

PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS APPROVAL FORM

Discipline: Global Languages and Cultures


Jared Barton (Oct 12, 2026 09:13:08 PDT)

Michelle Dean

10/12/2026

URTP Committee Chair

Date


Jessica Lavariega Monforti (Oct 12, 2026 13:30:42 PDT)

10/12/2026

Provost

Date

CSUCI
GLOBAL LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidelines for the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process for tenure-line faculty^[1] members under review within the Global Languages and Cultures Department. Candidates applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion under these Program Personnel Standards should also consult the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP-22-11 (referred to in this document as the “RTP Policy”) and obtain advice from Faculty Affairs, Success, and Equity (FASE), a faculty mentor, and/or their Department Chair when compiling their portfolio. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence and explanation for all achievements.

This document shall be reviewed every five years. At the request of the University President, or by simple majority vote of the full-time, tenured and probationary faculty of the Global Languages and Cultures Department, this document may be reviewed before the five years are completed. This document shall go into effect after review by CEAR and approval by the University RTP Committee and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The academic discipline of Global Languages and Cultures embraces a wide variety of specializations, including language acquisition or pedagogy (for learners of a second language or for heritage speakers); linguistics (i.e., sociolinguistics, linguistic adaptation/alignment, language variation and change, language preservation, phonology, etc.); literary and cultural studies (from any region where the languages are spoken); translation and interpretation (from English to another language and vice versa, focusing on Spanish-English translation and interpretation); creative writing; digital humanities, film, and other media; and the development of study-abroad programs in other countries. The multifaceted and interdisciplinary nature of the field of Global Languages and Cultures determines that its faculty members focus on different areas and subareas of specialization, all of which are important to develop a strong and competitive Global Languages and Cultures Department at CSUCI.

The Global Languages and Cultures Department is highly mission-focused in its support of interdisciplinarity, multicultural and international perspectives, and community engagement. All

faculty work that enhances the University mission shall be valued under these standards for attaining retention, tenure and/or promotion.

The educational quality of the Global Languages and Cultures Department depends on the excellence of its faculty. Global Languages and Cultures faculty support a quality department and the University mission through excellence in teaching; scholarly and creative activities; and service. A dedicated Global Languages and Cultures faculty promotes the academic caliber and reputation of the department and the University. This document seeks to establish clear and attainable standards for the Global Languages and Cultures Department faculty to maintain a high-quality program and to guide faculty through the RTP process. This document sets forth the general principles, guidelines, and criteria for the following three purposes:

1. To establish the personnel performance standards to maintain a highly qualified, dedicated, and performing faculty and department;
2. To guide individual faculty members to pursue a successful career, which includes retention, tenure, and promotion through the academic ranks;
3. To assist the Global Languages and Cultures Program Personnel Committee (PPC), the department chair, the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC), and other appropriate offices in reviewing the professional accomplishments of the Global Languages and Cultures Department faculty.

Statement on Equity and Inclusion

The Global Languages and Cultures Program Personnel Standards affirm California State University Channel Islands' commitment to equity and diversity as reflected by the Multicultural and International Mission Pillars of the University, as well as Academic Senate Resolution SR-16-01. Faculty members are responsible for helping to foster a collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity on our campus and beyond. Given this commitment, the Global Languages and Cultures Program Personnel Standards encourage and value contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity through teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and professional, university, and community service, including community-based research.

Reviewers shall apply these standards using equity-minded evaluative practices that recognize differential access to opportunity, documented bias in traditional evaluative measures, and the unequal distribution of service burdens and invisible labor.

Requirements for Retention, Tenure, and/or Promotion

According to the SP 22-11 RTP Policy, eligibility for tenure and/or promotion requires that faculty members under review obtain a minimum rating of "Meets Program Personnel Standards" or

“Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in all areas of evaluation (Teaching or Professional Activities; Scholarly and/or Creative Activities; and Service) from the highest level of review during the RTP cycle in which they are applying for tenure and/or promotion, consistent with Section L of the RTP Policy, which details the review process and levels of review. Furthermore, these requirements represent expectations for faculty to meet by the end of their probationary period or time at their current rank. A rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” constitutes successful and fully satisfactory professional achievement appropriate for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. With the exception of the area of Service, standards for faculty remain the same whether applying for promotion to associate or full professor. Faculty shall not be disadvantaged for strategically prioritizing teaching and scholarship during the early part of their probationary years.

