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Africana Studies
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised

Art
The two sub-headings under “Research and Creativity” need to be re-worded. “Evidence of continuous pursuit of scholarly research” and “Evidence of continuous pursuit of creative activities” are unclear. Is the intent something like: “Evidence of continuous scholarly activity” and “Evidence of continuous creative activity?”

There continues to be primarily a listing of activities that can be considered in the review process, but very little guidance in terms of quantity or quality that is expected, nor is there any indication of most highly valued or lesser valued scholarly and/or creative activity.

An example of the lack of specificity can be seen in the items under “Teaching Performance.” The first item simply says “Course syllabi, assignments, and examinations.” What does a reviewer look for in a faculty member’s syllabus, assignments, and examinations to determine if the faculty member is effective?

What would an unusually meritorious file look like? Are there certain standards that a person would have to exceed in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service?

Asian Pacific Studies
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised

Anthropology
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.

Chicano and Chicana Studies
Revisions delayed due to transition in leadership and new faculty appointments. Revised criterion must be submitted for approval by the Dean by May 1, 2005.

Communications
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised

Dance
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.

Digital Media Arts
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.
English
Department faculty still working on a more definitive set of criteria. Until then, we will use the criteria on record. The revised criteria must be submitted by no later than January 30, 2004 in time to be shared with candidates for the position currently being recruited.

Foreign Languages
Revision of criteria has been delayed due to the medical or professional leave of the majority of the senior faculty in the department. The revised criteria must be submitted for approval by the Dean by May 1, 2005.

Humanities
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.

Interdisciplinary Studies
The Dean is in receipt of the “Criteria for Scholarship” from Interdisciplinary Studies. However, a more comprehensive statement of the criteria for RTP is needed from the department. The department is reminded that the revised criteria must include a determination of what constitutes “unusually meritorious performance” which must be satisfied by a faculty member in order to be granted early tenure and/or promotion.

Music
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.

Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peace-building
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.

Philosophy
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised. The department poses some provocative questions which should be the basis of further internal discussions which will lead to an even more refined set of criteria.

The criteria developed for Philosophy will be the provisional criteria for History unless and until the History faculty develop a different set of criteria.

Theater Arts
Approved by Dean Williams, as revised.
DATE: October 8, 2004

TO: Chairs/Coordinators in
Anthropology Department
Art Department
Asian Pacific Studies Program
International Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peace Building
Chicano/Chicana Studies
Dance Program
English Department
Foreign Languages Department
Interdisciplinary Studies Department
Music Department
History and Philosophy Department

FROM: Selase W. Williams, Dean

RE: Department Criteria for RTP and Definition of Scholarship/Creative Activity

This memo is to acknowledge receipt of the document submitted by your department or program, either last spring or this fall, in response to the request for updating the department’s RTP criteria and definition of scholarship and creative activity. The majority of the submissions describe the process for the periodic review of probationary faculty and/or describe the kind of activities or products that will be reviewed. Many of the documents repeat, restate, or paraphrase language that can be found in the Faculty Handbook and/or the Agreement Between CFA and CSU. In the past, when there were few probationary faculty and adequate numbers of senior faculty, junior faculty could count on receiving more specific advice and guidance informally. However, with the increasing number of probationary faculty and the growing scarcity of senior faculty, the time has come to provide more direct and more formal guidance to probationary faculty and to the various levels of RTP review.

The new realities make it incumbent upon departments/programs to clearly state its expectations of a faculty member, not only in the first year of that person’s probationary period, but throughout the five or six years that he/she is in that status. Recognizing the heavy demands of teaching at institutions like ours, it is vital that probationary faculty and RTP review bodies know not only the kind of activities and products that are expected, but how many and at what level of quality. Can an Assistant Professor in your department/program receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion at the
Dear Council Members,

I have received word from Academic Affairs that the Provost would like to have your revised criteria for RTP and definitions of scholarship by November 15th.

Please submit your revised document to me by no later than November 12th. That is a Friday. The revised documents are due in to the Provost by Monday. Although I will be out of town that weekend, I will return on Sunday and review all of the documents in time for me to sign off on them and forward them to the Provost by Monday, November 15th.

I am giving myself very little time to review these so that you will have the maximum amount of time to do your work.

The criteria for RTP is discipline-specific and, in some cases, will even be specialty-specific. Do not feel that you have to evaluate everyone in your discipline by one standard. If a faculty member in one specialty is expected to perform as a measure of his/her scholarly/creative productivity, identify that as one of the expectations. If faculty are expected to publish a book during the six probationary years, indicate that as the expectation. Even with those expectations state, it does not prevent you from citing other products or activities as being equivalent to a book when the candidate is evaluated. I am not looking for cookie cutters.

You indicated that the "professional development plan" is the preferred place to delineate the expectations of the department in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service. If that is the way you wish to frame the criteria, that is fine, but make sure that you identify the level of performance that you expect, regardless of the kind of activity you will accept. For instance, whether you expect a particular probationary faculty member to exhibit, perform, or publish, indicate that the majority of the work submitted for the RTP review must be "juried" or "peer-reviewed" activity. Is there an expectation that the candidate will have gained recognition outside of the university? The region?

A number of you have already shown me drafts of your revisions. It is clear to me that the final drafts will be head and shoulders above the earlier versions and that these will provide much stronger guidance to probationary faculty and the various RTP committees.

Thanks for your diligence on this.

Selase
GUIDELINES
For
Narratives and Supporting Materials
In
Working Personnel Action Files

As part of the campus' annual Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) review process, each tenure-track faculty member and full-time lecturer submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Among the various documents included in the WPAF is a narrative based of a Supplementary Information Form (SIF). During the RTP process, WPAFs are reviewed to give timely, accurate and adequate performance evaluations for faculty under review. To provide the most effective feedback, consistent guidelines have been established for the construction of the WPAF. Guidelines are important to avoid excessive length and volume and to preclude the inclusion of extraneous materials. Parsimony in both narrative and supporting materials in a WPAF directs focus on major accomplishments. To achieve both consistency and reasonable length while including all key materials that demonstrate professional performance, these guidelines have been adopted for the construction of the WPAF.

The WPAF shall be limited in size and volume such that all materials will fit in one (1) 3-inch letter-size 3-ring binder. Three (3) 1-inch letter size 3-ring binders may be substituted only if that improves presentation in some way.

A faculty member’s SIF narrative shall be limited in length to a total of ten (10) typewritten pages that are single-spaced (or the equivalent), with two (2) spaces between paragraphs, using a 12-point font. The focus of the narrative shall be on key accomplishments and direction of professional work in all areas.

To keep to these length requirements, faculty are expected to focus on providing key information and to further reflect on the meaning of key information for their professional development and success. The following are examples of supporting materials for each area of review:

- For teaching: syllabi, selected handouts, and evaluative measures.
- For research, scholarship and creative activity: evidence of publications (e.g., published title pages, tables of contents, abstracts), peer evaluations of one’s research and scholarship, programs from presentations or shows. Raw data is not to be placed in the WPAF; summaries of research results are more appropriate.
- For service: letters indicating service on committees, event flyers.

Faculty under RTP review should consider selecting about five to six key items for each of the above categories that best represent their work.

These guidelines are effective for the 2003-2004 academic year RTP review cycle.