

## **Criteria and Standards for Retention, Tenure and Promotion** **Department of English** **Humboldt State University**

The Department of English is committed to helping faculty colleagues succeed in their teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. The tenured and tenure-track faculty in English have voted to approve the following departmental criteria and standards for the three areas of evaluation in the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process. We regard this as a living document meant to enhance, clarify, and /or interpret—but not to replace or supersede—the broader standards outlined in Appendix J of the HSU Faculty Handbook (revised August 2014). We understand that issues may arise which we did not anticipate and which this document does not adequately address. In such instances, the IUPC and the RTP candidate should indicate how and why it was necessary to depart from the guidelines below.

Appendix J, Section IX.2 of the Faculty Handbook requires periodic evaluation of candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion in three areas of performance:

*Candidates shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities, and service. The most important of these specific criteria for determining academic competence shall be teaching/librarian/counseling effectiveness. A record of teaching/ librarian/ counseling excellence, combined with an “Acceptable” level of performance in the two non-teaching/librarian/counseling areas, as defined in the department/unit criteria and standards, shall be taken as a strong justification for RTP.*

With the understanding that all candidates must demonstrate “excellence” in teaching effectiveness, Appendix J, Section X.2.c offers the table below to guide departments and candidates in determining whether a candidate’s progress to date is acceptable or unacceptable for retention, tenure and promotion.

<b><i>Scholarly/Creative Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Service</i></b>	<b><i>Outcome</i></b>
<i>Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>
<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Minimum Essential</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>
<i>Minimal Essential</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>
<i>Good</i>	<i>Minimum Essential</i>	<i>Unacceptable</i>
<i>Minimum Essential</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Unacceptable</i>

Appendix J, section X.2.c.1 further specifies that

*Each department/unit, in its criteria and standards, shall clearly define the level of performance required for each of the evaluative terms: Minimum Essential, Good, and Excellent.*

## A. Teaching Effectiveness

Appendix J, section IX.B.1.a.4 states, in part:

*Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student evaluations by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes.*

We recognize that student advising and mentoring should also be evaluated as part of teaching effectiveness, as per Appendix J, section IX.B.1.a.6:

*Constructive and professional relationships with students are important for a strong academic program; therefore, it is expected that faculty demonstrate sound academic advising, effective counseling of students on course-related matters, the ability to work with a diverse student population, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist the academic needs of students.*

All tenure-track members of the English Faculty (unless on an approved, extended leave such as a sabbatical) should write colleague letters that may include descriptions of, and reflections upon, their observations of the candidate's "Teaching Effectiveness." The IUPC shall ensure that all faculty members observe the candidate multiple times over the course of a WPAF review cycle (normally six years for tenure and promotion to Assistant Professor and five years for promotion to Full).

In evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness, colleagues may address activities including but not limited to the following:

1. **Direct Instruction:**
  - a. Observations of the candidate's in-class teaching, including lecture, discussion, and other types of instruction or classroom activity;
  - b. Observation of the candidate in other teaching environments, such as workshops, co-teaching, or guest lectures; and
  - c. Review of course syllabi and assignments and/or the candidate's use of a learning management system to organize and convey class material.
2. **Academic Advising, Supervision and Mentoring of Students:** This may include academic advising and career mentoring; supervising student assistants; and/or providing additional observation, evaluation and/or support outside of the normal classroom environment as indicated in student letters or collegial observation.
3. **Development of Teaching Materials and Curriculum:** This may include developing teaching materials such as course outlines, study-guides, instructional manuals, case studies and simulations and/or other content used in the classroom; developing and/or revising curriculum outcomes and assessment methodology; and/or making contributions to the achievement of departmental curriculum goals.

4. **Professional Development Activities in Teaching:** This may include reviewing literature and research in subject area teaching; planning and/or participating in professional development activities; developing and improving teaching and assessment methods; attending conferences and/or seminars related to subject area teaching; conducting private research related to teaching; and/or engaging in other activities related to teaching which have not resulted in publication or other forms of scholarly dissemination.

To achieve the standard of “excellence” in teaching effectiveness, a candidate for tenure and promotion must, at a minimum:

- Provide syllabi for all classes taught which clearly communicate course objectives, grading criteria, and other course and university policies;
- Be available to students outside of class each week via such means as regular office hours, e-mail, etc.;
- Carry out assigned advising duties responsibly;
- Participate in departmental efforts (if any) to assess and improve courses with which the faculty member has been involved;
- Demonstrate commitment to a diverse and/or inclusive learning environment through the use of multicultural content, varied means of assessment, and responsive teaching strategies; and
- Reflect and comment on any unfavorable patterns in student evaluations, noting applied or planned changes to pedagogical practice where warranted.

