November 8, 2004

Dear Selase,

You recently asked for the English department to submit a revision of its department-level RTP criteria. In particular, you have asked for a more finely detailed policy regarding scholarship and creative activity in the RTP process. The department met on Friday, November 5, to discuss this issue. As you and I discussed earlier, the situation with English has its own complications. Two years ago, I submitted a document to you (the one you now ask us to revise, and which I attach as Appendix A) without departmental consultation. This document, though not overly committal and in keeping with the faculty handbook generally, lacks official standing. It cannot stand as the departmental document without departmental approval; we must simply disregard it.

At Friday’s meeting, the department unanimously re-ratified its previous official document on Scholarship and Creative Activity (Appendix B). This document served the department for many years, and we intend its continued use. We believe that neither you nor the department should take any other steps in this matter, at least for the remainder of this RTP cycle. We have grave concerns that changing criteria in the middle of an RTP cycle raises questions of fairness. Faculty members undergoing review should not have to face shifting expectations mid-year.

The English department fully intends to keep working on this issue. We think it reasonable to submit a revised document to you in May for use in the 2005-06 RTP cycles. We understand that we will need to address issues such as the following in such a revision, and plan to address these and related issues in subsequent department meetings:

• The extent to which we should weight various types of evidence in RTP considerations
• The degree of specificity for criteria for normal tenure and promotion
• The degree of specificity for criteria for early tenure and/or early promotion
• Expectations of scholarship in a climate with continually decreasing resources (e.g. less/no time off for new hires; less release time for administrative duties)
• The extent to which scholarship accomplished prior to work at CSUDH should count
• The extent to which we can/should include peer review in our evaluation of teaching
• How our expectations and decisions will match those of other departments

In a sense, I am not giving you what you asked for at this time; rather, I give you a promissory note for May. The department agrees with both you and Provost Mori as to the importance of an informative and fair RTP process and wants to work deliberately to this end. Please keep in mind that our department-level RTP committees, as well as the chair, always write evaluative rather than descriptive letters. We know that local levels of review have the best authority to comment on the contributions of our colleagues, and we take our responsibility to use this authority wisely with the
utmost seriousness. The Provost made two main points in his meeting last Wednesday: a) that teaching evaluations should not refer to PTE numbers alone; and b) that scholarship evaluations should give a sense as to the relative importance of the work (the status of a given journal, conference, etc.). You already know that the English department has always done just this, and we will continue to do so.

To sum up: the English department reaffirms its earlier document on Scholarship and Creative Activity. It strongly urges that no changes to the RTP process take place mid-cycle. We give you our word to give you a revised document by May 2005. Until then, we promise that the department RTP committees and chair will continue to write informative, interpretive letters that will help higher levels of review make wise decisions. We trust that we will all work together to make the RTP process as just as possible.

Sincerely,

Ed Zoerner
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION  
September 2, 2004

The following gives the policies and procedures that the English Department will apply when evaluating its own faculty members for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion (RTP). These criteria follow the spirit of University RTP policy.

I. **Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty**

The department will evaluate faculty members with respect to three basic categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will judge a faculty member worthy of retention, timely tenure, or timely promotion only if the faculty member demonstrates sufficient achievement in all three categories. For a faculty member to earn a departmental recommendation for early tenure or early promotion, he or she must not only demonstrate sufficient accomplishment in teaching, but show exceptional achievement in at least one additional category.

A. **Evidence of Teaching Performance**

The English Department follows the University in giving teaching effectiveness the highest priority as a RTP criterion. In its effort to determine the teaching effectiveness of faculty under review, the department will:

1) Review and analyze both the statistical summaries and the written comments from students on the Perceived Teaching Effectiveness (PTE) forms for the courses that the faculty member has chosen for inclusion in the personnel action file.

2) Review and evaluate representative materials that the faculty member has given to students, such as: syllabi, examinations, homework assignments, writing assignments.

3) Review the grading criteria that the faculty member has established for courses.

4) Consider the faculty member’s self-assessment of teaching effectiveness.

5) Consider any other indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s teaching. This might include, for example, peer evaluation of a class session (requested by the faculty member under review).

