

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D. 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).

May 11, 2023

To: Nathan Carr, Ph.D.
Chair, Modern Languages and Literatures

Sheryl Fontaine, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

From: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs



Subject: **Departmental Personnel Standards for the Modern Languages and Literatures Department**

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the Modern Languages and Literatures department have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

AD:mc

cc: Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support
Dr. Dana Collins, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Georgia Spiropoulos, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. André Zampaulo, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS

Revised January 17, 2022

CONTENTS

I.	Preparation of the Prospectus, the Portfolio, and its Appendices	3
II.	Recommendations in the RTP Process	4
	A. Recommendations for Retention	4
	B. The Rating of “Needs Improvement”	4
	C. “Does Not Meet Expectations” During the Probationary Period	4
	D. Recommendations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	5
	E. Recommendations for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	5
	F. Recommendations for Promotion to Professor	5
	G. Recommendations for Early Promotion to Professor	5
	H. Full Performance Reviews and Abbreviated Reviews	5
III.	Teaching	6
	A. Expectations for Teaching Performance	6
	B. Evidence of Good Teaching Performance	6
	C. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching	8
	D. Evaluation of Teaching	13
IV.	Scholarly and Creative Activities	14
	A. Expectations	14
	B. Definitions	15
	C. Evidence of Research and Creative Activities	16
	D. Evidence of Peer Review	17
	E. Further Evidence of Quality of Scholarly and Creative Activities	18
	F. Co-authored Scholarly and Creative Activities	18
	G. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities	18
	H. Ratings	19
V.	Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community	21
	A. Expectations	21
	B. Definitions	22

C. Examples of Service to the Department	22
D. Examples of Service to the University	23
E. Examples of Service to the Profession	23
F. Examples of Service to the Community	23
G. Evidence of Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community	24
H. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community	24
VI. Election of the Department Personnel Committee and Alternate(s)	27
A. Inability of a Regular DPC Member to Serve	27
B. Associate Professor Members and Cases Involving Promotion to Full Professor	28
C. Recusals	28

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 narratives for Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives, which comprise the Prospectus ([UPS 210.000](#), II.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 210.002](#) 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 following the timetable prescribed in [UPS 200.000](#). 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 shall recommend a mentor for new probationary faculty upon their hiring.

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 according to expectations stated in this document and in [UPS 210.002](#) ([UPS 210.002](#), II.A-B).

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. Faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their Portfolio. Evaluators shall give this careful consideration during the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be sure that 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.

If service credit years were granted, the self-assessment narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service shall also address teaching performance during that period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to adequately present and comment on their accomplishments in this area.

II. Recommendations in the RTP Process

A. Recommendations for Retention

To be recommended for retention during the probationary period, a candidate must receive at least a “Needs Improvement” rating in all three broad evaluative categories described in this document: Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community.

B. The Rating of “Needs Improvement”

The rating of “Needs Improvement” shall be used only during the probationary period, for retention decisions.

C. “Does Not Meet Expectations” During the Probationary Period

During the probationary period, a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” shall only be awarded when (1) a candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion, and (2) weaknesses have been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of “Needs Improvement,” and (3) the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement. “Appropriate improvement” means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates that someone has made no progress, or very limited progress, and their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

D. Recommendations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must be rated as at least “Meets Expectations” in all three evaluative categories.

E. Recommendations for Early Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be recommended for early tenure and 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, University, Profession, and Community.

F. Recommendations for Promotion to Professor

To be recommended for promotion to Professor, a candidate must be rated at least “Meets Expectations” in all three evaluative categories.

G. Recommendations for Early Promotion to Professor

To be recommended for early promotion to Professor, a candidate must be rated “Exceeds Expectations” in all three evaluative categories.

H. Full Performance Reviews and Abbreviated Reviews

Full Performance Reviews and Abbreviated Reviews will normally take place according to the cycles set forth in [UPS 210.000](#), I.K. However, if a second- or fourth-year probationary faculty member is rated as “Needs Improvement” in one or more categories, and if evaluators deem that cumulative progress toward tenure is such that the candidate is at risk of not meeting requirements by the end of their probationary period, then evaluators may recommend that the candidate be awarded a third or fifth probationary year with a Full Performance Review.

