Department of English and Modern Languages
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Cal Poly Pomona

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Document
EML DRTP AY 2019/20 through 2023/24

Section I –Introduction

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which we assure the success of our faculty and thereby assure educational quality for our students. While the president makes final decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the president. The Department RTP Criteria Document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, the dean, the College RTP Committee, the University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies, including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Policies 1328 and 1329 (formerly appendices 10 and 16 of the University Manual), define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that a tenure-track faculty member be provided a copy of the Department RTP Criteria Document within two weeks of the start of his or her first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department web page, so that they are available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the Department RTP Criteria Document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its faculty members and in particular what they must achieve in order to be granted reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the candidates are able to plan their activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards. In other words, they should articulate a model of the department faculty-colleague to which the candidate should aspire.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting candidates, providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for candidates to be knowledgeable of department expectations and committed to meeting them.

I.1. Definitions:

Policy No. 1328 (formerly Appendix 16) section 3 provides a comprehensive overview of RTP procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

A. **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.

B. **RTP Committee** members must be full-time tenured faculty members. Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty. It is recommended that faculty members on leave not serve on the DRTP committee. Faculty on leave would need permission from the Provost to serve in this capacity. Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may be elected members of the RTP committee if requested by the majority vote of probationary and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President. In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. In addition, faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure review committees. (See CBA 15.43 and Policy No. 1328 1.17).

C. **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in CPP Policy No. 1328. Criteria define what a candidate must achieve in order to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. Department RTP criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the College RTP Committee for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the president or his/her designee. (See CPP Policy No. 1328).

D. A **probationary year** of service is two semesters. The first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment. The summer semester is not a state-supported term and is not used for this purpose. Required faculty assignments and service will take place during the fall and spring semesters.

E. A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure**.

F. A faculty member is **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time he or she applies for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current

rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.

G. **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities and service to the university and the profession.

H. **Student evaluation of teaching** is governed by Policy No.1329 (formerly Appendix 10) of the University Manual.

I. **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee and includes classroom visits, review of course syllabus and other teaching materials, and a written report.

J. A **candidate for reappointment must use the Department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the candidate's initial probationary appointment. *Current* procedures and policies apply. ***By "procedures and policies" are meant such things as number of classes evaluated, number of peer reviews, format for the self-evaluation report, etc.***

K. A **candidate for tenure or promotion may choose between the criteria** in effect at the time of the initial probationary appointment and those in effect at the time of the request for action. In any case, *current* procedures and policies apply. A candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.

I.2.1 Department Philosophy:
From here to its conclusion, this document represents the position of the Department of English and Modern Languages, in compliance with University Policy/Procedures and the current Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

We believe the RTP process should help clarify expectations, create mentoring relationships between new and senior faculty (thereby building trust and helping candidates achieve success), and strengthen the department's programs. As a department-wide dialogue, the RTP process should also engage our thinking about the meaning and application of standards; the wide-ranging forms and implications of accountability measures; and the kinds of professional growth that benefit us, our students, and all involved in our many outreach efforts.

I.2.2 Teaching Effectiveness:
It is expected that all tenure track faculty will continually enhance and improve their teaching with respect to our particular population at Cal Poly Pomona. This progress can be evidenced in a number of ways. For example, student evaluations are helpful, but the department does not consider them the sole indicator of teaching ability. Principles C and D of Policy 1329 stipulate:

The department faculty is best prepared to judge the quality of teaching by peers; the department should be given the maximum possible latitude in collecting, assessing and reporting available information on teaching performance.

In our estimation, then, we find that additional evidence of teaching ability can be found in (but not limited to) a faculty member's taking advantage of the Faculty Center for Professional Development workshops and programs (such as Writing across the Disciplines), participating in CSU workshops and conferences on teaching and learning, reading and deriving pedagogy from books and articles on working with particular segments of Cal Poly Pomona's population, and consulting with colleagues, both within and outside of the department and university.

Other evidence of progress in developing one's teaching includes syllabi, examinations, writing assignments, student papers to which the candidate has crafted responses, teaching portfolios, digital or multimedia responses to student papers and work, and attending professional conferences. Because student learning is an obvious component of teaching effectiveness, it is expected that assessment of learning be discussed, including the implications those assessments have for pedagogy.