6) Note the appropriateness of office hours that the faculty member sets and keeps.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to all of the above, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member. The department will hold (1) and (2) especially important when making such judgments.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who consistently proves deficient in any of the above considerations.
B. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly activity also holds great importance in the RTP process, for several reasons. An active scholar:
becomes a better teacher; stimulates intellectual activity within the department; and brings credit to the
University. The department will consider the following types of scholarly and creative activity when evaluating
a faculty member:

1) Publications. This would include such published works as: a book; an article in a refereed journal;
a story or poem; an article in a proceedings of a conference; a contribution to an anthology; editorial notes to a
text, a short article in a newsletter, and so on. The department will also consider scholarly and creative work
produced in forms other than written publication, such as films, videos, digital and media arts, and performances.
On a related note, the department will consider the faculty member’s other contributions to publications and
related organizations, such as serving on an editorial board or acting as a referee. Please understand the preceding
as representative rather than exhaustive.

2) Participation at Professional Conferences. This would principally include such things as: giving
a paper at a professional conference/workshop; serving as an invited panel member at a professional conference;
and giving an invited talk on one’s field of expertise. On a related note, the department will consider attendance
at professional conferences, chairing sessions at professional conferences and the like as participation. Again,
please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

3) Manuscripts in Progress. This would include work either under review or undergoing preparation
for review. The department will consider manuscripts and other works in progress as evidence of the faculty
member’s activity.

4) Other Research in Progress. This would include such things as: pursuing research through a
fellowship; conducting sabbatical-based research; taking part in seminars; preparing research proposals, and the
like.

5) Activity in Professional Organizations. This would include such things as holding an office or
serving on a committee within a professional organization, or (less importantly) membership in professional
organizations.

6) Other Professional Contributions. This would include such things as: giving an invited colloquium
or other presentation; receiving an award within the academic discipline; earning relevant credentials or licenses;
organizing a conference, colloquium, symposium or workshop, and so on. The department will remain open-
minded with respect to what counts as a professional contribution.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to scholarly and creative
activity, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely
tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does
not provide sufficient evidence of scholarly and creative activity.
C. Evidence of Effective Service within the Institution and Community

The successful faculty member contributes to the department, the University, and the community at large. Meaningful service can of course take many forms. The following lists merely suggest a few of the possibilities of what would count appropriate types of service; the department will of course consider other relevant contributions as well.

**Departmental Service**
- Serving on department committees
- Serving as a coordinator (Graduate; Composition; TESL, etc.)
- Directing or serving as a reader for Master’s Theses/Projects
- Leading student colloquia
- Proposing curricular modifications
- Collecting and analyzing data that assists departmental decisions

**Campuswide Service**
- Serving on College- or University-level committees
- Overseeing the GWAR
- Serving on committees for other University bodies (General Studies, Liberal Studies, etc.)
- Performing University Advising
- Bringing in grant money
- Serving as department chair

**Community Service**
- Holding office in a community organization
- Consulting for community groups within one’s field of expertise
- Coordinating symposia, workshops and the like for the public
- Giving a public lecture
- Participating in campus outreach efforts and activities

To repeat: the above lists do not exhaust the possibilities. The department will consider activities such as the above and other relevant activity for which the faculty member under review provides evidence.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to service, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of service to the department, campus, and/or community.
Scholarship and Creative Activity
Department of English

The faculty of the English Department believes that the university is best served by members who are intellectually active and engaged in scholarly work which enlivens and enriches their teaching, and keeps it current. The fruits of this activity may be shared with colleagues, students and the academic and wider communities in a variety of ways.

We have adapted the CSU Academic Senate's January 1986 description of what the evidence of professional activity might include, believing that it reflects our commitment to recognizing the variety of ways in which excellence may be achieved.

Evidence of professional activity may include:

1. Publication: papers in professional journals; books; texts;

2. Critical contributions, such as criticism or reviews for periodicals or magazines;

3. Papers or other contributions at professional conferences, seminars or special programs;

4. Creative activity which culminates in a product made available to one's peers for evaluation;

5. Consultantships, paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise, including serving as a referee, reviewer or editor of a journal or other compilation of professional contributions;

6. An active program of scholarly or creative work in progress, appropriate to the discipline;

7. Receipt of awards, fellowships, honors or grants related to the faculty member's professional work;

8. Active participation in seminars, conferences, meetings or other activity leading to growth in the faculty member's area of expertise, with recognition given to scholarship involved in the preparation of syllabi for new courses and new programs;

9. Service on committees or boards of professional organizations;

10. Other items of specific professional activity such as significant special appointments or visiting professorships or consultant assignments in other academic, professional or governmental institutions.
establish a new deadline.