III. Teaching

A. Expectations for Teaching Performance

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures reaffirms that teaching performance at all levels must be of consistently 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 exams, assignments, and class participation.

It is expected that in their teaching, faculty should:

1. Establish a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population.
2. Create courses linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
3. Use effectively a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities.
4. Establish appropriate academic standards and hold students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
5. Build and enhance currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching.
6. Comply with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

B. Evidence of Good Teaching Performance

Evidence of this performance must be documented by:

1. A Self-Assessment Teaching Narrative. The Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance shall be 1,000 words or less and shall contain a self-assessment of the instructor's teaching by discussing:
 - a. pedagogical approach and methods.
 - b. expectations regarding student achievement.
 - c. number and nature of courses taught.
 - d. Student Opinion Questionnaires (both quantitative results and student comments), including an explanation or rebuttal of patterns of negative comments.
 - e. the distribution of grades assigned to students
 - f. peer observation reports, including an explanation or rebuttal of negative comments.

- 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.
2. A list of courses taught which shows the session, course number, course title, and weighted teaching units (WTUs) for all classes taught during the period under review and accompanying frequency distributions of the Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) for the review period.
 3. Regularly administered and approved uniform statistical summaries of the Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) and SOQ comment reports for the period under evaluation. Different forms will be used for face-to-face, online, and supervision courses.
 4. Statements of evaluation made by members of the DPC or their designees after class visitations (see attached classroom observation forms).
 5. Grade distribution reports.
 6. Supporting Documents and Materials in the appendix that provide evidence of teaching performance. Syllabi for each separate course taught during the period of review, including any service credit years, shall be included. Other materials may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Class handouts or exercises.
 - b. Quizzes and/or tests.
 - c. Other course materials developed by the instructor.
 - d. Project/assignment details.
 - e. Scoring rubrics.
 - f. Examples of student work/projects/assignments.
 - g. Indicators of the use of technology for teaching (including accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience) such as websites, PowerPoint presentations, multimedia projects, online course development, effective and accessible learning management system (LMS) pages, etc.
 - h. Sample slide presentations.
 - i. Recorded lectures.
 - j. Curriculum development materials.
 - k. Indicators of academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies appropriate to the course.

- l. Indicators of pedagogical methods that consider student needs.
- m. Indicators of a grading system that is fair, transparent, and conducive to learning.
- n. Indicators of a classroom environment that encourages student interaction and engagement, and that contributes to equitable learning for all students.
- o. Indicators of clear guidelines for communication with students.
- p. Indicators (e.g., from course syllabi) that final exams or projects, if required by the instructor, are given on the date/time assigned by the University.
- q. Documentation of high-impact practices (HIPs).
- r. Reports of team-teaching or interdisciplinary collaborative teaching projects.
- s. Indicators (e.g., letters of support, or independent study learning agreements) of mentorship of students, including but not limited to supervising student research and other scholarly and creative activity, engaging students in research and other scholarly and creative activity (e.g., through an independent study course), or including students in the faculty member's research or other scholarly and creative activity.
- t. Grant proposals designed to develop or revise courses.
- u. Evidence of completion of FDC workshops, or other workshops, conferences, symposia, or the like, to enhance teaching and/or assessment.
- v. Letters of support or appreciation.
- w. Unsolicited correspondence from students and colleagues.
- x. Any other relevant documentation of actions taken to incorporate the provisions of UPS 100.007 ("Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice at CSUF") into the candidate's teaching.

C. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

Based on an assessment of the evidence listed above, evaluators will reach an overall assessment of teaching. The assessment will be expressed in terms of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Needs Improvement," or "Does Not Meet Expectations" (see III.D.1-3 in this document). During the probationary period, a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" shall only be awarded when (1) a candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion, and (2) weaknesses have been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of "Needs Improvement," and (3) the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement.

“Appropriate improvement” means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

“Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates that someone has made no progress, or very limited progress, and their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

1. Narrative Summary of Teaching Performance

2. Summary of list of courses taught

Evaluators may make a statement summarizing the number and variety of courses taught during the review period.

3. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions

Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Rather, academic rigor shall be assessed on the basis of the supporting documents and materials included in the appendix (see section III.C.7, below)

4. Quantitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires

To ensure that the interpretation of SOQ data and summaries are fair and equitable, the following procedures shall be used to evaluate SOQ quantitative data. Evaluators may make comparative observations about the highest and lowest semester frequency distributions of the individual faculty member. 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. The different forms used for face-to-face, online, and supervision courses shall be treated as equivalent by reviewers.