As an individual's expertise increases, teaching ability might be demonstrated by mentoring and guiding less experienced teachers; by *making* rather than simply attending presentations at Cal Poly Pomona, in the CSU, or at professional conferences; or by critiquing the teaching of others. Technology is also an important part of teaching, if its integration into the classroom and academic community adds to our students' critical understanding and abilities. In addition, when assessing teaching effectiveness, we place great value on a faculty member's commitment *as an academic advisor* (by which we mean advising that helps students with academic policies, curricula, probationary contracts, transfer cases and other petitions, and so on—as distinct from [d] Student Involvement, below), at the undergraduate and graduate levels and on directing an M.A. thesis.

I.2.3 Scholarly or Creative Work:

Cal Poly Pomona's 2009 White Paper on the Teacher-Scholar Model states that "Retention Tenure Promotion (RTP) documents within the polytechnic context should and often do allow for new faculty to engage in scholarship of various types […] beyond traditional peer reviewed publishing of basic research."

While remaining open to evolving modes of scholarship, our program has identified the following types of research and scholarly activities. These are

included in the White Paper: Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990); "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media," Modern Language Association (2012); "CCCC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Work with Technology" (2015).

The **Scholarship of Discovery** refers to inquiry and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. In Boyer's words, it contributes "not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university" (Boyer 17).

The **Scholarship of Integration** includes, but is not limited to, interpreting what new discoveries mean and how new knowledge relates to other disciplines. Often, integrative scholarship makes connections between separated fields and facts and puts them into perspective in order to educate non-specialists (Boyer 18-19).

The **Scholarship of Application** "refers to using knowledge in a responsible way to address consequential problems. This is accomplished by connecting theory with practice and can manifest itself through various forms of service." In the scholarship of application, "theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other" (Boyer 23).

These three types of scholarly work commonly result in articles published in scholarly journals, chapters of academic edited books, monographs, textbooks, translations, published creative writing, articles aimed at the educated layperson, grant proposals (including highly rated but non-funded proposals), conference presentations, as well as varied forms of digital scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed digital journals, websites, and other interactive platforms). Scholarship is increasingly multi-modal, which thus can involve database and archive construction, development of software tools, corpus analysis, mapping projects, and construction of physical spaces and infrastructure to do work in *making*. Regardless of format or medium, scholarship should conform to the description in III.3.b. (i.e., subject to peer review, held to benchmarks for innovation, and available to other scholars through distribution).

As not all publications are equal, a candidate could argue that one book is equal to four papers or that refereed articles in showcase journals are weightier than non-refereed articles. Arguments for such distinctions will be judged by the DRTPC, which may ask for peer review (in which case the scholarly/creative work in question should be submitted with a letter from an individual in the candidate's academic community qualified to review the work—someone from our own department, someone in another department, or someone off campus).

I.2.4 Service:

This includes service to the department, college, university, and community as well as to our academic disciplines. It includes active membership on department, college, university, and senate committees, service to the community at large, and service to our various academic disciplines by editing professional journals, serving in leadership positions, serving on editorial advisory boards, acting as a referee for academic journals, organizing conferences, etc. Candidates are expected, in time, to assume leadership roles, which could mean developing an external funding program, extending or improving departmental outreach, serving in a leadership capacity in the department (as department chair, for example), chairing a college or university committee, or serving in the academic senate or on any of its committees. Making oneself available as a resource (such as translating languages for or providing technological expertise to the department, college, or university) is also a valued form of service.

I.2.5 Student Involvement:

Student involvement includes (but is not limited to) mentoring, tutoring, advising a club, or otherwise helping to create an intellectual community for students, directing senior projects, directing and/or sitting on M.A. examination or thesis committees, or organizing student events such as the Graduate Student Research Symposium.

I.2.6 Indirect Instruction Activities

An Indirect Instructional Activity (IIA) is any work beyond direct instruction, advising, and traditional committee and related work that a faculty member performs to improve students' educational and professional success. Indirect Instructional Activities contribute to a faculty member's total number of Weighted Teaching Units (WTU) per term. A diverse range of activities fall under this heading. Participation in an IIA is not necessary for tenure and promotion nor does it carry any particular advantage for purposes of RTP action.

Candidates may classify work supported by an IIA under whichever category they consider more appropriate (Teaching, Service, or Student involvement) but needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may *not* be used toward 'exceeding' criteria in any of these categories.

Section II –Procedures

II.1 What follows is in compliance with Policy 1328, which describes university-wide RTP procedures that departmental procedures cannot violate.

II.2 Department RTP Procedures:

In this section the department's procedures for electing the DRTPC (during spring semester) will be detailed, as well as the role of the DRTPC chair in the RTP process.