Early Tenure and Promotion

For consideration for early tenure and promotion, please refer to the Policy on University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, SP 22-11, sections O (Requirements for Tenure), and P (Requirements for Promotion).

Professional Development Plan (PDP) and Portfolio

Please refer to sections H (Professional Development Plan) and K (The Portfolio), respectively, in SP 22-11 for information and clarification of the Professional Development Plan and Portfolio.

Structure and Responsibilities of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC)

For information on the structure of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), refer to the Policy on University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, SP 22-11, section E (Program Personnel Committees) in addition to the Global Languages and Cultures Department By-Laws. For information on the responsibilities of the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), refer to the Policy on University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, SP 22-11, section S (Responsibilities of Program Personnel Committees).

Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members

For information on the structure of the rights and responsibilities of faculty members, refer to the Policy on University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, SP 22-11, section R (Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members).

General Instructions

Faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service shall not be “double-counted,” despite the recognition that many contributions may straddle multiple categories. When such overlap occurs, faculty shall describe which components of their

contributions fall into each of the following categories. For example, student research or community-based research may be counted in research, service, or teaching, depending on the specific activities, or may include phases that fall into distinct categories. It is up to the faculty member to justify which contributions correspond to each category.

All categories of evaluation shall be assessed holistically and contextually. Reviewers shall evaluate all evidence in accordance with principles of equity, disciplinary context, and academic freedom, consistent with SP 22-11 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

TEACHING

Teaching is a central concern at a student-centered university and is vital to growing and maintaining a successful Global Languages and Cultures Department. Therefore, the Global Languages and Cultures Department is committed to promoting teaching excellence among its faculty. We regard teaching as a cyclical process composed of three required elements:

1. The planning, creation, and implementation of appropriate and effective course methods, materials, and teaching practices;
2. The assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices; and
3. Efforts to improve teaching and learning, personal reflection, and responsive change.

Each element informs the other two, and this cycle reflects the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher dedicated to continuous improvement. Standards for tenure and promotion in the area of teaching are based on these three elements.

Participation in Extended University, Summer Session, or Winter Session teaching is voluntary and shall neither advantage nor disadvantage faculty members in RTP evaluation.

The following section defines expectations for and provides examples of how to meet the following three Standards for Teaching, which are based on the required elements listed above in the introduction to the Teaching section. Evidence of success in the category of Teaching can include but is not limited to the examples listed under each of the three Standards defined below.

Standard A: Faculty will demonstrate effective planning, creation, and implementation of course methods, materials, and teaching practices.

Description: The candidate's narrative and appendices on Teaching shall demonstrate how they use specific methods and materials that are appropriate and effective to meet course, Department, and University learning outcomes. Additionally, candidates shall demonstrate how they have effectively balanced rigor, access, and equity in their teaching.

Evidence for Standard A in teaching can include (but is not limited to) the following:

1. Methods and materials that enable students to achieve the desired learning outcomes.
2. Examples of student work that show how learning outcomes for the course/department/university are being met.
3. Instructional methods and materials that actively engage students in course content.
4. Selected materials that reflect promising pedagogical practices.
5. Syllabi that conform to the requirements of CI Syllabi Policy.
6. Effective collaboration in interdisciplinary and/or team-teaching practices that speak to the interdisciplinary nature of the field of Global Languages and Cultures.
7. Effective inclusion and/or development of service-learning initiatives and community-engaged learning opportunities in courses.
8. Instructional methods that directly involve students in faculty-mentored student research.
9. Successful utilization of appropriate teaching technologies to improve student learning (e.g. Canvas, Open Educational Resources [OER], etc.).
10. Successful utilization of other high-impact practices to improve student learning and retention. Please see Section I.7.e[3] of the SP 22-11 RTP Policy for examples. Each department must consider the elements that best suit its discipline and determine how faculty teaching successfully satisfies this criterion. High-impact activities connected to increased educational outcomes include (but are not limited to) study abroad, student research, service learning, community-based learning, and internships.
11. Materials and methods that reflect the instructor's commitment to accessibility and inclusivity.
12. The use of materials that are appropriate to the topic that reflect current scholarship in the field.

Standard B: Faculty shall engage in assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and teaching practices.