Generally, statistical summaries shall be rated according to the following scale:

Rating	Frequency distributions during review cycle
Exceeds Expectations	80.00% or higher A + B responses; at least 40% A responses

Meets Expectations	70.00 - 79.99% A + B responses <i>or</i> 80.00% or higher A + B responses but < 40% A responses
Needs Improvement	60.00 - 69.99% A + B responses
Does Not Meet Expectations	0 - 59.99% A + B responses

Faculty members who believe their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching are encouraged to carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. In such cases, evaluators shall note the explanation, and adjust their ratings if and as appropriate.

5. Qualitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires

A written evaluation of student comments shall be made by evaluators.

The DPC shall review comments for courses taught during the review cycle to assign a rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” to the Student Opinion Questionnaire comments.

Faculty members who believe their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching are encouraged to carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. In such cases, evaluators shall note the explanation, and adjust their ratings if and as appropriate.

6. Peer Review

Peer reviews 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). Consistent with UPS 210.080, faculty members to be observed shall be provided a notice that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member to be evaluated and the observer to determine dates on which instruction will be taking place (as opposed to exams, student presentations, etc.). Consultation need not occur in person. Following consultation, the faculty member

being observed shall be given notice of the day, time, and class that will be observed at least five business days prior to the observation. Online classroom observations shall be scheduled in the same manner as in-class observations. The duration of the online observation shall be determined after consultation between the faculty observing and the faculty member being observed.

Probationary faculty members shall be observed at least once a year, unless more visits are deemed necessary by the DPC. Generally, in probationary years 3-6, the annual observation is to take place in the fall. The annual observation in probationary year 6, or the probationary year in which the candidate is undergoing a full review if applying for early tenure and promotion, may be saved and included for consideration during the subsequent review cycle. When a tenured faculty member is being evaluated for recommendation for promotion, they shall be observed 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 their choice from within the Department. Such evaluations shall be written on approved classroom observation forms.

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Needs Improvement,” 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 many of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form as appropriate to the class(es) observed.
- c. “Needs Improvement”: Demonstrates some of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form in the classes observed, with notable exceptions.
- d. “Does Not Meet Expectations”: Demonstrates few or none of the criteria listed on the classroom observation form in the class(es) observed.

Generally, when more than half of the DPC-assigned peer evaluations are “Exceeds Expectations,” the candidate shall be rated as “Exceeds Expectations.” Generally, when more than half of the DPC-assigned peer evaluations are “Meet Expectations,” the candidate shall be rated as

“Meets Expectations.” Generally, when more than half of the DPC-assigned peer evaluations are “Needs Improvement” or when there are multiple peer evaluations of “Does Not Meet Expectations” along with several peer evaluations of “Meets Expectations” or better, the candidate shall be rated as “Needs Improvement.” Generally, when more than half of the DPC-assigned peer evaluations are “Does Not Meet Expectations,” the candidate shall be rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations.”

However, evaluators should also weight more recent observation reports more heavily than older ones. In particular, if earlier observations indicated room for improvement and later observations indicated improvement has been made, this should be recognized in the rating. Evaluators may choose to adjust their overall rating of this category based on these considerations.

7. Other Supporting Documents and Materials

Evaluators shall give a rating of the overall quality of submitted materials, and the evaluation shall be expressed in terms of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Does Not Meet Expectations.” If a few materials are exceedingly strong but others are mediocre, this shall normally result in a rating of “Meets Expectations.”

Furthermore, for a rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” the file must include at least 12 different types of supporting documents and materials; for a rating of “Meets Expectations,” at least 9; and for a rating of “Needs Improvement,” at least 6. If the file includes fewer than 6 different types of supporting documents and materials, in a promotion case, it shall receive a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations.” In a retention case, it shall only be rated “Does Not Meet Expectations” if (1) the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion in the area of other supporting documents and materials, and (2) weaknesses in this area have been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of “Needs Improvement,” and (3) the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement. “Appropriate improvement” means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates that someone has made no progress, or very limited progress, and their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met