II.2.a Selection of the DRTP Committee:
The department RTP committee shall consist of full-time tenured members of the department elected by probationary and tenured faculty. In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. In addition, faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees (See CBA 15.43 and Policy No. 1328 1.17).

All seven members of the committee must be elected each year (at least four of whom are full professors). Thus, the department chair cannot automatically be placed on the committee. S/he will serve only if elected by the department to serve on the DRTPC or if the departmental RTP process has the department chair provide a separate level of review.

No elected members of the committee shall serve more than four consecutive years. A committee member who will be on leave for one semester may be elected provided a replacement is elected by the department before the leave commences; faculty who will be on leave for more than one semester should not accept election for that time period.

The election of the committee shall be conducted annually by secret ballot before the end of the spring semester of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle; election shall be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The DRTP committee shall elect one of its members (other than the department chair) as committee chair.

FERP faculty will be invited to participate in the process following Senate's approved guidelines (Policy No. 1328 1.17) and with consent of the Dean.

II.2.b DRTPC Chair's Duties:
The DRTPC chair's duties include the following:

Fall Semester:
- Ensure that candidates have information they need—including information about what actions they must/may apply for, information they need to prepare requests, department criteria;
- Ensure that the provisions of the DRTP document, CBA and Policies1328 and 1329 are carried out;
- Assist candidates in understanding expectations, preparing packages;
- Inform Faculty Affairs of requests;
- Ensure that packages are complete;

- Act as the official custodian of the RTP package for the period between the submission of the package to the DRTPC by the candidate and the forwarding of the package to the Dean's office;
- Authorize any additions to the package or any changes in the content of the package;
- Notify the appropriate parties of any additions or changes; and
- Review the department's recommendation with each candidate.

Throughout the year:
- Schedule peer evaluations (and ensure they are conducted) for all faculty members who will be candidates for RTP action in the future;
- Ensure that reports are provided to candidates within two weeks of the classroom visit.
- During the Spring semester each year the DRTPC Chair and the candidate will meet to discuss progress made regarding recommendations for improvement.

(For a more complete checklist of the DRTPC chair's duties, see document on file in department office.)

II.3 Student Evaluation of Teaching:

According to the CBA, section15.15, and Policy No.1329, section 3.1.2, all classes taught by candidates who are eligible for RTP actions, must be evaluated by students via the departmental Scantron form at the end of the semesters. As indicated in CBA 15.3, and as stated in section 2.0 D of Policy No.1329, section, "faculty members teaching online are subject to all the rights and conditions set out in the evaluative process and applicable evaluation policies."

The teacher of record cannot administer this evaluation process but must designate someone—a colleague, a responsible student—to do so. A copy of the summary of these evaluations (sent by email to each instructor several weeks after evaluation) must be submitted in the candidate's RTP packet for each class evaluated. Analysis by the candidate and the DRTPC must accompany descriptions of results.

The DRTPC will be responsible for posting notices that solicit written comments from students. Notice requesting faculty and student letters will be posted 20 working days prior to the deadline for candidates' packages to be received by the DRTPC, displaying a deadline that is 10 working days prior to the deadline for candidates' packages to be received by the DRTPC. Copies of any letters received up to the deadline will be provided to the candidate, who will then have 10 days to respond before they must submit their packages. Any letter received after the deadline will not be accepted for the current RTP cycle, but may be used in the subsequent RTP cycle. .

II.4 Peer Evaluation of Teaching:
See Policy No.1328, section 3.3 outlined below.

For all candidates eligible for RTP actions, CPP Policy No.1328 peer evaluation of teaching shall include classroom visits and a review of course syllabus and related material. Peer evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 3.3.

At the beginning of the academic year, the DRTPC will make a copy of this section available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues. A minimum of two peer evaluations shall be conducted each academic year (i.e. one in each semester). Peer evaluations will be scheduled by the DRTPC. There shall be consultation between candidates and reviewers regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (CBA 15.14). Courses reviewed shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. According to Policy 1328, section 3.3, the "individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five working days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content, is to take place."

Each peer review shall be conducted by a colleague of senior academic rank. Within two weeks of the classroom visit (Policy 1328, section 3.3 B), the report should be given to the candidate and filed with the DRTPC chair, who will submit copies to the EML Department Office and Dean's Office. The official peer reviews shall include the form developed by the department, which is included in Appendix B. The candidate has the right to respond in writing to the peer evaluation within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the evaluation (Policy 1328, section 33.b).

