

DEPARTMENTAL CODE
LANGUAGES, LITERATURES AND CULTURES

Approved by two-thirds majority vote of the voting faculty on April 16, 2009.

I. MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT	2
II. THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR	2
III. FACULTY ASSEMBLY	3
A. MEMBERSHIP	3
B. MEETINGS	4
IV. COMMITTEES AND COORDINATORS	4
A. STEERING COMMITTEE	4
B. GRADUATE COORDINATOR	5
C. UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATOR	5
D. SEARCH COMMITTEES	6
E. TENURED FACULTY COMMITTEE	7
F. PROMOTION COMMITTEE	7
G. NON-TENURE TRACK COMMITTEE	8
H. EVALUATION COMMITTEE	9
I. GRADE APPEAL COMMITTEE	9
V. THE UNDERGRADUATE AND THE GRADUATE FACULTY	9
VI. THE DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVE TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL	10
VII. EVALUATION PROCEDURES	10
A. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY	10
B. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY	12
C. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND GRANTING OF TENURE	12
D. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR	13
E. PHASE I COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEWS	13
F. PHASE II COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEWS	13
VIII. REVIEW OF AND REVISIONS TO THE CODE	16
IX. SELF-EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS	16
X. GRADE APPEAL GUIDELINES	16
APPENDIX ONE: GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION	18
I. EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND STANDARDS	18
II. DOCUMENTATION	23
APPENDIX TWO: GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	24
I. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	24
II. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	25
III. APPLICATION FOR SENIOR TEACHING APPOINTMENTS	26

I. Mission of the Department

The mission of the Department is to advance student learning and professional scholarship in foreign languages, literatures, and cultures. Such learning is one important component of a liberal education and enhances our students' futures as responsible citizens, as educated workers, and/or as developing scholars. The creation and dissemination of new knowledge in respected national and international venues support the missions of Colorado State University as a land grant institution and as a comprehensive graduate research University.

II. The Departmental Chair

A. The Chair is the administrative and academic officer of the Department. General and specific responsibilities of the Chair are defined in section C.2.6.2 ("Department Heads") of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (hereafter referred to as *Faculty Manual*).

B. Selection and Term of Office

The Dean of the College shall appoint a search committee and make the appointment in accordance with section E.4.3 of the *Faculty Manual*. The term of office is normally five years, renewable, with the caveats expressed in C.2.4.2.2.c of the *Faculty Manual*.

C. Specific responsibilities of the Chair:

1. Management of academic, administrative and financial matters within the Department, including the departmental budget. (The Chair shall report on the budget to the Faculty Assembly at least once each semester.)
2. Long-range planning.
3. Evaluation of faculty and staff in accordance with the *Faculty Manual* and the Department's Evaluation Guidelines. This process shall include an annual meeting with each faculty and staff member to discuss the individual's professional progress, as prescribed in the *Faculty Manual*.
4. Initiation of recommendations for appointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal of faculty members. Such recommendations will include student and faculty input relating to teaching and advising effectiveness of faculty members.
5. Appointment of members of the faculty to committees and to the positions provided for in the *Departmental Code*.
6. Cooperation with and assistance to other departments in matters affecting the University in its undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, and extension programs.

7. Faculty and Staff recruitment.
8. Any other matters relating to the effectiveness and welfare of the Department and its programs.
9. The Chair may appoint working groups / ad-hoc committees charged to accomplish specific tasks.

D. Evaluation

The Chair shall be evaluated annually by the Dean of the College, soliciting and utilizing information from all faculty members in the Department. (See *Faculty Manual*, C.2.7.a.) In this Department, the Steering Committee (Section IV.A) uses a survey form prescribed by the Dean to solicit both numerical ratings and comments from the tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and staff. These forms are returned directly to the Dean with a summary written by the Steering Committee. In accordance with the College Annual Procedures Manual, the Committee shall “prepare a narrative evaluation of the Chair’s performance, share it with the Chair, and forward it to the Dean along with the Chair’s Confidential Faculty Annual Activities Report, and all the original survey forms.”

III. Faculty Assembly

A. Membership

Employees of Colorado State University who hold academic rank as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Special Assistant Professor (SAP, with Senior Teaching or Special appointments) in this Department shall have the right to attend, speak and vote at meetings of the Faculty Assembly. This group of faculty shapes the Graduate Faculty.

The Non-tenure track faculty (NTT), excluding the SAPs, shall be allotted a number of votes equal to 25% of the total number of voting-eligible members of the graduate faculty. The Senior Teaching Appointees (STA) and Special Instructors (SI) shall divide these among themselves according to their determination. The number of voting-eligible members of Graduate Faculty will be calculated annually in the Fall and confirmed in the Spring. The 25% allotment will be rounded up or down to the closest number. If the decimal is 0.5, the number of representative votes shall be rounded upward. These representatives shall have the right to attend, speak and vote at meetings of the Faculty Assembly. In matters that deal exclusively with Tenure Track faculty, i.e. evaluation, graduate program, these representatives will abstain from voting. The NTT faculty shall be represented in Faculty Assembly by the following: 1) the NTT representatives to the Steering Committee, who will carry a total of one vote; and 2) the representatives elected in the Spring to serve on the Non-tenure track Committee, with the remaining voting-number determined by the above-mentioned calculation. These representatives shall have the right to attend, speak and vote at meetings of the Faculty Assembly.

Students, both undergraduate majors and graduate, shall each select one representative from among themselves in elections announced and conducted by the Department Chair. The undergraduate student will not have voting privileges. The graduate student representative will have one vote on matters dealing with the graduate program.

B. Meetings

The Department Chair shall convene the Faculty Assembly at least once each semester, with an agenda published in advance. Any member of the Assembly may submit agenda items. A special meeting may be requested by any of the committees specified in this Code, by either the Graduate or the Undergraduate Coordinator, or by one-quarter of the Assembly. One-half of the Assembly shall constitute a quorum for voting.