D. Evaluation of Teaching

Method of Assessment: In determining a candidate's effectiveness in Teaching, evaluators 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 three of the following categories: Quantitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Qualitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and 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 all four categories.
 - c. "Needs Improvement" when the candidate has been rated as "Needs Improvement" in one or more of the four categories.
 - d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when the Candidate has been rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one or more of the four categories, if (1) the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion, and (2) weaknesses have been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of "Needs Improvement," and (3) the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement. "Appropriate improvement" means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. "Does Not Meet Expectations" indicates that someone has made no progress, or very limited progress, and their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. A rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" shall not be given during the second-year review, and leads to a recommendation for a terminal year during any other probationary year review.
2. A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be rated as:
 - a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the candidate has been rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in three of the following categories: Quantitative Data:

Student Opinion Questionnaires, Qualitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and 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 all four categories.
 - c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has been rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or more of the four categories.
3. A candidate for promotion to Professor shall be rated as:
- a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the candidate has been rated as “Exceeds Expectations” in three of the following categories: Quantitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Qualitative Data: Student Opinion Questionnaires, Peer Evaluations, and 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 all four categories.
 - c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has been rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or more of the four categories.
4. Following UPS 100.007 (“Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice at CSUF”) and UPS 210.002 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Standards”), reviewers should consider the impact of cultural taxation and stereotype threat on faculty from underrepresented and marginalized groups, and acknowledge and credit appropriately the impact of such issues on a candidate’s teaching. As applicable, candidates should address the impact of these issues in their narratives, to ensure that they receive acknowledgement and appropriate credit.

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 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, 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, 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.
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. “Forthcoming” or “in press” shall be defined as a scholarly and/or creative work that has been accepted for publication without any further revision.

C. Evidence of Research and Creative Activities

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

1. Publications and Works in Progress

- 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

a. Copies of published book reviews.

b. Copies of book reviews submitted for publication.

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

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 Abstracts, the ERIC Database, etc.

E. Further Evidence of Quality of Scholarly and Creative Activities

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. Co-authored Scholarly and Creative Activities

Co-authored scholarly and creative activities may be given the same weight as single-author works. However, for a given co-authored accomplishment to carry that weight, a candidate must provide documentation of the extent and importance of their contribution to bringing the achievement to its final form. A Co-authorship Disclosure Form can be found on the FAR website.

G. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities

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

1. Qualitative Assessment: In evaluating the quality of a candidate's scholarly output, evaluators shall consider the evidence described in section IV.D, above.
2. Quantitative Assessment: As per [UPS 210.002](#) II.B.2.b.1, quantity does not substitute for quality, and evaluators shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, press, or venue; whether a publication is an article or a note). 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, evaluators 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.

3. 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.
4. While quantitative measures will be applied to the evaluation of a candidate's effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities, evaluators should 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, evaluators 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, evaluators 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). It shall be a candidate's responsibility to point out and provide evidence of such factors influencing their scholarly production.

H. Ratings

1. A candidate for retention shall be rated as:
 - a. "Exceeds Expectations" when the candidate is making excellent progress and is close to satisfying the scholarship requirements for tenure and promotion, below.
 - b. "Meets Expectations" when the candidate is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion.
 - c. "Needs Improvement" when the candidate is making less than satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion.
 - d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when (1) the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion, and (2) their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met, with this lack of progress having been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of "Needs Improvement," and (3)

the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement. “Appropriate improvement” means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” shall not be given during the second-year review, and leads to a recommendation for a terminal year during any other probationary year review.

2. A candidate for tenure and 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. They have also worked to fulfill all the requirements for tenure and promotion by maintaining an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities).
 - b. “Meets Expectations” when the candidate has published two peer-reviewed publications in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B and has actively worked to fulfill all the requirements for tenure and promotion by maintaining an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities).
 - c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has published fewer than two peer-reviewed publications and has failed to maintain an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities), and provides little or no evidence of progress towards meeting expectations in this area.
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 publications in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B. They have also worked to maintain an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities).

- b. “Meets Expectations” when the candidate has published two peer-reviewed publications in reputable academic journals or equivalent venues according to the descriptors in IV.B and has worked to maintain an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities).
- c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has published fewer than two peer-reviewed publications and has failed to maintain an active research agenda during the period under review (for example, by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, and/or presenting at professional conferences, among other possible activities), and provides little or no evidence of progress towards meeting expectations in this area.