During the spring semester, the DRTPC will contact candidates to verify that they have had the requisite peer evaluations for that academic year and will help remedy the situation if they have not.

II.5 Evaluation of Faculty on Leaves and Other Changes to Tenure Timetable:

Sections 11.5.a and 11.5.b below apply to candidates who are serving in administrative positions or performing administrative duties, serving in positions of academic governance, or on leave (see also Policy No.1328, section 2.1):

II.5.a Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they must/may apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as candidates in residence. It will be the candidate's responsibility to meet all deadlines.

II.5.b Candidates who accept positions outside of their departments while they are still eligible for RTP action must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The candidate and the DRTPC shall commit to writing, in light of the special circumstances, (a) an interpretation of the departmental criteria and (b) a

statement that specifies expectations and outcomes. This memorandum of understanding shall be approved by the dean and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

II.5.c For Extensions of the Probationary Period, see CBA 13.7 and 13.8.

II.6 Candidates' Additional Responsibilities:

According to Policy 1328: 7.4 C, candidates are required to assemble an RTP package which makes the case for the requested action. To prepare the RTP package, candidates are encouraged to attend university or CFA-sponsored workshops and seek the counsel of the DRTPC. The following structure will help make such reference explicit:

- Discussion of teaching performance—includes analysis of student and peer evaluations, explanation of activities related to student advising and/or mentoring, and discussion of any outcomes-assessment measures to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

- Discussion of scholarly and creative activities—includes specific citation of all peer-reviewed publications, dates of attendance at professional meetings, and all duties/assignments in professional organizations; also explanation of work in progress and ongoing activities.

- Discussion of service to the university, college, department, and community—includes specific citation of committee assignments and duties, assistance in a professional capacity to any group, etc.; response to any problems/deficiencies pointed out in previous evaluations of service (steps taken, progress made).

- Discussion of short-term and long-term goals in all areas of evaluation—includes brief discussion of why goals are appropriate (i.e., candidates' goals are related not only to their own interests, strengths, responsibilities, and career aspirations but also to the department's, college's, and university's goals and mission) and of how these goals will be met.

- Discussion of progress made on goals established in previous year's self-evaluation, with such progress connected clearly and reasonably to the current year's self-evaluation.

Section III –Criteria for RTP Action
III.1 Elements of Performance and Evaluation:
These will be (a) Teaching Effectiveness, (b) Scholarly or Creative Work, (c) Service, and (d) Student Involvement, described below. Although approval of RTP requests will require that the criteria in all four areas be addressed—and, where specifically quantified, satisfied—the unlikelihood of performance being

equally strong in all areas is understood. Striving for effective performance in all areas, the candidate should call attention to areas of special strength while demonstrating fulfillment of the mandated criteria. As well, the candidate should situate the evidence of teaching effectiveness in a context of pedagogical development and experimentation; new courses (including courses taught for the first time, interdisciplinary courses, and courses the faculty member takes on as a favor to the department or university), technological and procedural innovations, attempts to integrate the most current scholarship—these the department regards as an invaluable part not only of teaching effectiveness but also of the department's mission. We also understand that funding and other contingencies may interfere with one's ability to satisfy the mandated criteria (e.g., loss of funding for trips, delays and editorial changes at journals, cutbacks at presses, etc.); such contingencies should be addressed and, if possible, documented in the candidate's self-evaluation report.

III.1.a Expectations for Documentation of Performance:
In its evaluation of the candidate, the DRTPC shall take into account information from the following sources:

- Summaries and interpretations of students' numerical evaluations
- Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance
- Self-evaluation provided by candidate
- Signed material (to be added to candidate's RTP package) received from other faculty, referees/editors for academic journals and presses, administrators, and students
- Material requested from candidate by the DRTPC (e.g., requests for clarification of, corrections to, augmentations of any aspect of RTP package)
- Other written material, identified by source, submitted to the DRTPC before the closing date

III.2 Criteria for Reappointment:
To be reappointed, a candidate must provide evidence (see III.1.a, above) of making steady progress toward meeting the criteria for *Promotion to Associate Professor* (III.4, below) and *Tenure* (III.3, below) or if hired at the Associate Professor level, for Professor (III.5, below) and Tenure (III.3 below). "Steady progress" can be demonstrated by evidence of student and peer evaluations, submission of scholarly work (including referees' reports), conference and other professional activity, participation on committees and in student-involvement areas, and criteria-referenced plans that are also responsive to the DRTPC's and dean's suggestions. The closer to tenure, the more concretely the candidates should be able to show how they have made good on their plans to satisfy the criteria.