IV. Committees and Coordinators

A. Steering Committee

1. Organization

The Steering Committee shall be composed of:

- a) three members elected by the tenured and tenure track faculty;
- b) the Coordinator of Undergraduate Programs and the Coordinator of the Graduate Program;
- and c) two non-tenure track faculty, elected annually by the NTT faculty provided they have been asked to be considered.

Elected tenured and tenure track members shall serve a staggered term of two years and not more than two terms in succession. If in any one year one of the major language programs in the Department does not have representation on the Committee with either a regularly elected or appointed faculty member, the Department Chair may appoint an additional tenured or tenure track faculty member to the Committee for a term of that year in order to give that major language program at least a one-person representation. The Department Chair shall sit ex-officio on the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee shall name its chair from among its members.

2. Selection of tenure track and special/temporary faculty members

Prior to April 30 of each year, three members shall be elected by the tenured and tenure track faculty and one member may be elected by the special/temporary instructors, as follows: All regular tenure track faculty and all special/temporary instructors are eligible for election to the positions open to their respective groups. Each position to be filled by election shall be announced to the faculty in advance, and a list of eligible persons circulated by the Department Chair. In the case of special and temporary faculty, only those individuals who express to the

Chair their desire to be considered as candidates shall be placed on this list. Any tenured or tenure track faculty member who wishes to have his or her name omitted shall submit a letter to the Chair stating the reasons. Once the ballot is determined, it shall be distributed and collected before April 30.

3. Functions

The primary function of the Steering Committee is to advise the Department Chair. It is responsible both to the Chair and to the Faculty Assembly. In this capacity, the Steering Committee may appoint, in consultation with the Chair, ad-hoc committees charged to accomplish specific tasks.

B. Graduate Coordinator

1. Appointment

The Graduate Coordinator shall be appointed for a one-year term by the Chair on or before April 15 and shall be a member of the tenured faculty. The Graduate Coordinator, who shall have release time from teaching, will normally not serve for more than five consecutive years.

2. Responsibilities

Oversight and recommendations to the Chair regarding:

- a) design and review of the graduate curriculum;
- b) graduate class staffing and scheduling;
- c) graduate recruitment and admissions, including recommendations to the Chair on graduate teaching assistantships;
- d) graduate student learning/development and coordination of assessment (including outcomes assessment);
- e) coordination of faculty responsible for initial graduate advising; f) advising students in selection of graduate committees;
- g) supervision of M.A. examinations;
- and h) selection and appointment of the GTA coordinator, when applicable.

The Graduate Coordinator may appoint in consultation with the Chair ad-hoc committees from among the tenured and tenure track faculty and full-time special and temporary faculty as necessary to accomplish these tasks.

C. Undergraduate Coordinator

1. Appointment

The Undergraduate Coordinator shall be appointed for a one-year term by the Chair on or before April 15 and shall be a member of the tenured faculty. The Undergraduate Coordinator, who shall have release time from teaching, will normally not serve for more than five consecutive years.

2. Responsibilities

Oversight and recommendations to the Chair regarding:

- a) design and review of the undergraduate curriculum;
- b) undergraduate class staffing and scheduling;
- c) student recruitment;
- d) undergraduate outcomes assessment;
- e) student learning/development assessment;
- f) advising;

and g) gathering and dissemination of information about the Department.

The Undergraduate Coordinator may appoint in consultation with the Chair ad-hoc committees from among the tenured and tenure track faculty and full-time special and temporary faculty as necessary to accomplish these tasks.

D. Search Committees

1. Appointment and Functions

The Chair of the Department shall bring to discussion the creation of a new search committee (after the Dean has approved the request for a new position), and the Faculty Assembly will agree on the members that will shape it (including the chair of the Committee), taking into consideration that it should reflect the diversity of visions existing in the department (one of its members will be a graduate student). All members of the search committee will have voting rights. The position description and search process will be in accordance with the philosophy and policies of the University as reflected in the University Search Manual.

The Committee shall have the following charges:

- a) Create and present to the Faculty Assembly the position description for discussion, until its approval.
- b) Review candidates once the description has been approved and advertised, and produce and present the list of semifinalists (first meeting) and finalists (second meeting) who will be advancing in the process. In these two meetings there will be no voting, but faculty members may provide their opinions and challenge or request additional explanations regarding the selected candidates being advanced to the next step of the process. All dossiers will be made available to the voting members of the Faculty Assembly. Confidentiality is required, in agreement with the *Faculty Manual* (E.4.3). It is expected that any challenge to the list of candidates proposed will be raised only after reading the dossiers of all the candidates.

c) After the on-campus interviews are conducted, the committee will request input of the whole department. Following this, the committee will lead a discussion of the finalists. The whole body of the Faculty Assembly will participate in the discussion. Only eligible members will vote on a recommendation to the chair.

and d) If the position is offered and declined by all finalists, the voting-eligible faculty will meet again to discuss offering the position to the alternates in either the rank-order recommended by the Search Committee or in a new order.

E. Tenured Faculty Committee

1. Composition

The Tenured Faculty Committee shall comprise all tenured faculty, excluding the Chair of the Department. The Tenured Faculty Committee shall elect one of its members to coordinate evaluation procedures, chair meetings, and report recommendations to the Department Chair. In the event there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the Department, a Committee for tenure recommendations must be formed in accordance with the procedures under the Promotion Committee (Section F, below).

2. Functions

The Tenured Faculty Committee shall:

- a) advise the Chair on the annual reappointment of untenured faculty members (Section VII.A);
- b) conduct comprehensive reviews of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period at the University (Section VII.B);
- c) make recommendations to the Chair regarding the conferral of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Section VII.C). In agreement with the *Faculty Manual* (Section E.10.3), any untenured faculty member in the probationary status shall annually receive two independent memos regarding his/her progress toward tenure, one from the Department Chair, and one from the Promotion Committee.

and d) consider and take action on other matters properly falling within the purview of the tenured faculty in accordance with the *Faculty Manual*.

