantial revisions, articles, book chapters, co-edited or edited books or series, contributions to edited collections, anthologies, or peer-reviewed conference proceedings, substantial review essays, translations of critical and/or expository works by other authors, CD-ROMs, websites, museum exhibits and accompanying catalogs, documentary films, and the end products of field work projects.

2. “Monograph” shall be defined as a book-length scholarly work, including authored and co-authored books.
3. "Creative works" shall be defined as (but are not limited to) novels, stories, poems, plays, and translations of creative works by other authors.

4. Book-length volumes of creative works can be considered equivalent to scholarly monographs.

5. "Peer review" shall be defined as pre-publication review by referees who are specialists in the field.

6. "Peer-reviewed publications" shall be defined as scholarly and/or creative works that are published in either printed or electronic form by reputable academic or literary publishers, or under the auspices of recognized academic or cultural organizations.

7. "In press" shall be defined as a scholarly and/or creative work in the final stages of editing and production.

C. Evidence of Research and Creative Activities may include but is not limited to documentation of the following accomplishments:

1. Publications

   a. Copies of peer-reviewed publications. Candidates must provide evidence of peer review for each publication included in the Appendices of the Portfolio. In cases where publications are accepted, Candidates must include documentation attesting to the fact that final revisions have been accepted with no further revisions (i.e. correspondence from editors and/or publishers, copies of galley proofs, etc.).

   b. Copies of peer-reviewed scholarly and/or creative works that have been provisionally accepted for publication. Candidates must provide evidence of acceptance in the form of copies of contracts and/or correspondence from editors and/or publishers attesting to the fact that works have been provisionally accepted for publication.

   c. Copies of scholarly and/or creative works submitted for peer-reviewed publication. Candidates must provide correspondence from editors and/or publishers attesting to the receipt and/or pending review of such manuscripts.

   d. Copies of completed or nearly completed scholarly and/or creative works prepared for peer review and publication but not yet submitted. Candidates must include a statement explaining when the manuscript will be completed and to whom it may be submitted.

   e. If necessary, English translations or explanations of editorial correspondence written in another language.
2. Research Grants

a. Copies of research and/or creative grant proposals funded by external agencies. Candidates must provide correspondence from the granting agency attesting to the fact that the grant has been funded.

b. Copies of research and/or creative grant proposals under review by external agencies. Candidates must provide correspondence attesting to the receipt and/or pending review of such grant proposals.

c. Copies of funded intramural research and/or creative grants.

d. Copies of intramural research and/or creative grants under review.

3. Book Reviews


c. Copies of book reviews prepared for publication but not yet submitted.

4. Scholarly Presentations, including Papers, Panels, and/or Posters at Professional Conferences, with evidence of presentation (for example, calls for submissions, abstracts, notifications of conference acceptance, conference programs, copies of conference papers, presentations, and/or posters, etc.)

5. Copies of materials attesting to Candidates' scholarly participation in non-traditional and/or emerging venues for scholarly and creative activity.

6. Copies of materials attesting to the editing of books, journals, special issues, and/or anthologies of original work in one's field of study, translated into or explained in English if written in another language.

D. Evidence of Peer Review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Descriptions of the review process from a website or other source.

2. Copies of peer reviewers' comments.

3. Correspondence from the editor or publisher describing the peer review process.

4. The ratios of articles submitted to articles published.

5. Descriptive entries from relevant indexes and directories such as the MLA Directory of Scholarly Presses, the Linguistics and Language Behavior Ab-
stracts, the ERIC Database, etc.

E. Further Evidence of Quality of Scholarly and Creative Activities may include but is not limited to the following: prizes awarded, peer evaluations, testimonials from specialists, published reviews, citations in work of other authors, and prestige of the organization or institution that published the work.

F. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities

1. Method of Assessment: In determining a Candidate's effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities, the DPC shall evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively the evidence presented in the Scholarly and Creative Activities portion of the Appendices of the Portfolio.

a. Qualitative Assessment: In evaluating the quality of a Candidate's scholarly output, the DPC shall consider the evidence described in section IV.D, above.

b. Quantitative Assessment: As per UPS 210.000 II.B.2.b.1, quantity does not substitute for quality. In general, as stated above, the most important evidence of effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities is peer-reviewed publication. In evaluating the quantity of a Candidate's scholarly output, the DPC shall give primary consideration to the number of peer-reviewed publications included in the Portfolio. Of secondary importance is the number of completed scholarly works under peer review as well as funded research grants, published book reviews, and scholarly presentations. Considered to a lesser extent will be scholarly works in preparation as well as pending research grants, book reviews, and conference papers.

c. Scholarly presentations, intramural research grants, book reviews, and unpublished manuscripts should be submitted as evidence of ongoing research but are not in lieu of published scholarship sufficient to merit promotion or tenure, although they may be sufficient to merit retention in the early years of probation.

d. While quantitative measures will be applied to the evaluation of a Candidate's effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities, the DPC will nonetheless bear in mind that the pace and nature of scholarship varies significantly from scholar to scholar. Such factors as field of research, accessibility of sources, and the availability of financial support can significantly impact the rate at which a faculty member can produce scholarly works. In assessing the Portfolio of a Candidate for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, the DPC shall thus consider the degree of difficulty the author has encountered in obtaining access to the source materials utilized in the research as well as the material's geographic proximity. Furthermore, the DPC shall recognize the time implications involved when a Candidate's scholarly project involves substantial travel and reliance on sources that are in non-native language(s).
G. Ratings

1. A Candidate for Retention shall be rated as:

   a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the Candidate makes better than expected progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

   b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate meets all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 at the expected rate.

   c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate makes little to no discernable progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

2. A Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor shall be rated as:

   a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the Candidate has published a peer-reviewed monograph with a reputable press in the author's field or at least three peer-reviewed publications in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B. He or she has also actively worked to fulfill all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences.

   b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate has published two peer-reviewed works in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B and has actively worked to fulfill all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences.

   c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has published fewer than two peer-reviewed publications and/or shows little progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

3. A Candidate for Promotion to Professor will be rated as:

   a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the Candidate has published a peer-reviewed monograph with a reputable press in the author's field or at least three peer-reviewed in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B. He or she has also actively worked to fulfill all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 by applying for research grants, publishing book
reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences.

b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate has published two peer-reviewed works in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B and has actively worked to fulfill all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences.

c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has published fewer than two peer-reviewed publications and/or shows little progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

V. Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community

A. Expectations: The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures views collegiality and service as important components of faculty life. The Department thus expects faculty to take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the Department, the University, the profession, and the community through good citizenship and through application of their professional expertise. The Department believes faculty members at all career stages should participate in professional organizations and activities relevant to their teaching and research fields. The Department expects significant contributions to departmental committees during the probationary years. It also expects that faculty members, especially those who are tenured, will play an active and continuing role in the governance of the Department and University. Furthermore, it encourages faculty members, especially those who are more senior, to use their skills and expertise for the betterment of the community.

B. Definitions

1. "Service to the Department" is defined as activities that further the goals of the Department.

2. "Service to the University" is defined as activities that further the goals of the University.

3. "Service to the Profession" is defined as activities that further the goals of the profession and its constituent organizations.

4. "Service to the Community" is defined as activities that contribute to the intellectual enrichment and general well-being of the communities comprising the University’s service area.

C. Service to the Department may include but is not limited to:

1. Attendance at and participation in departmental and program meetings.
2. Participation in departmental committees.

3. Attendance at Commencement and Department-sponsored events.

4. Attendance at MLL student association and alumni events.

5. Service in departmental leadership roles.

6. Service as a mentor for colleagues and/or visiting scholars within the Department.

7. Service as an academic advisor within the Department.

8. Sponsorship or advisement of departmental student organizations.

D. Service to the University may include but is not limited to:

1. Attendance at University-sponsored events.

2. Participation in College and University committees, boards, and offices.

3. Service as a mentor for faculty members and/or visiting scholars outside the Department.

4. Service as an advisor to students outside the Department.

5. Presentations of lectures, addresses, or programs to College and University audiences.

6. Sponsorship or advisement of extra-departmental student organizations.

E. Service to the Profession may include but is not limited to:

1. Membership in and attendance at the meetings of relevant professional organizations.

2. Non-peer-reviewed participation (e.g., chair, commentator, discussant) in relevant professional forums such as conferences, symposia, colloquia, workshops, and the like.