Description: To meet this standard, the candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in a process of evaluation and assessment of student learning outcomes and of their own teaching practices.

Evidence for Standard B in teaching must include the first two items listed below as required per the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy SP 22-11 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement; additional evidence can include but is not limited to the other examples listed in part 3.

1. **Peer observations of teaching:**

a) A minimum of one peer observation of teaching by a tenured colleague of a higher rank for each probationary year is required by the RTP policy. For tenured faculty, a minimum of one peer observation is required during the period of review.

b) Ideally, the peer observer would be from the department itself or a related discipline, provided that they have sufficient knowledge of Spanish. This does not preclude observers from unrelated disciplines.

c) Peer observations shall be conducted using the department-approved observation forms with specific criteria for different modalities: synchronous face-to-face or online, blended, and asynchronous. The forms focus on specific aspects and best practices in the different modalities and leave room for qualitative feedback from the observer. Peer observations should assess the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methodology, course materials, and course material presentation, and offer constructive suggestions for improvement as appropriate.

d) These observations are snapshots in time and are meant to present part of a holistic view of a faculty member's teaching. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on these peer observations in their narratives. It is the faculty's responsibility to arrange for peer observations in consultation with their chair. Per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements to these observations.

2. **Student responses to instruction** (e.g. Student Ratings of Teaching, aka SRTs): SRTs are administered in all courses considered as part of the review and shall be considered by all levels of review. SRTs are expected to reveal a generally positive view of the faculty member's teaching. SRTs are not necessarily an accurate direct measure of how effectively students learn in the classroom. As such, their value must be taken in context as part of a holistic evaluation and thus shall normally be considered in light of other indicators of teaching proficiency, including peer observations. Student responses to instruction can, however, provide insights into a number of important dimensions of the faculty member's efforts. In addition, some variation in SRTs is to be expected, for example, for courses with experimental teaching methods and for new course preparations. Such situations should be recognized by the review committee and addressed by the candidate in the teaching narrative. In addition, bias may be present in SRTs^[4], and per the CBA, faculty may submit rebuttal statements in response to perceived bias. The Global Languages and Cultures Department concurs with the assessment by the American Sociological Association that using SRTs "as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in faculty review processes can systematically disadvantage faculty from marginalized groups" (Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching, September 2019). In order to minimize potential bias in scoring the Teaching category, reviewers of Global Languages and Cultures faculty shall consider the full range of evidence, including the teaching narrative, curricula, peer observations,

participation in curriculum development and/or assessment, continual effort to improve teaching, and Student Ratings of Teaching. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on SRTs in their Teaching narrative. No single measure of teaching effectiveness, including SRTs, shall be used in isolation to determine the overall evaluation of teaching. Reviewers shall contextualize SRT data in light of course level, modality, class size, curricular experimentation, and documented evidence regarding systemic bias.

3. **Assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes:** In addition to peer observation and student responses to instruction, candidates are encouraged to engage in other activities that assess and evaluate student learning outcomes in order to inform and improve their teaching practices. These activities can include the following:
 - a. Development of classroom assessment techniques and tools that elicit student feedback on teaching practices (e.g. implementation of formal/informal mid-semester reviews, surveys of student learning, student reflections on their learning, etc.)
 - b. Learning assessment tools that are aligned to learning outcomes.
 - c. Teaching and/or advising awards, success of students in post-graduate endeavors, or other unsolicited communication or recognition from students (e.g., nominations for teaching awards).

Standard C: Faculty shall engage in efforts to improve teaching and learning, reflection, and responsive change

Description: To meet this standard, the candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher, which is a process of continuous improvement, such as adapting to changing circumstances, flexibility to teach in different modalities at a consistent level, and incorporating constructive feedback (whether it be from peer evaluations, previous PPC letters or other committee reviews, and SRTs).

Evidence for the three areas of standard C in teaching is listed below. For each category, faculty shall describe how such efforts have led to growth and development in their teaching practice or in student learning.

- I. **Demonstrate a continual effort to improve teaching and learning** described in the teaching narrative. Examples of evidence of continual effort to improve teaching and learning can include but are not limited to the following:
 - A. Involvement with faculty development opportunities.
 - B. Consultation and/or work with colleagues in formal and/or informal ways to implement methods to increase teaching effectiveness.