F. Promotion Committee

A Promotion Committee must have at least three members and shall make recommendations to the Chair regarding the promotion from Associate to Full Professor. It shall consist of all members of the tenured Department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration. If a Committee of at least three tenured faculty of higher rank cannot be constituted within the Department, the Promotion Committee

shall include all tenured faculty of higher rank and as many additional member(s) from other departments within the College as are necessary to create a three-member Promotion Committee. These additional members shall be drawn by lot from a list of College faculty with relevant scholarly expertise, said list to be drawn up by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.

G. Non-Tenure Track Committee

1. Composition

The Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee shall consist of the two non-tenure track faculty representatives to the Steering Committee, the LLC Department Representative to the College of Liberal Arts Adjunct Faculty Committee, and three other members of the non-tenure track faculty. The Steering Committee Representatives and Adjunct Committee Representative, as well as the other three members, shall be elected in the Non-Tenure Track Committee elections sometime in April. Two of the latter members will also be expected to regularly attend Faculty Assemblies; the third member will serve as an alternate, in case one of the two is ill or unable to attend the meeting. Members of the Non-Tenure Track Committee shall serve one-year terms. All Special and Temporary Instructors hired for a semester or a year are eligible to vote at all non-tenure track meetings. The Committee will also invite an ad-hoc tenure track or tenured faculty member to attend meetings as needed for specific issues.

2. Functions

The Non-Tenure Track Committee is responsible for representing the interests of non-tenure track faculty and working toward their equitable treatment and professionalization in the Department, the College, and the University; to advance the mission of the Languages, Literatures and Cultures Department; and to enhance undergraduate education.

Its duties include, but are not limited to:

- a) calling regular meetings for all Special and Temporary Instructors;
- b) identifying issues that concern non-tenure track faculty;
- c) communicating non-tenure track faculty concerns to Departmental, College, and University administration and governing bodies;
- d) communicating Departmental, College and University policy and procedures, and other matters of interest to non-tenure track faculty;
- and e) bringing matters of concern to non-tenure track faculty to the Steering Committee as needed.

H. Evaluation Committee

In evaluating tenure track faculty for merit increases, the Chair shall be advised by an Evaluation Committee of five persons. The Evaluation Committee shall be formed in May and begin service the following Academic Year.

The Evaluation Committee shall have five tenured members. Each year one tenured member, and in alternate years an additional tenured member, shall be elected for two-year terms, by the entire tenure track faculty. Two tenured members shall be appointed by the Department Chair. These three elected and two appointed tenured members shall serve two-year terms. (These terms shall be staggered for continuity, using the following plan: initially, one member shall be elected for one year, one member for two, and one member for three; all subsequent elections shall be for two years. Initially, one of the appointed tenured members shall be appointed for one year, the other for two; subsequently, one shall be appointed each year for a two-year term.)

The Evaluation Committee shall prepare and update advisory reports for the Tenured Faculty Committee in preparation for any reappointment recommendations on tenure track faculty to be made.

I. Grade Appeal Committee

The Grade Appeal Committee shall have five members appointed by the Chair in the Fall of each academic year. Two tenured or tenure track faculty members, one undergraduate major, and one graduate student shall be appointed from within the Department. The Committee chair shall come from outside the Department. Procedures are specified in the University Code (I.7.1) and below (Section X).

V. **The Undergraduate Faculty and the Graduate Faculty**

The Undergraduate Faculty includes all special and temporary faculty and all regular (tenured and tenure track) faculty members of the Department. The Graduate Faculty consists of all tenured and tenure track faculty and the GTA coordinator (ex-officio).

Both the Undergraduate and the Graduate Coordinator may appoint in consultation with the Chair, from among the membership of the Undergraduate Faculty and the Graduate Faculty, ad-hoc working groups or committees to function under their direction as needed to complete specific tasks necessary to the well-being and operation of the Department. The tasks of such groups shall include matters such as:

1. Curriculum / Program review and design.
2. Class staffing and scheduling.
3. Student recruitment.
4. Outcomes assessment.
5. Advising.

6. Research / pedagogy, e.g. data gathering and research on methodology, criticism, bibliography, etc.
7. Graduate committees and recommendation for admission of graduate students.
8. Evaluation of graduate teaching assistants for reappointment.
9. Gathering and disseminating information about the Department.
10. Other matters involving the effectiveness and welfare of the undergraduate and graduate programs and the Department.

VI. The Departmental Representative to the Faculty Council shall be elected at-large in accord with University procedures as stated in the *Faculty Manual*.

VII. Evaluation Procedures

A. Annual Evaluation of Faculty (See also Appendix One)

1. In accordance with the *Faculty Manual* (C.2.5 and E. 14) all faculty are subject to annual reviews for recommendations for merit salary increases and to facilitate continued professional development.
 - a) It shall be the responsibility of each faculty member to provide the Chair with a Confidential Faculty Annual Activities Report covering the calendar year just completed; supporting documentation; a one-page statement of goals; and a current curriculum vitae by the third working day in January. The Confidential Faculty Annual Activities Report form is available electronically.
 - b) In the area of scholarship or creative activity, merit ratings shall be based on the current year plus the previous two years.

In accordance with the *Faculty Manual* (E.14) “All faculty members, including department heads and deans, are subject to performance reviews. These reviews include annual reviews, comprehensive reviews of tenure track faculty members, and comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty members.”

2. a) Non-tenure track faculty members shall be reviewed each year for reappointment. The Department Chair and the Steering Committee shall draft review policies for non-tenure track faculty, make the draft available to the non-tenure track faculty to receive their consultation, and then submit these policies to the Faculty Assembly for approval by a majority vote. These procedures shall then stand until the Chair, the Steering Committee, or the Faculty Assembly proposes changes that are subsequently passed in the Faculty Assembly by a majority vote.
- b) The Tenured Faculty Committee shall make to the Chair advisory recommendations for or against reappointment of untenured tenure track faculty members
- c) The recommendations will then go to the tenure track faculty members under review.