In addition, the candidate may demonstrate a record of accomplishment in activities such as (but not limited to):

- Participating in professional development activities designed to enhance teaching effectiveness and advising (e.g., the Institute for Student Success, faculty and staff book circles, etc.);
- Mentoring of students above and beyond required advising duties;
- Developing and implementing new courses, original course content, and/or innovative teaching methods or technologies;
- Conducting workshops or seminars on teaching within the department, college or profession;
- Leading departmental curricular development or review;
- Receiving a college, university, or other teaching award;
- Supervising students in original research or collaborative, faculty-based research;
- Participating in extra-classroom activities with students, such as exhibitions, field trips, and workshops;
- Developing opportunities for the publication or dissemination of student work.

It is understood that candidates for RTP will document these activities in their WPAF, and that they will critically reflect upon their pedagogical philosophy and practice—and, where applicable, on student and peer evaluations of their teaching—in the relevant sections of their PDS. We recommend that candidates offer narrative commentary on *each course* taught, in addition to a general statement of teaching philosophy.

## **B. Scholarly/Creative Activities**

Because faculty in English come from a variety of disciplinary and professional backgrounds, including Composition and Rhetoric, Creative Writing, Cultural Studies, English Education, Linguistics, and Literary Studies, and because our scholarly and creative work is often inter- or trans-disciplinary, the

following standards reflect a broad definition of scholarship and creative activity that reflects the range of aims, audiences, and methodologies within our field. Candidates for RTP in English may choose to be evaluated in terms of Scholarship, Creative Activity, or both. A given instance of Scholarly/Creative Activity may also straddle or combine from both categories.

As guiding principles, we:

- Recognize that scholarship and creative activity may take many forms and employ many different methodologies.
- Embrace the five dimensions of scholarship as proposed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (discovery, integration, application, teaching, and community engagement) and as outlined in Appendix J, Section IX.B.2.a-e, with the understanding that all forms of scholarship and creative activity must be publicly disseminated and subject to some form of peer review.
- Value work produced for academic and/or non-academic audiences.
- Value collaborative research and creative activity and co-authored publications, on the same level as solitary or single-authored work.
- Understand that peer-reviewed online, digital, and new-media venues may equal print publications in terms of significance and prestige.
- Recognize that while the lag between submission, acceptance, and publication in Humanities disciplines is often quite protracted, nevertheless a manuscript accepted for publication in one review cycle and published in the next should not be claimed in both cycles.

Our recognition of scholarship also includes activities that draw on scholarly expertise but do not result in a publication, such as refereeing, editing, and commenting on the scholarly work of others; the conceptual and intellectual (as opposed to merely logistical) work of organizing conferences and editing books or journal; etc. (Individual candidates shall make the case whether such activities constitute “scholarly” or “service” achievements and provide appropriate evidence in their WPAF.) We also recognize the value of community-based research and collaborations with community organizations that result in reports, public hearings, and/or substantive engagement with community members, all of which may indicate a faculty member’s stature in his or her field.

We have grouped examples of such scholarly and creative activities into Categories 1 and 2 below. These lists should not, however, be considered exhaustive. Furthermore, we note that Appendix J, Section IX.B.5 provides that a candidate may submit for evaluation an activity not specifically included under Boyer’s five dimensions of scholarship (see above). In such instances, candidates should explain and justify the case for inclusion, and should consult with the IUPC throughout the probationary period to ensure that the activities in question can be adequately evaluated with reference to the standards of achievement outlined below.

As per Appendix J (VII.A.1.b), we consider it optional but desirable for candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion to invite written evaluations of their scholarship/creative activities from experts in their fields at other institutions for inclusion in their WPAF. When requested, such “outside” reviews should be solicited by the IUPC and not by the candidate. This type of external evaluation is *not* expected of probationary candidates being considered for retention only.

At the same time, we consider the quantitative targets outlined in the tables below as necessary but imperfect measures of achievement in scholarship and creative activity. In all cases, committees’ judgments of the value, significance, or prestige of a given scholarly/creative activity and/or of the candidate’s scholarly/creative record as a whole should be guided by the qualitative evaluation of experts and peers in the candidate’s field(s) of endeavor.