III.3 Criteria for Tenure:

A faculty member is **eligible to apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early tenure** (see I.1.e—emphasis in original).

The candidate for tenure must satisfy criteria a-d listed below. The DRTPC must take into consideration items mandated by University policy. These mandated items will be starred (*). Items mandated by the department will be so indicated. Other items are meant to suggest the kinds of activity upon which the DRTPC will base its judgments.

III.3.a Teaching Effectiveness:

The Department's expectation for satisfactory teaching performance is an average score of "2" or better (i.e., lower), or evidence of progress toward this average score) on the course-oriented items (#6 through #10) and on the instructor-oriented items (#11 through #16) of the EML Student Evaluation Scantron form.

The DRTPC will take into careful consideration evidence of improvement in existing courses; accounts of how the faculty member plans to respond (as well as reports on how the faculty member did respond) to less-than-positive evaluations of teaching; accounts that provide contexts for evaluations, whether positive or negative, of teaching; the development of new courses; currency in the discipline; and the development of appropriate creative approaches and applications of technology.

- *Peer evaluations of teaching and course materials
- Academic advising
- Directing a thesis
- Course development
- Curriculum development
- Participation in workshops that enhance teaching (such as the Faculty Center's Teaching Circles)
- Interdisciplinary teaching
- Multicultural/international/diversity activity
- Learning outcomes assessment
- Integration of technology
- Service-learning courses
- Teaching innovations and revisions in response to assessments
- Involvement in the preparation of teachers

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.3.b Scholarly and Creative Work:
Candidates must satisfy the first two requirements, as well as show activity in the remaining areas.

- Since arrival, an ongoing record of scholarship: e.g. three [3] articles published in, <u>or accepted by</u>, refereed journals *or* a book/textbook/monograph/translation published by an academic/commercial [i.e., non-vanity] press, or work equivalent to the foregoing in digital scholarship modes or other modes. Publications such as chapters in academic books are considered equivalent to articles. The DRTP committee will evaluate the commensurability of the various forms of scholarship, including significant varieties of performance. Since EML is a multi-disciplined department, <u>each publication, project of digital scholarship, and/or performance should be briefly described and the relative weight of its contribution to the field assessed</u>. The EML RTP Committee recognizes that new forms of scholarship, such as projects in the digital humanities, often cannot be segmented and measured according to the traditional units of scholarly output (the peer-reviewed article and single-author monograph). It is incumbent on the candidate to present evidence allowing the committee to evaluate the degree of intellectual investment and time investment these projects entail, and the contribution they make to the field.

AND

- An ongoing record of conference presentations (at least four [4])
- Other noteworthy scholarly/creative activity might include the following:

  - Other publications (articles, chapters, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, ERIC) or creative activity–published or accepted, performed or contracted
  - Public recordings of dramatic reading (or other)
  - Work in a professional association
  - Role as chair or respondent at conference
  - Attendance at conferences related to one's *scholarly/creative* work
  - External grants (including highly rated non-funded proposals)
  - Internal grants (including highly rated non-funded proposals)
  - Conducting Workshops on Teaching (Scholarship of Application)
  - Making Presentations on Teaching (Scholarship of Application)

Though the forms of digital scholarship and its distribution may change over time, the following three basic characteristics of scholarly activity (identified in "CCCC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Work with Technology," 2015) remain constant:

- The digital scholarship must be <u>subject to peer review</u>. When the research in question is not distributed on peer-reviewed platforms, the candidate can present alternative evidence for peer review, such as:
  - Preferentially, candidates will submit projects for review separately through professional organizations.
  - Candidates will provide alternative evidence of review (e.g., competitive grants or competitive prizes and awards won), and alternative evidence of scholarly impact (e.g., speaking invitations and interviews, conference presentations, website views, scholarly citations).
  - When no other review mechanisms are possible, candidates should submit letters from established scholars working in closely aligned fields within academia, familiar with the specific technology, in which these outside reviewers assess the validity, reach, and importance of the digital scholarship.
- It must be <u>innovative</u>. This category includes the scholarship of discovery, application, and integration, described above. In addition, the EML Department recognizes that given the emerging nature of (for example) digital scholarship in our fields, the development of novel protocols and techniques for data and text analysis and its application can constitute a valuable original contribution.*
- It must be made <u>available to other scholars</u> through appropriate distribution channels. Candidates need to note:
  - the reach of digital research distribution platforms by citing appropriate numeric metrics;
  - the longevity and permanence of distribution channels by explaining the timeline of the research project;
  - plans for its permanent archiving as it comes to the end of its life cycle.