- d) These recommendations of both non-tenure track and non-tenured tenure track faculty shall be based on class visitations and the following materials:
1. A statement of annual and long term professional goals and objectives, where appropriate, related to each of the areas of their respective responsibilities, and an assessment of success in achieving them, including an identification of areas of relative strength and weakness.
 2. Course evaluation surveys from the faculty member's classes during the evaluated semesters. A faculty member may furnish written responses to the student evaluations. These surveys shall be returned to the faculty member, who shall keep them intact until the next comprehensive (non-annual) evaluation, when they shall be tendered to the reviewing committee or the Chair, as appropriate.
 3. Copies of syllabi, course objectives, and final exams for courses taught during the evaluation period.
 4. Copies of publications (including works accepted or submitted for publication) and copies, or a concise indication, of work in progress.
 5. Documentation (text, outline, or other) of presentations at professional meetings.
 6. A concise written statement of professional service.
 7. A concise written statement regarding advising and mentoring.
 8. And other supporting data or documentation the faculty member deems relevant to the reappointment decision.
- e) The Department's reappointment recommendations on tenure track faculty are forwarded to the College of Liberal Arts on a schedule announced by the Provost. The dates listed below do vary from year to year and should be considered approximate. They are given only as a general guide:
1. In the *first* year of appointment, the recommendation regarding reappointment to Year Two must reach the Dean's office by February 1.
 2. In the *second* year of appointment, the recommendation regarding reappointment to Year Three must reach the Dean's office by November 1.
 3. In the *second* year of appointment, the recommendation regarding reappointment to Year Four must reach the Dean's office by April 1. By University policy, this recommendation requires the vote of the Tenured Faculty Committee. The Chair shall also complete the College's Confidential Report of Progress Toward Tenure and Progress Toward Tenure Evaluation forms, with copies to the faculty member.
 4. In the *third* year of appointment, the recommendation regarding reappointment to Year Five must reach the Dean's office by April 1. The comprehensive review required in this year (see below) shall serve as the

Tenured Faculty Committee's recommendation to the Chair on reappointment. The Chair shall include a copy of that review and new Confidential Report of Progress Toward Tenure and Progress Toward Tenure Evaluation forms with the materials and the recommendation he/she forwards to the Dean's Office.

5. In the *fourth and fifth* years of appointment, the recommendation regarding reappointment to Years Six and Seven must reach the Dean's office by April 1. No reappointment recommendation is made in the Spring Semester in which a recommendation for or against promotion and tenure is made.

B. Comprehensive Reviews of Tenure Track Faculty

1. The Tenured Faculty Committee shall conduct a review of tenure track faculty members in their third year (or the equivalent for faculty with prior service credit for tenure track experience at other institutions). Evaluations of tenure track faculty conducted by members of the Committee as part of this review shall be submitted in writing to the full Tenured Faculty Committee. The Committee must submit a written summary of conclusions and recommendations to the faculty member, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. This report should include any of the written evaluations for the Committee from its members (*Faculty Manual*, E.14.2).
2. The faculty member to be reviewed shall submit copies of his/her Confidential Report of Progress Toward Tenure and Progress Toward Tenure Evaluation forms (which the Chair prepared in the second year of appointment), a current curriculum vitae, and a statement of goals and objectives to the reviewing committee.
3. The report shall include one of the three possible outcomes described in E.14.2 of the *Faculty Manual*. Briefly, these are 1) satisfactory progress toward tenure; 2) existence of deficiencies that, if corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure; and 3) failure to meet stated requirements in one or more areas, to the degree that the Committee recommends against further reappointment.
4. The Committee report shall serve as input for the reappointment of third-year faculty to Year Five (see above).

C. Promotion to Associate Professor and Granting of Tenure (See also Appendix Two)

1. The Department Chair shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion and tenure not later than the sixth year of service of a regular member of the faculty; he/she shall ask the Tenured Faculty Committee to vote by ballot in this matter.
2. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the candidate for response, then the Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or reversal.

3. If a reversal occurs at a higher administrative level below the President, the reasons shall be stated in writing to the faculty member and Department Chair, and shared with the Tenured Faculty Committee.
4. If the Tenured Faculty Committee's recommendation to deny promotion and tenure, or if its recommendation to grant promotion and tenure is reversed by an administrative officer below the President, the recommendation of the Committee and the reasons for reversal (if applicable) shall be made available promptly to the faculty member under consideration.

D. Promotion to Full Professor (See also Appendix Two)

The Department Chair shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion. All procedures shall be the same as for the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, save for the composition of the Promotion Committee (see section IV) and the standards that must be met by the faculty member under consideration.

E. Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews (*Faculty Manual*, E.14.3.1)

1. A Phase I Review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vitae, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives. Faculty being reviewed shall submit these materials to the Chair early in the Fall semester.
2. Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty shall be conducted by the Chair at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five-year review period.
3. Conferral of tenure and/or promotion automatically resets the five-year interval to the next Phase I review.
4. Faculty on transitional appointments or who have indicated in writing to the Dean their intention to retire or resign at the end of the academic year in which they are scheduled for any Comprehensive Performance Review are exempted from the review process.
5. Faculty on sabbatical or leave during the year in which they are scheduled for any Comprehensive Performance Review shall be reviewed the next academic year they are on campus, but this postponement must be cleared by the Provost's Office.

F. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews

1. "Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the Department head determines that a tenured faculty member's performance was

unsatisfactory in the Phase I Review” to the degree that deficiencies could not be corrected by a professional development plan developed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member. (See *Faculty Manual* E.14.3.2)

2. Within ten working days after determining that a Phase II Review is needed, the Chair shall convene the tenured members of the Department whose rank is the same as or higher than the faculty member to choose from among their number a three-person review committee. (Faculty on leave and the faculty member being reviewed are excused.) Any member of this pool of eligible faculty may ask to be excused for reason of bias or conflict of interest. Such requests shall be decided on by majority vote of the rest of the pool; in the event of a tie vote, the member shall be excused. The Chair or the faculty member under review may challenge any member of this pool of eligible faculty on the grounds of their being significantly biased for or against the member under review. Members so challenged shall have the opportunity to respond. Whether or not a challenged member shall remain in the pool shall be decided on by majority vote of the rest of the pool; in the event of a tie vote, the member shall be excused.
3. Members of the tenured faculty remaining after any exclusions made under these provisions shall comprise the eligible pool. Each member of this pool shall vote by secret ballot for three members of the pool to serve on the Phase II Review committee. No voting abstentions will be permitted. The three members receiving the largest numbers of votes shall serve as the review committee. Ties shall be broken by drawing lots.
4. If the eligible pool after exclusions comprises fewer than three persons, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts shall be asked to choose the remaining member(s) of the Phase II Review committee from among the tenured members of the College of Liberal Arts whose rank is the same as or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. After any exclusions made by processes parallel to those described under F.2 above, the departmental member(s) of the review committee shall decide whether or not to accept the Dean’s nominee(s). If there are two departmental members, both must accept the College nominee.
5. The Department Chair shall provide the following materials in a timely manner to the peer review committee:
 - a) copies of the faculty member’s previous Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review report(s) and, when applicable, previous Phase II reports;
 - b) a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review;
 - and c) other official records requested by the committee that are pertinent and reasonable.
6. The faculty member being reviewed may submit a written response to the materials given the committee under the preceding paragraph, and may include supporting documents he or she judges to be appropriate. The deadline for submission of this response shall be ten working days after the selection of the Phase II review committee, but may be extended at the discretion of the committee.

7. If deficiencies in teaching are among the concerns that have triggered the Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review, evidence regarding teaching effectiveness shall be secured by peer visitation to a minimum of two courses, as well as by review of departmental student evaluations from all the faculty member's classes during the evaluated years, including the current year. The peer visitation may be by members of the peer review committee or by members of the Department selected by the committee and will ordinarily include more than one visit per course. A written report of the visitations will be given to the faculty member within five working days after the last visit and to the committee within ten working days. A faculty member being reviewed may request additional visits and may furnish his or her written responses to peer and student evaluations.
8. The majority of the Phase II Review committee must make one of the following findings:
 1. the faculty member has met reasonable expectations for performance;
 2. deficiencies identified are not substantial and/or recurrent;
 3. there are substantial and chronic deficiencies that must be addressed in a professional development plan, with deadlines, to be worked out between the faculty member and the Chair;
 - or 4. provisions of Section E.14.3.2 of the University Code should be applied. Under condition (1) or (2), no further action is required other than reporting the findings.
9. Criteria for judgement are based on the overall expectations for faculty as expressed in the University Code and on the expectations and standards stated in the Appendices to this Code. They shall take into account the responsibilities and effort distribution of the individual faculty member.
10. The peer review committee shall interview the faculty member, the Chair, and any other persons whom the committee, the Chair, or the faculty member believes could provide pertinent information regarding the professional performance of the member under review. The committee is encouraged to direct other appropriate members of the faculty to assist the committee when a good understanding of the language involved is necessary for the fair evaluation of teaching, research and scholarly work, or service.
11. Within forty working days after its formation, the peer review committee shall communicate its findings and recommendations in writing to the Chair and the faculty member under review. The majority of the committee must agree on one of the four possible conclusions stipulated in the *Faculty Manual*, E.14.3.2 and summarized under (8) above.
12. Upon receipt of the peer review committee's findings, the faculty member under review shall, at his or her option, respond in writing within ten working days. The committee shall provide the Chair with a copy of this response within one working day of its receipt.

13. The Chair shall forward the peer review committee's report and any response from the faculty member, together with his/her recommendations, to the Dean within twelve working days of the receipt of the committee report. Recommendations of the Dean and the Chair shall be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.

VIII. Review of and Revisions to the Code

- A. Proposed amendments to this Code must be circulated in writing to all members of the faculty at least two weeks in advance of a meeting at which the proposed revisions are to be discussed and acted upon. Such proposed amendments in order to be adopted must be approved by two-thirds of the faculty eligible to vote. For approval of and revisions to this Code, the voting faculty is restricted to those faculty members who have completed at least one year of service at the University as regular, regular part time, or transitional appointees with rank above that of instructor or equivalent. (See *Faculty Manual*, C.2.4.2.2.e.)
- B. The Code of the Department shall be reviewed in the year prior to the end of each term of the Chair in accordance with the *Faculty Manual*.

IX. Self-Evaluation of Departmental Operations

- A. The operations of the Department will be reviewed periodically in accordance with the *Faculty manual*.
- B. The Chair or members of the Department may initiate a request for an interim evaluation of the Department. If the request comes from the faculty, at least one-half (but not less than three members) of the Department's regular full-time faculty must sign the request for an interim evaluation before it can be conducted. The request is to be submitted to the Dean, who shall follow the procedure outlined for the regular evaluation after notifying the Chair and the eligible faculty members of the request for interim evaluation.

X. Grade Appeal Guidelines

Students who appeal faculty grading decisions must demonstrate that the grading decision was made on the basis of any of the following conditions:

- a) A grading decision was made on some basis other than performance and other than as a penalty for academic dishonesty.
- b) A grading decision was based upon standards unreasonably different from those that were applied to other students.
- c) A grading decision was based on a substantial, unreasonable, or unannounced departure from previously articulated standards.

Before making an appeal, the student should discuss the situation with the faculty member(s) involved in the decision.