- C. Participation in curriculum development demonstrated by the creation of new courses and/or revision of existing courses, curricula, or programs; syllabi developed.
 - D. Development of course assessment tools, analysis, interactive activities, new rubrics, and instructor-created course materials.
 - E. Creation and development of study abroad programs in other countries.
 - F. Development of courses in accord with the University mission (e.g, multicultural, international, interdisciplinary and civic engagement/service learning).
 - G. Participation in assessment efforts of the Global Languages and Cultures department as a whole (creation of assessment tools, compiling data, analyzing data, and/or writing reports).
 - H. Applying for grants designed to improve teaching effectiveness.
 - I. Demonstrate development and use of service-learning pedagogy, community-engaged learning, and community-engaged teaching.
 - J. Building and enhancing currency in the discipline and pedagogical developments related to teaching.
- II. **Reflect on teaching** that demonstrates faculty efforts to continually improve their courses. Examples of evidence can include, but are not limited to, the following:
- A. Summary of and personal reflection on student responses to teaching and peer observations.
 - B. Description of changes made in response to formal/informal midterm course evaluation.
 - C. Continued development of one's teaching philosophy and practice.
- III. **Demonstrate responsiveness in teaching** that improves student learning opportunities and experiences. Examples of evidence can include, but are not limited to, the following:
- A. Redesign of course structure and/or revision of assignments in response to assessments and feedback.
 - B. Revision of curriculum to ensure the infusion of new or innovative teaching practices, such as effective use of instructional technology, into course content and delivery.
 - C. Modification of instructional methods and technologies in response to feedback.
 - D. Use of technologies to enrich student learning.
 - E. Redesign of course structure to meet the needs of second- and heritage-language learners and/or students with special needs.

- F. Redesign of courses in response to department and university needs and growth (e. g. changing course delivery modalities).
- G. Incorporation of instructional methods and materials introduced during professional development events.
- H. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate high-impact practices in their teaching, if appropriate to the course. High-impact activities connected to increased educational outcomes include (but are not limited to) service learning, community-based learning, and internships.

Requirements for Retention in Teaching

Faculty showing appropriate progress towards meeting the above standards consistent with their time at rank, shall earn a rating of “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. Faculty demonstrating evidence for achievements in Teaching that surpass reasonable expectations (taking into consideration multiple factors from the standards established above) for their time at rank shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion in Teaching

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence of achievement across the three elements described above shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence of exceeding the standards across the three elements shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching. “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” shall reflect sustained impact, innovation, leadership, or achievement substantially beyond baseline expectations appropriate to rank and discipline, rather than simply increased quantity of labor or activity.

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

At its core, scholarly and creative activity adds knowledge and visibility to one’s field; synthesizes, criticizes, or theorizes in original ways; clarifies extant knowledge; communicates unique connections between existing knowledge and practical applications; and stimulates the intellectual development of one’s colleagues in the field. For RTP considerations, scholarly and creative activity shall be measured in terms of consistent progress toward concrete outcomes, as reflected

in the PDP. In addition, given the nature of the Global Languages and Cultures discipline, collaborative and interdisciplinary work is highly valued but not required for the RTP process.

External letter(s) of review: Candidates for retention, tenure and/or promotion have the option to solicit a letter of review from up to three (3) reviewers from outside of the University who have expertise in the candidate's specialization as a means to assess the impact and significance of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work in the field. Chosen reviewers may not be collaborators with the candidate on any scholarly and/or creative work at any stage of the publication process. Because external review letters are optional and supplementary, candidates shall not be disadvantaged for choosing not to solicit external letters.

Standard: Faculty are expected to establish a record of scholarly/creative endeavors that generates, integrates, and disseminates knowledge.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates shall produce refereed publications and/or juried creative activities as appropriate to their discipline (Linguistics, Literature, Cultural Studies, Translation Studies, etc.). Scholarship and/or creative activities that engage with student research, are community-engaged and/or are community-based are valued equally. Translation of literary, academic, and other culturally significant texts is considered a fusion of creative writing and scholarly work. In recent decades, academic programs throughout the world have recognized translation as a serious intellectual and creative activity and a legitimate form of research and scholarship that requires cross-cultural and interdisciplinary expertise. Given the wide scope of the research focus of department faculty, it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to communicate the nature and significance of their scholarly and/or creative publications and other activities in the self-assessment narrative submitted with their portfolio. Specifically, the candidate should address the following:

1. The nature of the scholarly and/or creative activities: e.g., a summary of the achievement, the area of specialization, type of publications (editorial standards of the publisher or sponsoring organization; peer-reviewed/editorially reviewed or not, single or co-authored, etc.).
2. The dissemination and scope of impact (e.g., the number of citations and/or reviews, etc.).