Professional Performance

(Reference: PM 84-11, 5/84 and PM 85-06, 4/1985)

The following list of particulars is illustrative of professional achievement, but is not exhaustive. Not all examples must be used and they may be adapted to fit the needs of individual departments or areas within the University, and other evidence may be added.

In applying the criteria below, care is to be exercised to assure that evaluations and recommendations are based only on professional competence and professional performance as documented in the file.

1. Evidence of teaching performance. Such evidence as the following will be considered.

   1.1 A representative sample of course materials (including, but not limited to, course outlines, syllabi, statements of goals and objectives, assignments, lists of texts and other materials, sample assignments, copies of examinations) must be submitted for those classes in which the PTE evaluations are officially included in the RTP file, so that the materials can be evaluated at the department level for appropriateness of level and coverage, scholarly currency, and helpfulness to students.

   1.2 Indications of the ability to fit course content and teaching strategies to the level and purpose of each course (e.g., general education, upper division, elective courses, sequential relation to other courses).

   1.3 Student evaluations of a faculty member.

   1.4 Evidence of independent work and activities of the faculty member or his or her students beyond the usual requirements.

2. Evidence of Scholarship or Creative Activity. (Revision adopted May 27, 1975) Such evidence as the following will be considered, and distinction in at least one of these categories is required for faculty appointment without the doctorate in the teaching field.

   2.1 Significant research resulting in publication and reports.
2. Evidence of Scholarship or Creative Activity. (Revision adopted May 27, 1975.) Such evidence as the following will be considered, and distinction in at least one of these categories is required for faculty appointment without the doctorate in the teaching field.

2.1 Significant research resulting in publication and reports.

2.2 Publications in learned journals and periodicals in the teaching field (which may or may not be research-related, depending on specialty).

2.3 Significant consulting, paid or unpaid, in fields closely related to the teaching discipline; or evidence of related research, paid or unpaid, from which no publication necessarily results, even though propriety reports may be written; provided that the quality and originality of these activities is attested by recognized experts in the field or by equivalent evidence. (Added by PM 80-06, 3/3/80)

2.4 An outstanding regional, state, or national reputation in the field of specialty in at least one of the following examples: publishing, teaching, speaking, consulting, performance, production, or related activities.

For creative rather than research-oriented disciplines, appropriate examples are:

For Fine Arts or Theater Arts Faculty: a regional and/or national exhibition, production, or performance record, or a record of creativity resulting in performed works evaluated by peers and department chairperson.

For Communications Faculty: a record of continuing publication in significant newspapers or periodicals with regional or national distribution, or a record of continuing production of radio, television, or film material which has regional or national distribution.

2.5 Active participation through papers, panels, symposia, etc., in meetings and conferences of professional organizations.

2.6 Significant activity in the leadership of professional organizations such as holding office, committee membership, etc.

2.7 Effective sharing of research findings, consulting experience, and related activities with colleagues and students for the general benefit of the University community.

2.8 Receipt of significant awards, commissions, prizes, honors, or grants.

The policy below was adopted upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate, on October 10, 1985 (PM 85-11).
The policy below was adopted upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate, on October 10, 1985 (PM 85-11).

Activity for completion of a terminal degree (as defined by the appointment letter) shall not be counted under the criterion of scholarship for RTP purposes. It shall only be considered in fulfillment of obligation for pre-tenure review. Scholarship which utilizes terminal degree material (for example, dissertation chapters) beyond the satisfaction of degree requirements shall be deemed acceptable for RTP purposes.

3. Evidence of effective functioning in the institution and in the community.

Such evidence as the following will be considered:

3.1 Effective participation and contributions as a member of departmental, interdisciplinary, school, University-wide and system-wide committees.

3.2 Effectiveness in student advisement.

3.3 Participation in student activities as sponsor or advisor.

3.4 Availability for consultation with students.

3.5 Representation of the University in community groups or agencies (other than those of a purely social nature) e.g., speeches, consultancies, committee memberships.

Professional Resume

Candidates in the RTP cycle should also be aware of the following policy.

All processes that involve personnel actions respecting a faculty member should include an up-to-date professional resume. This particularly refers to reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews.

All personnel actions forwarded to the President for review should be accompanied by a current professional resume including the following: (1) all post secondary education with precise indication of the discipline(s) in which all advanced degrees are held (with dates); (2) all relevant professional employment (in reverse chronological order) with indications of other activity for any period in which professional employment was not held (such as military service); (3) a list of all
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The following gives the policies and procedures that the English Department will apply when evaluating its own faculty members for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion (RTP). These criteria follow the spirit of University RTP policy.

I. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The department will evaluate faculty members with respect to three basic categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will judge a faculty member worthy of retention, timely tenure, or timely promotion only if the faculty member demonstrates sufficient achievement in all three categories. For a faculty member to earn a departmental recommendation for early tenure or early promotion, he or she must not only demonstrate sufficient accomplishment in all three, but show exceptional achievement in at least one category.

A. Evidence of Teaching Performance

The English Department follows the University in giving teaching effectiveness the highest priority as a RTP criterion. In its effort to determine the teaching effectiveness of faculty under review, the department will:

1) Review and analyze both the statistical summaries and the written comments from students on the Perceived Teaching Effectiveness (PTE) forms for the courses that the faculty member has chosen for inclusion in the personnel action file.

2) Review and evaluate representative materials that the faculty member has given to students, such as: syllabi, examinations, homework assignments, writing assignments.

3) Review the grading criteria that the faculty member has established for courses.

4) Consider the faculty member’s self-assessment of teaching effectiveness.

5) Consider any other indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s teaching. This might include, for example, peer evaluation of a class session (requested by the faculty member under review).

6) Note the appropriateness of office hours that the faculty member sets and keeps.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to all of the above, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member. The department will hold (1) and (2) especially important when making such judgments.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who consistently proves deficient in any of the above considerations.
B. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly activity also holds great importance in the RTP process, for several reasons. An active scholar becomes a better teacher, stimulates intellectual activity within the department; and brings credit to the University. The department will consider the following types of scholarly and creative activity when evaluating a faculty member:

1) Publications. This would include such published works as: a book; an article in a refereed journal; a story or poem; an article in a proceedings of a conference; a contribution to an anthology; editorial notes to a text, a short article in a newsletter, and so on. The department will also consider scholarly and creative work produced in forms other than written publication, such as films, videos, digital and media arts, and performances. On a related note, the department will consider the faculty member’s other contributions to publications and related organizations, such as serving on an editorial board or acting as a referee. Please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

2) Participation at Professional Conferences. This would principally include such things as: giving a paper at a professional conference/workshop; serving as an invited panel member at a professional conference; and giving an invited talk on one’s field of expertise. On a related note, the department will consider attendance at professional conferences, chairing sessions at professional conferences and the like as participation. Again, please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

3) Manuscripts in Progress. This would include work either under review or undergoing preparation for review. The department will consider manuscripts and other works in progress as evidence of the faculty member’s activity.

4) Other Research in Progress. This would include such things as: pursuing research through a fellowship; conducting sabbatical-based research; taking part in seminars; preparing research proposals, and the like.

5) Activity in Professional Organizations. This would include such things as holding an office or serving on a committee within a professional organization, or (less importantly) membership in professional organizations.

6) Other Professional Contributions. This would include such things as: giving an invited colloquium or other presentation; receiving an award within the academic discipline; earning relevant credentials or licenses; organizing a conference, colloquium, symposium or workshop, and so on. The department will remain open-minded with respect to what counts as a professional contribution.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to scholarly and creative activity, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of scholarly and creative activity.
C. Evidence of Effective Service within the Institution and Community

The successful faculty member contributes to the department, the University, and the community at large. Meaningful service can of course take many forms. The following lists merely suggest a few of the possibilities of what would count appropriate types of service; the department will of course consider other relevant contributions as well.

Departmental Service
- Serving on department committees
- Serving as a coordinator (Graduate; Composition; TESL, etc.)
- Directing or serving as a reader for Master’s Theses/Projects
- Leading student colloquia
- Proposing curricular modifications
- Collecting and analyzing data that assists departmental decisions

Campuswide Service
- Serving on College- or University-level committees
- Overseeing the GWAR
- Serving on committees for other University bodies (General Studies, Liberal Studies, etc.)
- Performing University Advising
- Bringing in grant money
- Serving as department chair

Community Service
- Holding office in a community organization
- Consulting for community groups within one’s field of expertise
- Coordinating symposia, workshops and the like for the public
- Giving a public lecture
- Participating in campus outreach efforts and activities

To repeat: the above lists do not exhaust the possibilities. The department will consider activities such as the above and other relevant activity for which the faculty member under review provides evidence.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to service, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of service to the department, campus, and/or community.
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The following gives the policies and procedures that the English Department will apply when evaluating its own faculty members for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion (RTP). These criteria follow the spirit of University RTP policy.

I. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty
The department will evaluate faculty members with respect to three basic categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will judge a faculty member worthy of retention, timely tenure, or timely promotion only if the faculty member demonstrates sufficient achievement in all three categories. For a faculty member to earn a departmental recommendation for early tenure or early promotion, he or she must not only demonstrate sufficient accomplishment in all three, but show exceptional achievement in at least one category.

A. Evidence of Teaching Performance
The English Department follows the University in giving teaching effectiveness the highest priority as a RTP criterion. In its effort to determine the teaching effectiveness of faculty under review, the department will:

1) Review and analyze both the statistical summaries and the written comments from students on the Perceived Teaching Effectiveness (PTE) forms for the courses that the faculty member has chosen for inclusion in the personnel action file.

2) Review and evaluate representative materials that the faculty member has given to students, such as: syllabi, examinations, homework assignments, writing assignments.

3) Review the grading criteria that the faculty member has established for courses.

4) Consider the faculty member’s self-assessment of teaching effectiveness.

5) Consider any other indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s teaching. This might include, for example, peer evaluation of a class session (requested by the faculty member under review).

6) Note the appropriateness of office hours that the faculty member sets and keeps.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to all of the above, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member. The department will hold (1) and (2) especially important when making such judgments.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who consistently proves deficient in any of the above considerations.

B. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity
Scholarly activity also holds great importance in the RTP process, for several reasons. An active scholar: becomes a better teacher; stimulates intellectual activity within the department; and brings credit to the University. The department will consider the following types of scholarly and creative activity when evaluating a faculty member:
1) **Publications.** This would include such published works as: a book; an article in a refereed journal; a story or poem; an article in a proceedings of a conference; a contribution to an anthology; editorial notes to a text, a short article in a newsletter, and so on. The department will also consider scholarly and creative work produced in forms other than written publication, such as films, videos, digital and media arts, and performances. On a related note, the department will consider the faculty member’s other contributions to publications and related organizations, such as serving on an editorial board or acting as a referee. Please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

2) **Participation at Professional Conferences.** This would principally include such things as: giving a paper at a professional conference/workshop; serving as an invited panel member at a professional conference; and giving an invited talk on one’s field of expertise. On a related note, the department will consider attendance at professional conferences, chairing sessions at professional conferences and the like as participation. Again, please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

3) **Manuscripts in Progress.** This would include work either under review or undergoing preparation for review. The department will consider manuscripts and other works in progress as evidence of the faculty member’s activity.

4) **Other Research in Progress.** This would include such things as: pursuing research through a fellowship; conducting sabbatical-based research; taking part in seminars; preparing research proposals, and the like.

5) **Activity in Professional Organizations.** This would include such things as holding an office or serving on a committee within a professional organization, or (less importantly) membership in professional organizations.

6) **Other Professional Contributions.** This would include such things as: giving an invited colloquium or other presentation; receiving an award within the academic discipline; earning relevant credentials or licenses; organizing a conference, colloquium, symposium or workshop, and so on. The department will remain open-minded with respect to what counts as a professional contribution.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to scholarly and creative activity, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of scholarly and creative activity.

C. **Evidence of Effective Service within the Institution and Community**

The successful faculty member contributes to the department, the University, and the community at large. Meaningful service can of course take many forms. The following lists merely suggest a few of the possibilities of what would count appropriate types of service; the department will of course consider other relevant contributions as well.

**Departmental Service**
- Serving on department committees
- Serving as a coordinator (Graduate; Composition; TESL, etc.)
- Directing or serving as a reader for Master’s Theses/Projects
• Leading student colloquia
• Proposing curricular modifications
• Collecting and analyzing data that assists departmental decisions

Campuswide Service
• Serving on CAS- or University-level committees
• Overseeing the GWAR
• Serving on committees for other University bodies (General Studies, Liberal Studies, etc.)
• Performing University Advising
• Bringing in grant money
• Serving as department chair

Community Service
• Holding office in a community organization
• Consulting for community groups within one’s field of expertise
• Coordinating symposia, workshops and the like for the public
• Giving a public lecture
• Participating in campus outreach efforts and activities

To repeat: the above lists do not exhaust the possibilities. The department will consider activities such as the above and other relevant activity for which the faculty member under review provides evidence.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to service, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of service to the department, campus, and/or community.
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The following gives the policies and procedures that the English Department will apply when evaluating its own faculty members for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion (RTP). These criteria follow the spirit of University RTP policy.

I. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The department will evaluate faculty members with respect to three basic categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will judge a faculty member worthy of retention, timely tenure, or timely promotion only if the faculty member demonstrates sufficient achievement in all three categories. For a faculty member to earn a departmental recommendation for early tenure or early promotion, he or she must not only demonstrate sufficient accomplishment in all three, but show exceptional achievement in at least one category.

A. Evidence of Teaching Performance

The English Department follows the University in giving teaching effectiveness the highest priority as a RTP criterion. In its effort to determine the teaching effectiveness of faculty under review, the department will:

1) Review and analyze both the statistical summaries and the written comments from students on the Perceived Teaching Effectiveness (PTE) forms for the courses that the faculty member has chosen for inclusion in the personnel action file.

2) Review and evaluate representative materials that the faculty member has given to students, such as: syllabi, examinations, homework assignments, writing assignments.

3) Review the grading criteria that the faculty member has established for courses.

4) Consider the faculty member's self-assessment of teaching effectiveness.

5) Consider any other indicators of the quality of the faculty member's teaching. This might include, for example, peer evaluation of a class session (requested by the faculty member under review).

6) Note the appropriateness of office hours that the faculty member sets and keeps.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to all of the above, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member. The department will hold (1) and (2) especially important when making such judgments.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who consistently proves deficient in any of the above considerations.

B. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly activity also holds great importance in the RTP process, for several reasons. An active scholar: becomes a better teacher; stimulates intellectual activity within the department; and brings credit to the University. The department will consider the following types of scholarly and creative activity when evaluating a faculty member:
1) **Publications.** This would include such published works as: a book, an article in a refereed journal, a story or poem, an article in the proceedings of a conference, a contribution to an anthology, editorial notes to a text, a short article in a newsletter, and so on. The department will also consider scholarly and creative work produced in forms other than written publication, such as films, videos, digital and media arts, and performances. On a related note, the department will consider the faculty member’s other contributions to publications and related organizations, such as serving on an editorial board or acting as a referee. Please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

2) **Participation at Professional Conferences.** This would principally include such things as: giving a paper at a professional conference/workshop; serving as an invited panel member at a professional conference; and giving an invited talk on one’s field of expertise. On a related note, the department will consider attendance at professional conferences, chairing sessions at professional conferences and the like as participation. Again, please understand the preceding as representative rather than exhaustive.

3) **Manuscripts in Progress.** This would include work either under review or undergoing preparation for review. The department will consider manuscripts and other works in progress as evidence of the faculty member’s activity.

4) **Other Research in Progress.** This would include such things as: pursuing research through a fellowship; conducting sabbatical-based research; taking part in seminars; preparing research proposals, and the like.

5) **Activity in Professional Organizations.** This would include such things as holding an office or serving on a committee within a professional organization, or (less importantly) membership in professional organizations.

6) **Other Professional Contributions.** This would include such things as: giving an invited colloquium or other presentation; receiving an award within the academic discipline; earning relevant credentials or licenses; organizing a conference, colloquium, symposium or workshop, and so on. The department will remain open-minded with respect to what counts as a professional contribution.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to scholarly and creative activity, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of scholarly and creative activity.

C. **Evidence of Effective Service within the Institution and Community**

The successful faculty member contributes to the department, the University, and the community at large. Meaningful service can of course take many forms. The following lists merely suggest a few of the possibilities of what would count appropriate types of service; the department will of course consider other relevant contributions as well.

*Departmental Service*

- Serving on department committees
- Serving as a coordinator (Graduate, Composition, TESL, etc.)
- Directing or serving as a reader for Master’s Theses/Projects
Leading student colloquia
Proposing curricular modifications
Collecting and analyzing data that assists departmental decisions

Campuswide Service
• Serving on CAS- or University-level committees
• Overseeing the GWAR
• Serving on committees for other University bodies (General Studies, Liberal Studies, etc.)
• Performing University Advising
• Bringing in grant money
• Serving as department chair

Community Service
• Holding office in a community organization
• Consulting for community groups within one's field of expertise
• Coordinating symposia, workshops and the like for the public
• Giving a public lecture
• Participating in campus outreach efforts and activities

To repeat: the above lists do not exhaust the possibilities. The department will consider activities such as the above and other relevant activity for which the faculty member under review provides evidence.

A faculty member who meets standard departmental expectations with respect to service, in the opinion of the department, deserves retention, timely promotion or timely tenure, as appropriate for that faculty member.

The department may decide to argue against retaining, tenuring, or promoting a faculty member who does not provide sufficient evidence of service to the department, campus, and/or community.