**Category 1a (Scholarly Activity)**

- A scholarly or general-interest book (published or under contract).
- A textbook, critical edition, or other significant endeavor related to the scholarship of teaching (published or under contract).
- An edited book with authorial contributions and editorial responsibilities (published or under contract).

**Category 1a (Creative Activity)**

- A book-length manuscript (published or under contract).
- An edited book with authorial contributions and editorial responsibilities (published or under contract).

**Category 1b (Scholarly Activity)**

- A peer-reviewed or invited article or chapter in a scholarly journal or collection (published or accepted for publication).
- A peer-reviewed or invited presentation at a regional, national or international scholarly conference, workshop, forum, etc., and/or inclusion in conference proceedings or anthologies derived from such an event.
- Certain aspects of serving as series editor for a university press or as “special issue” editor of a scholarly journal (see p. 4, above).
- Receipt of an external grant, fellowship, or residency in support of original research.
- Curricular design or revision (as part of a process involving dissemination and peer review).

**Category 1b (Creative Activity)**

- A peer-reviewed or invited publication in a literary journal or collection (published or accepted for publication).
- The publication of a chapbook or broadside under 40 pages in length.
- An invited reading or performance at a regional, national or international conference, workshop, forum, etc.
- Receipt of an external grant, fellowship, or residency in support of new creative work.

**Category 2 (Scholarly Activity)**

- A published scholarly book review, review essay, headnote, encyclopedia (or other reference work) entry, or online resource.
- A published non-scholarly book review or magazine/newspaper article.
- Certain aspects of organizing a major local, regional, or national/international scholarly conference (see p. 4, above).
- Certain aspects of participating in an academic conference, seminar, workshop or forum as a panel discussant, respondent, or organizer (see p. 4, above).
- Work as a scholarly consultant in non-academic contexts (e.g., for government, media, foundations, etc.).
- Production of ancillary materials for textbooks or online resources.
- Production of text for a museum or gallery exhibition.
- Receipt of an internal grant (not including travel grants) in support of original research.
- Work in the digital humanities (e.g., a scholarly website or other online resource, a highly trafficked scholarly blog, software, etc.).

**Category 2 (Creative Activity)**

- An invited reading or performance at a local venue.

- Participation in a regional, national, or international literary workshop or writers’ conference.
- Work as a literary consultant.
- Receipt of an internal grant (not including travel grants) in support of new creative work.
- Work in the digital humanities (e.g., design and maintenance of software, websites, online tools, or other resources related to creative production, research, or pedagogy)

The charts below show the minimum combination of activities required for f Minimal Essential, Good, and Excellent with respect to different ranks in the RTP process. These benchmarks lay out the expectation for activity over the course of the entire review period, including any service credit awarded. **Probationary** candidates are expected to show continued progress towards achieving the standards required for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

**Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

<b>Minimum Essential</b>	At least ONE activity from Category 1b AND
	At least FOUR distinct activities from Category 2
<b>Good</b>	At least TWO distinct activities from Category 1b (ONE of which must be a publication) AND At least FOUR distinct activities from Category 2
<b>Excellent</b>	At least ONE distinct activity from Category 1a or THREE activities from Category 1b (TWO of which must be publications), AND At least FIVE distinct activities from Category 2

**Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

<b>Minimum Essential</b>	At least TWO distinct activities from Category 1b AND
	At least FIVE distinct activities from Category 2 shorter
<b>Good</b>	At least ONE distinct activity from Category 1a or THREE distinct activities from Category 1b (TWO of which must be publications) AND At least FIVE distinct activities from Category 2 whichever is shorter
<b>Excellent</b>	At least ONE distinct activity from Category 1a and ONE from Category 1b, or at least FOUR from Category 1b (THREE of which must be publications), AND At least SIX distinct activities from Category 2

## Notes:

- 1) Additional activities in Category 1 may substitute for activities from Category 2, but additional activities from Category 2 may not be used to offset deficiencies in Category 1. Under certain circumstances—e.g., when a candidate has a preponderance of activities in Category 1—it may be acceptable to see *no* activities in Category 2.
- 2) “Distinct activity” does not suggest that a candidate must demonstrate achievement of three different *types* of activities. For example, three peer-reviewed journal articles would count as three distinct activities.