To appeal a grading decision, the student shall submit a written request to the Department Chairperson, identifying one of the three issues set forth above. The request must be submitted (or postmarked) no later than 30 calendar days after the first day of classes of the next regular semester following the date the grade was recorded.

Within 30 days of receipt of the request for an appeal, the student's appeal shall be provided to the faculty member or instructor who assigned the grade and an Appeals Committee formed. If the request is received prior to or during the summer session when the instructor(s) who assigned the grade or other faculty members may not be available, then the Appeals Committee will be formed no later than 30 days from the beginning of the following fall semester. See IV.G, Grade Appeal Committee, on p. 6.

The Appeals Committee shall review the written appeal and response of the faculty member(s) or instructor(s). It may elect to separately interview both the student and the faculty member or instructor before rendering a decision. The decision of the Appeals Committee shall be based upon whether one of the conditions for an appeal set forth above has been met. At the conclusion of the deliberations, the Committee shall render one of the following decisions:

1. the original grading decision is upheld, or
2. the Department Chairperson or his/her designee(s) will reevaluate the student's achievement of the instructional objectives of the course and assign a grade accordingly.

Written notice of the Committee's decision and the reasons for the decision normally will be sent to the student and the faculty member(s) or instructor(s) within 30 calendar days of appointment of the Committee. The Appeals Committee's decision is the final decision of the University. Written summaries of the hearing and decision, together with a rationale for that decision, shall be provided to the student and the faculty member who assigned the grade and shall be retained in the Department office for a period of one year.

Appendix One: Guidelines for Annual Evaluation

I. Evaluation Categories and Standards

Note: In arriving at an evaluation, the Chair shall adhere to the definitions, criteria, and terms of our disciplines' national professional organizations and the following. It is critical for the faculty member to understand that some activities, such as public lectures, workshops conducted in one's academic specialty, electronic dissemination of information, development of computer-aided teaching programs or databases, and critical bibliographies or editions may fall into different categories, depending on the nature of the work. For example, web page development may be a part of teaching, it may be a service to the profession or the public, or it may be a vehicle for publishing the results of original and previously unpublished research. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to propose classifications where necessary and provide enough information on the Activities Report for the Chair to categorize and evaluate the activity or seek peer review.

A. Instruction, Advising, and Mentoring

“Teaching includes but is not limited to classroom and/or laboratory instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study. Outreach activities such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes, should be considered as teaching. Scholarly inquiry, essential for maintaining currency and competency in a given field, is also an aspect of teaching.” (*Faculty Manual*, E.12.1) The Department endorses the characterizations of good instruction, advising, and mentoring stated in the *Faculty Manual*, E.12.1.

1. Superior

Conferral of a College, University, or professional award for quality teaching or advising shall automatically lead to a Superior rating. Superior performance may be also demonstrated by an exceptional record based on more than one of the following: signed peer evaluations; development of new courses and teaching techniques; appropriate surveys of teaching effectiveness, letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty, and professional peers are useful for building a case for superior performance in advising.

2. Exceeds Expectations

Performance that exceeds expectations may be demonstrated by strongly positive evidence that includes more than one of the following: signed peer evaluations;

examples of significant course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; teaching a challenging course for the first time; integration of service learning, appropriate surveys of teaching effectiveness, letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty, and professional peers are useful for building a case for performance in advising that exceeds expectations.

3. Meets Expectations

Performance that meets expectations may be demonstrated by a satisfactory record based on more than one of the following: clear and well-organized course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements to adapt to changing material, students, and contexts; satisfactorily teaching a course for the first time; integration of service learning, appropriate surveys of teaching effectiveness, letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty, and professional peers are useful for building a case for performance in advising that meets expectations.

4. Below Expectations

Performance that is below expectations will be evident from deficiency issues such as the following: sketchy or confusing course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; failure to make course improvements to adapt to changing material, students, and contexts; appropriate surveys of teaching effectiveness, letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty, and professional peers are useful for documenting areas in advising that do not meet expectations.

5. Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory performance will be evident from serious deficiencies based on issues such as the following: signed peer evaluations; failure to make critical course improvements; appropriate surveys of teaching effectiveness, letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty, and professional peers are useful for documenting areas in advising that are unsatisfactory.

B. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

“Research is the discovery and development of knowledge; other creative activity is original or imaginative accomplishment. Research and other creative activity include but are not limited to publications; exhibitions, presentations or performances; copyrighted, patented and licensed works and inventions; supervision of or assistance

with graduate student theses/dissertations and undergraduate research; and the award of funding to support research and other creative activities.” (*Faculty Manual* E.12.2)

In this Department there is an especially wide range of venues for the publication of research and creative work. It is vital for faculty members to identify peer-reviewed publications as such in their Confidential Faculty Annual Activities Reports and provide any other information that can help the Chair judge the significance of their publication achievements. Similarly, in the case of translations (which are subsumed under “book” or “article” below), the faculty member must provide an indication of the philological challenges involved, the amount of annotation demanded by the text or the publisher, and any other helpful information.

The standards below cannot cover all eventualities, but they do set levels of expectation that may be extrapolated to cover exceptional cases.

In the evaluation of a faculty member’s productivity under the category of “Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity” (but not under “teaching” or “service”), the moving time frame of a three-year period is appropriate for assessing the faculty member’s average record, to be used for an evaluation rating in any given year.

1. Superior

Generally demonstrated by significant published scholarly pieces and/or award-winning creative activity of high quality. This implies the publication of a book, a substantial monograph or edited critical anthology in the year evaluated.