3. Holding office in relevant professional organizations.

4. Participation in a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization.

5. Service as an editor or editorial board member for a relevant press, journal, or newsletter.
6. Participation in relevant non-peer-reviewed grant or contract work.

7. Service as an external referee for scholarly manuscripts, textbooks, grants, and academic promotions.

F. Service to the Community may include but is not limited to:

1. Presentation of lectures to community groups.

2. Service as an active or honorary member of community or civic groups.

3. Facilitation of service-learning opportunities above and beyond regular teaching assignments.

4. Appointment to community task forces, advisory boards, advancement projects, or other improvement initiatives.

G. Evidence of Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community may include but is not limited to:

1. Letters of appointment.

2. Acknowledgments.

3. Major policy documents and reports.

4. Event programs.

5. Awards, honors, and commendations.

6. Articles in newspapers or professional newsletters.

7. Testimonials or unsolicited letters of appreciation.

H. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community

Method of Assessment: In determining a Candidate’s effectiveness in Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community, the DPC shall rate the evidence presented in the Service section of the Portfolio with the following ratings:

1. A Candidate for Retention shall be rated as:

   a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the Candidate makes better than expected progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.
b. “Meets Expectations” when the Candidate is meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000 at the expected rate.

c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the Candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

2. A Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor shall be rated as:

a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the Candidate has displayed at least four indicators of service that display strong leadership (e.g., chairing a departmental, College, or University committee, serving in departmental leadership roles, advising student organizations, serving as a mentor for faculty members or visiting scholars, holding office in relevant professional organizations, serving as an editor or editorial board member for a relevant press, journal, or newsletter, participating in a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization, organizing a conference panel) or extensive involvement in activities. Of the four or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented.

b. “Meets Expectations” when the Candidate has displayed at least three indicators of service that display strong leadership (e.g., chairing a departmental, College, or University committee, serving in departmental leadership roles, advising student organizations, serving as a mentor for faculty members or visiting scholars, holding office in relevant professional organizations, serving as an editor or editorial board member for a relevant press, journal, or newsletter, participating in a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization, organizing a conference panel) or extensive involvement in activities. Of the three indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented.

c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the Candidate has displayed fewer than three indicators of service and/or service indicators in fewer than two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community).

3. A Candidate for Promotion to Professor will be rated as:

a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the Candidate has displayed at least five indicators of service that display strong leadership (e.g., chairing a departmental, College, or University committee, serving in departmental leadership roles, advising student organizations, serving as a mentor for faculty members or visiting scholars, holding office in relevant professional organizations, serving as an editor or editorial board member for a
relevant press, journal, or newsletter, participating in a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization, organizing a conference panel) or extensive involvement in activities. Of the five or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented.

b. "Meets Expectations" when the Candidate has displayed at least four indicators of service that display strong leadership (e.g., chairing a departmental, College, or University committee, serving in departmental leadership roles, advising student organizations, serving as a mentor for faculty members or visiting scholars, holding office in relevant professional organizations, serving as an editor or editorial board member for a relevant press, journal, or newsletter, participating in a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization, organizing a conference panel) or extensive involvement in activities. Of the four indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented.

c. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has displayed fewer than four indicators of service and/or service indicators in fewer than two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 CLARITY/ORGANIZATION. Your instructor presented class material clearly and in a well organized fashion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 STUDENT PARTICIPATION. Your instructor promoted active student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 FEEDBACK. Your instructor gave regular, helpful feedback on your class performance (for example, oral comments about class participation, written assignments and tests returned properly, corrections/comments on returned work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. Your instructor created a supportive and constructive learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 TESTS/ASSIGNMENTS. The tests and/or assignments clearly related to overall course objectives and were evaluated consistently with these objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 OVERALL EVALUATION. This class was well taught.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Continue on Page 2
2. General Comments:

2.1 Explain whether you learned as much as you expected in this class given the amount of effort put into it.

2.2 Elaborate on any point evaluated above or anything else relevant to the quality of the course or instructor.
### 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Your supervisor visited classrooms as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Your supervisor communicated clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Your supervisor was available for individual conferences as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Your supervisor related to you in a professional matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Your supervisor's suggestions were useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Continue on Page 2
2. Comments

Written comments are especially helpful to the instructor and others evaluating the quality of instruction. Please make your comments only in English.

2.1 Elaborate on any point evaluated above or anything else relevant to that quality of the course or supervisor.
**Department of Modern Languages and Literatures**  
**California State University, Fullerton**  
**Classroom Observation Form**

Instructor: __________________________  
Instructor has taught class ____ times before

Class: ___________________________  
Number of students: ______

Date: ___________________________  
Visitor: _________________________

Time: ___________________________  
Signature: _______________________

Is this class team taught? (Circle one)  **Yes**  **No**  
Position: _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments (See back for criteria for each category)</th>
<th>Outline of Class Session or Lecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTS AND ASSIGNMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING STRATEGIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments and suggestions (You may include an additional page.)  
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Overall Rating of Instructor (circle one):

Exceeds Expectations  Meets Expectations  Does Not Meet Expectations
Directions:
1. Provide a brief outline of the class session or lecture as it is occurring in the right-hand column. You may also want to note the amount of time spent on each section.

   Example:  
   - 10 min. Review of past tense irregular verbs (chart)  
   - 15 min. Dialogs with past tense irregular verbs (pair work)  
   - 25 min. Role-play creation (small groups)  
   - 20 min. Demonstration of role plays (front of class)

2. Make ongoing notes about what you see in the left-hand column. You may want to use some of the phrases on this page or note other related activities.

| LEARNING ENVIRONMENT | Builds positive self-concept  
|                      | Encourages quiet or reluctant learners  
|                      | Establishes positive, supportive climate  
|                      | Shows interest in and enthusiasm for subject  
|                      | Respects students’ native languages and cultures  
|                      | Maintains a lively pace while conducting activities  
| CLARITY/ORGANIZATION | Has a clear focus  
|                      | Has materials ready  
|                      | Starts class on time  
|                      | Provides clear and concise directions  
|                      | Presents material with logical sequencing  
| STUDENT PARTICIPATION | Uses students’ names  
|                      | Utilizes appropriate grouping strategies  
|                      | Presents material according to students’ comprehension  
|                      | Perceives when students are having trouble understanding  
|                      | Makes sure class knows what kind of response is required  
| FEEDBACK | Provides feedback appropriate to student level  
|          | Provides sufficient, focused feedback on homework and assignments  
|          | Assists students in identifying their own errors or correcting themselves  
| TESTS AND ASSIGNMENTS | Returns tests and assignments in a timely manner  
|                     | Shows ability to adapt assignments  
|                     | Tests and assignments correspond to class objectives  
| TEACHING STRATEGIES | Uses a variety of activities  
|                    | Encourages critical thinking  
|                    | Encourages the use of learning strategies  
|                    | Uses methods and strategies appropriate to students  
|                    | Uses mix of inductive and deductive teaching strategies  
|                    | Teaches for communicative competence if a language class  
|                    | Provides opportunities for negotiation of meaning if a language class  

3. During the last few minutes of the class or immediately after class, write several sentences summarizing what you observed. Compliment the instructor on positive aspects of the class. Give suggestions about how to improve less positive aspects.

4. Circle your overall evaluation for the class: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations

5. Meet with the instructor immediately after class or talk to him/her on the phone about your feedback.