**C. Service**

1. Activities to be assessed: see Appendix J IX.B.3.a-g.
2. Candidates should demonstrate their active participation and the value and significance of their service in their PDS and via letters from colleagues.
3. As noted above (under Scholarly/Creative Activity), candidates may decide whether certain kinds of activities constitute “scholarly” or “service” achievements and make the case accordingly, providing appropriate evidence in their WPAF.
4. We recognize the “Cultural Taxation” of faculty members of color, who frequently provide intensive student mentoring and/or are called upon to serve on multiple equity committees and institutional change initiatives.
5. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are expected to carry out normal university duties (such as attending convocation and commencement) and departmental duties (such as attending department meetings, writing peer evaluations for colleagues and letters of reference for students, and working collaboratively and collegially with colleagues). Candidates who consistently fail to carry out such duties shall not receive a positive recommendation.
6. Categories for Service Criteria

English recognizes two categories of service activity: Type I (heavier, recurring, or more sustained duties) and Type II (lighter, temporary, or more occasional duties), with ONE Type I activity regarded as the rough equivalent of TWO Type II activities.

**Type I** might include (but is not limited to) activities such as:

- Membership on a more active or labor-intensive department, college, or university committee (e.g. curriculum, search, personnel, professional leave, etc.)
- Chairing such a committee
- Serving as chair or first reader of a master’s or doctoral committee at HSU or another campus
- Leading or participating in significant *ad hoc* departmental, college, or university tasks related to areas of expertise
- Sustained participation as an officer or member of a professional organization, task force, government or non-governmental organization, or community organization
- Providing ongoing consulting services to the university or to a community group or to a non-profit, corporate, or government agency
- Advising an active student club
- Reviewing or refereeing journal submissions, book manuscripts, grant proposals, digital humanities resources, etc. in one’s field
- Serving on the editorial committee of a journal or book series
- Logistical (as opposed to conceptual or intellectual) organizing of a scholarly or professional conference

- Organizing and/or leading a community outreach program
- Organizing and/or leading a community service activity or participating in local government
- Serving as department chair, composition director, graduate coordinator, or any other position for which release time has been granted

**Type II** might include (but is not limited to) activities such as:

- Excess advising (i.e., more than 40 students)
- Talks and presentations to a local or campus audience (e.g., a colleague’s class, a meeting of a local chapter of AAUW, a high school group or campus club, etc.)
- Membership on department, college, and university committees that meet rarely or on an ad hoc basis (less than three times per semester)
- Serving as second reader or committee member on a master’s or doctoral committee at HSU or another campus
- Participation in such events as Campus Dialogue on Race, Cesar Chavez Day, Women’s History Month, International Education Week, etc.
- Reading or reviewing for a local, regional, or national/international contest
- Serving as a reviewer for faculty at other universities or colleges

Examples of levels of accomplishment that meet criteria for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:

<b>Minimum Essential</b>	Participation in at least two Type II activities per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period.
<b>Good</b>	Participation in at least four Type II or two Type I activities (or some combination thereof) per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period.
<b>Excellent</b>	Participation in at least six Type II or three Type I activities (or some combination thereof) per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period.

Examples of levels of accomplishment that meet criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor:

<b>Minimum Essential</b>	Participation in at least three Type II activities per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period.
<b>Good</b>	Participation in at least four Type II or two Type I activities (or some combination thereof) per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period, including at least one leadership position (e.g., chairing a department, program, or labor-intensive committee).
<b>Excellent</b>	Participation in at least six Type II or three Type I activities (or some combination thereof) per academic year, on average, over the course of the review period, including at least one leadership position (e.g., chairing a department, program, or labor-intensive committee).

Note:

- 1) In a case in which candidates have been called upon to perform disproportionate service in one activity (e.g., ongoing mentoring of students, chairing a labor-intensive or time-consuming committee or extended service on such a committee, etc.), they may make the case in the WPAF for exceptional and/or compensatory weighting of such activities.

The tenured and tenure-track members of the English Department whose signatures appear below approved the above criteria and standards in February 2016.

---

Christina Accomando

---

Janelle Adsit

---

Mary Ann Creadon

---

Barbara Curiel

---

Kathleen Doty (FERPing/not present Spring 2016)

---

Michael Eldridge

---

Laura Hahn

---

Nikola Hobbel

---

Suzanne Scott

---

David Stacey

---

Janet Winston