*Presner argues that the digital design itself is an important aspect of the scholarly rigor of a project, and that while "scholarly rigor must be assessed by examining how the work contributes to and advances the state of knowledge of a given field or fields," it is also true that "new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content" ("How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship," *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 1:4, 2012).

III.3.c Service:
During the *evaluation period*, it is expected the candidate will take part in the following kinds of service. The first item on the list below is required. Activity in some of the remaining kinds of service is encouraged but not absolutely required.

- **Two** department committees per year during the evaluation period
- College-level or university-level committee work
- Program coordinator
- Program development

- Administrative work
- Supervision of Teaching Associates (or other teacher training)
- Academic senator
- Accreditation work
- System-wide work
- Services to professional societies and organizations such as journals and presses
- Services to public-interest community groups off campus

III.3.d Student Involvement:

During the evaluation period, the candidate will do **two** or more of the *types* of activities listed below, which are in addition to helping deserving students by writing letters of recommendation:

- Mentor students (sit on thesis committee, M.A. examinations, senior projects, research, special projects)
- Editing, producing, publicizing, organizing and facilitating readings/performances (such as the Graduate Symposium)
- Advise a club
- Documented extra time spent outside of office hours creating and fostering an intellectual community (such as presenting at Graduate Orientation or rehearsing students for their public presentations at the Sigma Tau Delta Convention, the UCR Symposium for Undergraduate Research, etc.)

III.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor:

A faculty member is **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time he or she applies for tenure (***See Sections 14.2 and 14.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and Policy 1328)***). Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible to apply for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current rank. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion** (see I.1.f—emphasis in original).

Because promotion to associate professor is tied to tenure, the criteria for promotion to associate professor are those for tenure. Therefore, the candidate for promotion to associate professor must satisfy the criteria a-d in III.3 (above).

III.5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor:

Promotion to professor requires tenure or the simultaneous award of tenure.

The candidate for promotion to Professor must satisfy criteria a-d listed below. The DRTPC must take into consideration items mandated by University policy. These mandated items will be starred (*). Items mandated by the department will be so indicated. Other items are meant to suggest the kinds of activity upon which the DRTPC will base its judgments.

III.5.a Teaching Effectiveness:
Continued demonstration of *effectiveness and professionalism* is expected: competency in the classroom, efforts to improve and stay current, and willingness to support fellow teachers in their efforts to improve and stay current. These criteria, then, come with a "continued" in front of them.

- *Continued strong evidence of effective teaching. A composite average score of "2" or better (i.e., lower), or evidence of progress toward this average score, on questions 6-10 and 11-16 of the EML Student Evaluation Scantron form.

The DRTPC will take into careful consideration evidence of improvement in existing courses; accounts of how the faculty member plans to respond (as well as reports on how the faculty member did respond) to less-than-positive evaluations of teaching; the development of new courses; currency in the discipline; and the development of appropriate creative approaches and applications of technology.
- **Peer evaluations of teaching and course materials
- Academic advising
- Directing a thesis
- Course development
- Curriculum development
- Participating in workshops that enhance teaching
- Interdisciplinary teaching
- Multicultural/international/diversity activity
- Learning outcomes assessment
- Integration of technology
- Service-learning courses
- Teaching innovations and revisions in response to assessments

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.5.b Scholarly and Creative Work:
For promotion to full professor, candidates must continue contributing to their academic discipline. Candidates must satisfy the first two requirements, as well as show activity in the remaining areas. Since EML is a multi-disciplined department, a brief description of the publication and its importance in the field should accompany the publication.