The ranking of superior may also be demonstrated by

- Two substantial articles published in major refereed journals

plus one or more of the following:

- Two distinct papers given at major national or international conferences
- A creative performance in a premier national/international venue with positive critical reviews or awards and reflecting the faculty member’s field of research or teaching
- An extensive entry or chapter in a reference work or book published in the year evaluated that provides significant new data or analysis based on the author’s scholarship
- Completion of a major project in electronic media based on new scholarship or pedagogical research and available nationally or internationally
- Award(s) for scholarship

2. Exceeds Expectations

May be demonstrated by fulfilling the criteria in a single one of the bullets listed under the rating of Superior (see immediately above), or, for example:

- Award of external funding of \$1,000 or more to pursue research or creative activity

- Three or more short entries or chapters in reference work(s) or book(s) published in the year evaluated
 - Two substantial articles or the equivalent published in refereed journals
 - Completion of a major project in electronic media that makes existing scholarship or teaching/testing materials available nationally or internationally in a more effective format than before
 - Creative performance in a prestigious venue with positive critical reviews and reflecting the faculty member's field of research or teaching
 - Invited participation in a major national or international research workshop
 - Publication of a book review or review article that provides significant new data or analysis based on the reviewer's scholarship
3. Meets Expectations
- Any combination of an article, along with reviews, conference papers, short works, creative activities, and so forth, that does not rise to the standards set above but gives evidence of an active research or creative agenda of considerable merit
 - active engagement in research leading to publication, preferably with a minor work or article published in the year under evaluation or in the preceding year
4. Below Expectations
- A record of scholarly and/or creative activity that gives evidence of a faltering agenda of scholarly or creative development
5. Unsatisfactory
- No publications or activities that attest to the existence of an active agenda of scholarly or creative development.

C. University/Professional/Public Service and Outreach

“University service includes but is not limited to contributions to the governance and leadership of the University through participation in the formulation and implementation of department/college/university policies via membership on committees, councils, and advisory groups and participation in administrative activities. University service also includes advising student organizations.” (*Faculty Manual* E.12.3.1-E.12.3.2)

“Service in professional organizations includes but is not limited to editorial activities for professional publications; service as an officer or committee member of a professional society; participating in or organizing research conferences, workshops or professional meetings; reviewing grant proposals; and service on academic review or accreditation boards.” (*Faculty Manual* E.12.3.2)

“Outreach includes but is not limited to presentations, workshops or training sessions; professional consultation; service on local, state, national, or international commissions, advisory boards, corporate boards, or agencies; assisting in program development in grades K-12; participation in a professional capacity in programs sponsored by student, faculty, or community groups; participation in distance and continuing education instructional activities including those in an organizational or advisory capacity for University programs; technology transfer and non credit lectures to groups; and public relations activities that serve the University's interests such as appearances as a University representative before government bodies or citizen groups, and responding to inquiries from citizens. Service rendered in one’s professional capacity as a citizen of the community ... can be evaluated as an appropriate faculty activity.” (*Faculty Manual* E.12.3.2)

Service cannot be judged merely by counting the number of committees on which one serves. The University encourages the protection of junior faculty members from excessive service demands and recognizes the obligation of more senior colleagues to put their experience to work in service. All faculty members, moreover, are free to give greater or lesser weight to service in their annual evaluations, subject to minimum and maximum relative-weight limits. The following standards may be applied independently of quantitative measures, though such measures should also be factored in as appropriate.

1. Superior

- University service dealing actively and successfully with one or more major issues that are extraordinarily important or time-consuming
- Professional service in one or more leadership/officer positions that require active effort and have wide impact
- Professional service on more two or more panels to review programs, grant proposals, or matters of similar importance
- Peer review of two book MSS or three or more articles
- Editorship of a professional journal
- Outreach service that is ongoing or requires extensive preparation and has a major impact on both the constituency and the profile of the University

2. Exceeds Expectations

- University service, dealing actively and successfully with institutional matters, that places a larger than normal service burden on the faculty member
- Advising a student organization
- Professional service in one or more leadership/officer positions that require only occasional active effort but reflect well on the institution
- Professional service on one panel to review programs, grant proposals, or matters of similar importance
- Peer review of one book MS or two articles

- Active membership on the editorial board of a professional journal or publisher
 - Outreach service that is not intensely time-consuming but still has a significant impact on both the constituency and the profile of the University
3. Meets Expectations
- University service that is competent and consistent with the needs of the Department
 - Service on the board of professional associations requiring active participation one or two times per year
 - Peer review of one or two articles
 - Participation in outreach activities that reflect well on the University
4. Below Expectations
- University service that is desultory or sporadic
 - No membership in relevant professional organization(s)
 - Participation in outreach activities in a manner that does not show initiative
5. Unsatisfactory
- Service in any area that places the Department, College, or University in an unfavorable light
 - Refusal of reasonable service assignments
 - Performance of service in a manner that goes beyond professional and constructive disagreement to a level that interferes with the orderly function of the Department

II. Documentation

Evaluation shall be based on the materials recommended in the Confidential Faculty Annual Activities report, supplementary documentation the faculty member may wish to add, and the faculty member's rationale for the classification of certain activities that may fall into more than one category.

Appendix Two: Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

I. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In all but the most unusual circumstances, when tenure is granted to an assistant professor, the individual will be concurrently promoted to associate professor.

Recommendation for tenure shall require clear evidence that the faculty member's research/creative activity is in the process of achieving professional recognition among leaders in the candidate's discipline, and that the candidate's teaching has demonstrated accomplishment and promise for continued growth. Evidence shall also be required of effectiveness in institutional and professional service in those capacities in which the faculty member under consideration has had opportunities to serve.

A. Standards for Scholarship or Creative Activity

Recommendation for promotion shall require evidence of continuing scholarly or creative activity in the relevant areas. The faculty member should have a documented record of original scholarship that makes substantial contributions to his or her field. Both quality and quantity are relevant, but quality is the primary concern. In cases where the number of publications has been markedly high or unusually low, evidence of substance, coherence, high quality, and impact will be critical.

Normal quantitative expectations for assistant professors in Languages, Literatures and Cultures will be five or six substantial refereed journal articles or chapters in peer-reviewed books, or one book (based on the candidate's own research) and at least one journal article, or the equivalent of the above. Works that are "in press" — i.e., accepted without further review or revision— will be counted.