Candidates shall “meet expectations” by accumulating 20-27 points at rank, according to the rubric below, of which 11 or more must be from Group A. Candidates surpassing 27 (i.e. 28+) points shall be considered to “exceed expectations.”

Peer-reviewed or editorially reviewed publications that have been formally accepted and are forthcoming or in press shall be treated as publications for purposes of these standards, provided that the candidate supplies documentation of formal acceptance.

Evidence of achievement in the category of scholarly and/or creative activities can include, but is not limited to, the following:

GROUP A: All specific GROUP A items appear under the assumption that the faculty member was a significant contributor (see Description).

1. Single-authored or single-translated publications of peer-reviewed books, textbooks, or monographs by a reputable and recognized academic press of an international/national reputation in Global Languages and Cultures, or related field. (20 pts.)
2. Co-authored or co-translated publications of peer-reviewed authored books, textbooks, or monographs by a reputable and recognized academic press of an international/national reputation in Global Languages and Cultures, or related field. (12 pts.)
3. Publication of an edited book of which the faculty member was the primary editor. The contribution of a peer-reviewed chapter (excluding the introduction) within the edited book shall count as a separate publication in (4 or 5) below. (7 pts.)
4. Single- or lead-authored publications of peer-reviewed book chapters or journal articles by recognized presses or journals (online or in print). The author has primary responsibility for the research, writing, and intellectual direction of the chapter, regardless of whether it's single- or multi-authored. (7 pts.)
5. Co-authored publications of peer-reviewed book chapters or journal articles by recognized presses or journals (online or in print). Each author role is significant, though the author does not have the sole responsibility. (4 pts.)
6. Supporting-authored publications of peer-reviewed book chapters or journal articles by recognized presses or journals (online or in print). For instances where the author made a significant but secondary contribution, such as contributing specialized knowledge, analysis, or sections of the chapter, but without primary responsibility for the whole. (3 pts.)
7. Other translations of literary, academic, or cultural significance published by relevant presses, journals, or other venues (online or in print). When evaluating the import and merit of translations shorter than book-length, factors such as cultural/linguistic complexity and general level of difficulty are important considerations. (3-5 pts.)
8. Translations performed in support of university or community initiatives are considered a service activity rather than scholarly and/or creative activity.
9. Editorially reviewed published creative works: novels, a book-length collection of short stories, book-length collection of poetry, plays, etc. (10 pts.)
10. Other peer-reviewed works including creative works, curating exhibits, performances, or other activities that are clearly demonstrated to have widespread and meaningful impact on

the faculty member's professional community or other kinds of dissemination appropriate to the nature of the research. In their narratives, faculty will argue and demonstrate how points should be determined depending on which category is most appropriate from I-VIII above. (3-20 pts.)

GROUP B:

1. Presentations at professional meetings, seminars, symposia, and conferences (3 pts.)
2. Keynote, invited talk, or guest lecture that contributes to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship (5 pts.)
3. Publication as single or lead-author in proceedings of professional meetings and conferences (5 pts.)
4. Publication as a co- or supporting author in proceedings of professional meetings and conferences (3 pts.)
5. Publications in popular media (films, videos, digital humanities, or other non-traditional publications) with national, regional, or local readerships (5 pts.)
6. Submitted applications for large external grants, commissions, fellowships, prizes, other awards if demonstrating significant effort/scholarly progression (2 pts.)
7. Receipt of an awarded external grant to support scholarship (must be an amount or specific award considered significant in faculty member's discipline or field - limited to one for purposes of promotion and tenure). (3-4 pts.)
8. Media production assistance, background research, and collaboration that contribute to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship (3-4 pts.)
9. Media appearances that contribute to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship (2 pts.)
10. Reports of applied research and/or community-based research (e.g., policy paper, newspaper article) (2 pts.)
11. Development of high-impact software or searchable, categorized, digital repositories (3-4 pts.)
12. Creating or editing publications for local or regional audiences (1-2 pts.)
13. Other works, including creative works, that are clearly demonstrated to have widespread and meaningful impact on the faculty member's professional community or other kinds of dissemination appropriate to the nature of the research. In their narratives, faculty will argue and demonstrate how points should be determined depending on which category is most appropriate from a-k above. (1-5 pts.)