- Since promotion to associate professor, an ongoing record of scholarship: e.g. three [3] articles published in, or accepted by, refereed journals *or* a book/textbook/monograph/translation published by an

academic/commercial [i.e., non-vanity] press, or work equivalent to the foregoing in digital scholarship modes or other modes. Publications such as chapters in academic books are considered equivalent to articles. The DRTP committee will evaluate the commensurability of the various forms of scholarship, including significant varieties of performance. Since EML is a multi-disciplined department, <u>each publication, project of digital scholarship, and/or performance should be briefly described and the relative weight of its contribution to the field assessed.</u> The EML RTPC recognizes that new forms of scholarship, such as projects in the digital humanities, often cannot be segmented and measured according to the traditional units of scholarly output (the peer-reviewed article and single-author monograph). It is incumbent on the candidate to present evidence allowing the committee to evaluate the degree of intellectual investment and time investment these projects entail, and the contribution they make to the field. The EML RTPC recognizes that new forms of scholarship, such as projects in the digital humanities, often cannot be segmented and measured according to the traditional units of scholarly output (the peer-reviewed article and single-author monograph). It is incumbent on the candidate to present evidence allowing the committee to evaluate the degree of intellectual investment and time investment these projects entail, and the contribution they make to the field.

AND

- An ongoing record of conference presentations since promotion to associate professor: at least four (4) in all, **one** of which must be made at a national or international conference
- Other noteworthy scholarly/creative activity might include the following:

  - Participation on editorial board of, or as referee for, a scholarly journal
  - Other publications (articles, chapters, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, ERIC) or creative activity
  - Public recordings of dramatic reading (or other)
  - Work as an officer or committee member of a professional association
  - Role of chair or respondent at conferences
  - Attendance at conferences related to one's *scholarly/creative* work
  - External grants (including highly rated non-funded proposals)
  - Internal grants (including highly rated non-funded proposals)
  - Conducting Workshops on Teaching (*Scholarship of Application*)
  - Making Presentations on Teaching (*Scholarship of Application*)

Though the forms of digital scholarship and its distribution may change over time, the following three basic characteristics of scholarly activity (identified in "CCCC

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Work with Technology," 2015) remain constant:
- It must be subject to peer review. When the research in question is not distributed on peer-reviewed platforms, the candidate can present alternative evidence for peer review, such as:
  - Preferentially, candidates will submit projects for review separately through professional organizations.
  - Candidates will provide alternative evidence of review (e.g., competitive grants or competitive prizes and awards won), and alternative evidence of scholarly impact (e.g., speaking invitations and interviews, conference presentations, website views, scholarly citations).
  - When no other review mechanisms are possible, candidates should submit letters from established scholars working in closely aligned fields within academia, familiar with the specific technology, in which these outside reviewers assess the validity, reach, and importance of the digital scholarship.
- It must be innovative. This category includes the scholarship of discovery, application, and integration, described above. In addition, the department recognizes that given the emerging nature of (for example) digital scholarship in our fields, the development of novel protocols and techniques for data and text analysis and its application can constitute a valuable original contribution.*
- It must be made available to other scholars through appropriate distribution channels. Candidates need to note:
  - the reach of digital research distribution platforms by citing appropriate numeric metrics;
  - the longevity and permanence of distribution channels by explaining the timeline of the research project;
  - plans for its permanent archiving as it comes to the end of its life cycle.

*Presner argues that the digital design itself is an important aspect of the scholarly rigor of a project, and that while "scholarly rigor must be assessed by examining how the work contributes to and advances the state of knowledge of a given field or fields," it is also true that "new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content" ("How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship," *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 1:4, 2012).

III.5.c Service:
During the *evaluation period*, it is expected the candidate will take part in the following kinds of service. ***Note that <u>the first three (3) are required</u>; the others are considered valuable kinds of service***:

- ***Two** department committees per year, at least **one** of which has been **chaired** for **two** years

- *** Participation in** one college committee
- *** University-level committee work**

- Significant service within the college or at university level may include the following:
    - Leadership of programmatic development
    - Supervision of Teaching Associates (or other teacher training)
    - Academic senator
    - Accreditation work
    - System-wide work (such as sitting on the English Council board)
    - Peer review of junior colleagues
    - Community service

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.5.d Student Involvement:
During the evaluation period, the candidate will do **two** or more of the *types* of activities listed below, which are in addition to helping deserving students by writing letters of recommendation:

- Mentor students (sit on thesis committee, M.A. examinations, senior projects, research, special projects)
- Editing, producing, publicizing, organizing and facilitating readings/performances (such as the Graduate Symposium)
- Advise a club
- Document extra time spent outside of office hours creating and fostering an intellectual community (such as presenting at Graduate Orientation or rehearsing students for their public presentations at the Sigma Tau Delta Convention or the UCR Symposium for Undergraduate Research, etc.)

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.6. Criteria for Early Tenure:
Policy No. 1329, section 2.6, states that requests "for early actions shall not be considered unless the individual will have completed two years of full-time service in an academic rank position on this campus prior to the effective date of those actions." Further, such consideration "shall place emphasis on teaching ability and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications

with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession."