The reputation of the press, journal, or other publishing medium will be considered. Because the faculty of this Department work in so many languages and fields, we are heavily dependent on the external reviewers for guidance in assessing publishing venues. The same applies to the reputation of funding agencies, juried awards, published reviews, and similar indicators, when relevant. It is also desirable to provide, if applicable, the number, source, and substance of citations of the work.

An edited book may be accorded a high value in annual evaluations, but such a work may or may not count as "a book" in considerations for tenure or promotion. If it is not counted as a book, there must be a way to decide the number of refereed articles or book chapters to which it would correspond. Evaluators in the tenure and promotion process will ask such questions as the following:

Do external reviewers consider the work as a whole to be a significant scholarly contribution?

Did the faculty member make a significant scholarly contribution in the introduction or any chapter(s) that he/she prepared for the book?

What was the nature and extent of the editorial work done by the faculty member on the contents of the other contributions to the volume?

Except in cases where pedagogy or education is the faculty member's scholarly field, textbooks would not normally be presented as the central or critical pieces of a

scholarly record in a positive tenure or promotion recommendation. When textbooks are presented as central pieces in a scholarly record, further conditions need to be met, such as determining that an original theoretical approach has been pursued and accomplished. In those rare instances when it is appropriate to present textbooks as a central piece in a scholarly record outside the field of education or pedagogy, conditions such as the following need to be met:

1) the textbook presents an original and distinctive theoretical/intellectual approach that is anchored in the candidate's original scholarly/creative agenda, as shown in prior scholarly monographs, refereed articles or essays, or creative work;

and 2) be judged by external reviewers as making a significant scholarly contribution to the field.

In *any* co-authored work, the faculty member must state clearly how the work was apportioned and how it was actually carried out. Information on the professional reputation of the other contributors is also helpful.

Creative work is normally expected to fall within the scope of the candidate's field or area of study and research. In the case of candidates whose field is teaching creative writing, poems, novels, plays, etc., could be critical or central pieces of a scholarly record in a positive tenure or promotion consideration. For candidates outside these fields, such works would not normally serve as critical or central pieces of a scholarly record in such recommendations. In any case, for creative activity to have a significant positive impact, it must be judged by external reviewers and the Department as having substantial merit.

B. Standards for Teaching and Service

In the case of teaching and service, the kinds of activities that are evaluated in connection with promotion and tenure and the kinds of evidence that should be provided are the same as those described in the Appendix on Annual Evaluations (See sections A and C of Appendix One).

A consistent record of "Meets Expectations" in instruction, advising, and mentoring is insufficient to support a recommendation for tenure and promotion. Evaluators in the tenure and promotion process will be looking for evidence that at least some aspects of the faculty member's performance in this area exceed expectations. They will also take into account improvements across time.

II. Promotion to Professor

Recommendation for promotion to professor requires, in addition to continued demonstration of meeting the criteria for excellence in teaching and service (e.g., as stipulated for promotion to the rank of associate professor), demonstration that the faculty member has matured in scholarship or creative activity. It is expected that the faculty member will have achieved recognition among leaders in the profession and enjoy a national or international reputation for high quality contributions to the field.

Maturity in scholarship is normally demonstrated by a sustained focus in the field as represented by publication (following promotion to associate professor) of a significant scholarly book in a distinguished press or in a series of substantive articles in premier journals or a distinguished press. With respect to quantity of work, evidence of adequate scholarly research productivity may be considered as at least five or six substantial refereed journal articles or the equivalent (e.g., one scholarly book reflecting original research and one or two journal articles). Maturity in creative activity is normally demonstrated by sustained and focused achievement in the field as evidenced by publication (following promotion to associate professor) of a significant creative work or series of works in distinguished venues and/or a significant series of performances, readings, or exhibitions, along with one or two journal articles.

Regardless of quantity, the case made for quality and scholarly significance remains the primary concern in recommendations for promotion to full Professor. Publications must be in print, not in press, to be considered.

III. Guidelines for Applications for Senior Teaching Appointments

The Senior Teaching Appointment offers departments a formal means to recognize non-tenure track faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and have shown a long-term commitment to their Department and the University. The Senior Teaching Appointment recognizes the experience and insight of these individuals and acknowledges their potential for making valuable contributions to faculty discussions within the department.

The procedures and minimum requirements for a Senior Teaching Appointment are stated in Section E.11 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Departments and colleges may set additional criteria beyond these minimum requirements. These additional criteria may be based on the annual evaluations or progress reviews for teaching faculty.

An applicant for a Senior Teaching Appointment should submit a professional curriculum vitae, a list of all courses taught during the previous ten semesters of employment, and a letter of application that addresses accomplishments, teaching philosophy, and goals for the future.

An application for a Senior Teaching Appointment should include evidence that demonstrates a history of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, some of the following:

- Annual evaluations or progress reviews
- Course syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
- Examples of course improvements or improvements in teaching techniques
- Development of new courses or new teaching techniques
- Integration of service learning
- Signed written comments from students

- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Student course surveys
- Participation in professional development activities related to teaching
- Participation in education research

An applicant is not expected to address a majority of these categories. When available, annual evaluations/progress reviews will often provide sufficient information (the applicant should check this with the department head/chair).

An application for a Senior Teaching Appointment may include other evidence of value to the Department, College, and/or University. Such additional evidence may include, but is not limited to, some of the following:

- Honors and awards
- Contributions to advising or mentoring of students
- Participation in departmental, college, or university activities
- Engagement or outreach activities
- Professional affiliations and activities

An applicant is not expected to address a majority of these categories.

(X:)FLLarchive\CLANetDir\ForLang\Departmental Code

(Revised, Fall 2016)
(Revised, Fall 2013)
(Revised, Spring 2012)
(Approved, Spring 2009)