- 4. Following UPS 100.007 (“Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice at CSUF”) and UPS 210.002 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Standards”), as applicable, candidates from underrepresented and marginalized groups should address the impact of cultural taxation and stereotype threat in their narratives, to ensure that they receive acknowledgement and appropriate credit. Reviewers should consider the impact of these issues on candidates, and acknowledge and credit appropriately the impact of such issues on a candidate’s scholarly and creative activities.

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 communities within or outside the University’s service area.

C. Examples of Service to the Department

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.
9. Developing/facilitating internships, service learning opportunities, and community-engaged learning opportunities.

D. Examples of Service to the University

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. Examples of Service to the Profession

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. Examples of Service to the Community

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

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, evaluators 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 is making excellent progress and is close to satisfying the service requirements for tenure and/or promotion, below.
 - b. "Meets Expectations" when the candidate is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion.
 - c. "Needs Improvement" when the candidate is making less than satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion.
 - d. "Does Not Meet Expectations" when (1) the candidate is making little to no discernable progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and/or promotion, and (2) their cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met, with this lack of progress having been identified in one or more earlier review cycles through a rating of "Needs Improvement," and (3) the candidate has not addressed these weaknesses explicitly and shown appropriate improvement.

“Appropriate improvement” means that cumulative progress toward tenure is sufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met. A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” shall not be given during the second-year review, and leads to a recommendation for a terminal year during any other probationary year review.

2. A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be rated as:
 - a. “Exceeds Expectations” when the candidate has displayed at least four indicators of service that display either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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). Of the four or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented. In addition, the candidate shall provide evidence of service in the remaining two categories.
 - b. “Meets Expectations” when the candidate has displayed at least three indicators of service that display either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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). Of the three indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented. In addition, the candidate shall provide evidence of service in the remaining two categories.
 - c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has displayed fewer than three indicators of service that display either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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), when the indicators represent fewer than two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community), and when there is not evidence of service in each of the four categories.

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 either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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). Of the five or more indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented. In addition, the candidate shall provide evidence of service in the remaining two categories.
 - b. “Meets Expectations” when the candidate has displayed at least four indicators of service that display either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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). Of the four indicators, at least two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community) shall be represented. In addition, the candidate shall provide evidence of service in the remaining two categories.
 - c. “Does Not Meet Expectations” when the candidate has displayed fewer than four indicators of service that display either strong leadership or extensive involvement in activities (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), when the indicators represent fewer than two distinct categories (Department, University, Profession, Community), and when there is not evidence of service in each of the four categories.

4. Following UPS 100.007 (“Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice at CSUF”) and UPS 210.002 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Standards”), reviewers should consider the impact of cultural taxation and stereotype threat on faculty from underrepresented and marginalized groups, and acknowledge and credit appropriately any additional service performed by these faculty as a result of such issues. As applicable, candidates should address such additional service in their narratives, to ensure that they receive acknowledgement and appropriate credit.

VI. Election of the Department Personnel Committee and Alternate(s)

In conformity with UPS 210.000, the MLL Department shall determine the method of electing the members of its personnel committee; however, election of the personnel committee shall be by secret ballot. At the end of the spring semester, the MLL Department shall elect a personnel committee of three members. These members shall have been granted tenure and shall not include the Chair of the Department. All eligible, tenured faculty members shall appear on the ballot.

At the time of election of the regular Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC), at least one full professor, other than the Department Chair, shall be elected to serve as alternate(s) for members of the DPC. The alternate(s) shall serve in the following situations:

A. Inability of a Regular DPC Member to Serve

When a regular DPC member becomes unable to serve (e.g., due to extended absence, or candidacy for promotion), one or more alternates shall replace the departing member for the remainder of the academic year. If no alternates remain after this, an election shall be held by secret ballot to select one or more new alternates.

B. Associate Professor Members and Cases Involving Promotion to Full Professor

If one or more DPC members are associate professors, the alternate(s) shall step in to evaluate cases involving promotion to full professor.

C. Recusals

In the event that a DPC member must recuse themselves from a particular case as required by UPS 210.060, "Nepotism and Conflict of Interest in Employment," an alternate member shall step in to replace the regular DPC member in the evaluation of that candidate's portfolio.