It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our four areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Performance that exceeds our expectations in all four areas might *add* the following:

III.6.1 Teaching Effectiveness:
- A composite average score of "2" or much better (i.e., lower), on questions 6-10 and 11-16 of the EML Student Evaluation Scantron form.
- Peer evaluations that attest to extraordinary quality
- **Two** or more years of effective academic advising
- Significant number of theses directed
- Significant course and curriculum development
- Significant work in assessment
- Participation in teaching-related workshops
- Innovative integration of technology
- Service-learning courses
- Regional and national workshops on teaching

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.6.2 Scholarly and Creative Work:
- Six (6) or more refereed publications *or* **a** book (with evidence of more work, such as other publications, work in press, or a contract)
- Editorship of a scholarly journal or a position on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
- External grants

III.6.3 Service:
- Officer in CSU English Council (or equivalent)
- Directorship of a university center or program (such as the Testing Center or Writing Center)
- Leadership in Academic Senate

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.6.4 Student Involvement:
- Editor-in-chief of student-centered or student-run publication
- Significant work as club advisor (such as helping students organize a major fundraiser or conference)

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.7. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor:
A faculty member will be considered for early promotion only if he or she has demonstrated superior performance in all areas. Superior performance is reflected in the following:

III.7.1 Teaching Effectiveness:
- A composite average score much better than 2 (or lower) or evidence of progress toward this average score on questions 6-10 and 11-16 of the EML Student Evaluation Scantron form.
- Peer evaluations that attest to extraordinary quality
- **Two** or more years of effective academic advising
- Significant course and curriculum development
- Significant work in assessment
- Significant number of theses directed
- Participation in teaching-related workshops
- Innovative integration of technology
- Service-learning courses
- Regional and national workshops on teaching

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.7.2 Scholarly and Creative Work:
- Six (6) or more refereed publications *or* **a** book (with evidence of more work, such as other publications, work in press, or a contract)
- Editorship of a scholarly journal or a position on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
- External grants

III.7.3 Service:
- Officer in CSU English Council (or equivalent)
- Directorship of a university center or program (such as the Testing Center or Writing Center)

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.7.4 Student Involvement:
- Editor-in-chief of student-centered or student-run publication
- Significant work as club advisor (such as helping students organize a major fundraiser or conference)

Work performed in this category with the support of an IIA, needs to be marked clearly as IIA supported (both in the narrative and in the bullet summary), for example with an Asterisk and the phrase "supported by IIA." IIAs may not be used toward 'exceeding' criteria.

III.8. Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor:
As with requests for early tenure, Policy 1328 states that the consideration of request for Early Promotion to Professor "shall place emphasis on teaching, and shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications with regard to scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession" (Policy No. 1328 Section 2.6 and CBA 13.3). It is thereby emphasized that exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications must be demonstrated by exceeding, in our four areas of performance and evaluation, *all* the specific criteria for promotion to professor. Performance that exceeds our expectations in all four areas might *add* something like the following:

III.8.1 Teaching Effectiveness:
- A composite average much better (lower) than 2, on questions 6-10 and 11-16 of the EML Student Evaluation Scantron form.
- Continuous and demonstrably effective academic advising
- Leadership roles at national workshops on teaching

III.8.2 Scholarly or Creative Work:
- Six (6) articles in refereed journals (or the equivalent) or **a** book since promotion to associate professor
- Regular invited-speaker status at conferences

III.8.3 Service:
- Significant accomplishment as result of committees chaired
- Leadership in programmatic assessment

III.8.4 Student Involvement:
- Creation and leadership of new clubs, productions, etc.

- Supervision of student work leading to publication

APPENDIX A
Student Evaluation Instructions

The following procedure statement will be read or handed out to the class prior to administering the student evaluation:

> The EML Department requests your participation in the evaluation process of this class. A volunteer will proctor and distribute the evaluation form to each student. The instructor will not be present during the administration of the questionnaire. Completion of the questionnaire is voluntary. Results are confidential. The questionnaire is anonymous and will not affect your grade.

> Please do not write on the back of the questionnaire. If your instructor wishes written evaluations, a separate sheet will be used.

> Please start filling in the questionnaire as soon as your instructor has left the room.

Student Proctor Instructions:

- Student proctor will seal all questionnaires, used and unused in the envelope provided by the department.
- Student proctor will deliver sealed envelope to the EML department office.