Requirements for Retention in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Faculty undergoing retention review must present the points they have earned to date, along with a clear timeline for the completion of each planned scholarly or creative activity. Faculty who demonstrate and provide this evidence for achievement that indicates timely progress towards the required 20 points of scholarly/creative activity shall earn “On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence that they will surpass the 27 points for research and scholarly/creative activity at their current rank shall earn a rating of “On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria. While we expect faculty members to ultimately earn more than half their points (11+) in Category A activities for Promotion and Tenure, Category B activities demonstrate growth and development towards this goal.

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a minimum of 20 points (11+ from Category A) during the time in rank shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activities. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for more than 27 points of scholarly/creative activity shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards.”

PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Faculty service activities encompass service performed for the Global Languages and Cultures Department, the Academic Senate, other campus divisions, student organizations, the University, the CSU system, professional organizations at local/regional/national/international levels, and the community (broadly defined).

Given the small size of the Global Languages and Cultures Department, faculty are encouraged to give special attention to department-related activities. These include, but are not limited to, engagement in governance activities, serving on ad-hoc committees or task forces as needed, participating in formal and informal search and hiring processes, contributing to Department and curriculum development and implementation, taking part in department assessment activities, and conducting or participating in peer observations. Active participation in these areas is essential to the growth and sustainability of the department. While faculty are encouraged to contribute meaningfully to the department, they have the flexibility to determine how they balance their overall service commitments.

Standard: Faculty shall take a continuous and active role in addressing the needs of the Department, the University, the profession, and the community through good citizenship and application of professional expertise.

Description: To meet this standard, candidates are expected to maintain appropriate and consistent service activity throughout the period of review for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Service contributions are expected of all department faculty regardless of rank. However, reviewers at all levels shall take into account the need for assistant professors to prioritize their teaching and scholarly/creative activities during their probationary years. Therefore, assistant professors may choose to primarily focus their service contributions in support of Global Languages and Cultures Department activities. This means that assistant professors shall not be held to the same standard of service contributions as more senior faculty (i.e., associate and full professors with tenure). In other words, greater depth of service and roles of greater responsibility shall be expected as faculty are promoted through the ranks.

Evidence: While there is not a set number or type of service commitments that a faculty member must undertake to meet standards, they shall clearly show that they have assumed a service load appropriate to the three (3) WTUs^[7] that all tenure-track faculty are assigned for this purpose; for some faculty, this will mean sustained engagement in a Senate committee that meets regularly and has a high workload, while for others it will mean participation in multiple, less time-consuming committees or community and professional engagements. It is up to each faculty member to describe the responsibilities and significance of the service that they perform.

Any service that is compensated with additional release time shall be clearly stated by the faculty member and shall not normally be considered as part of their primary service requirement, though it may be considered as part of the overall service contributions as outlined in the narrative. For example, if a faculty member receives release time for a service role, they should explain what other service they engage in that fulfills their initial 3 WTUs for service; in the case where a faculty member is given extra release time for a service role, but that service role is exceptionally large, they should explain how their service extends beyond the extra release time given to fulfill their initial 3 WTUs as well.

Evidence of performance in the categories of professional, university and community service can include, but is not limited to, the following activities:

1. Global Languages and Cultures Department activities, special projects, governance or offices (e.g., chair, adviser), committee or subcommittee activities.
2. Academic Senate activities, work projects, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities.
3. Campus division activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities.
4. Participation or advisory roles for student organizations.

5. University or CSU system-wide activities, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittee activities.
6. Community (broadly defined) initiatives, organizations, work projects, task forces, or offices consistent with the faculty member's area of professional expertise.
7. Service in professional organizations at local, regional, national, or international levels, including elective or appointed positions.
8. Service on editorial boards or editorial responsibilities for books and/or journals with national or international significance.
9. Service-learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities.
10. Other service activities deemed appropriate by the faculty member. The above list of activities and forms of collaboration in no way reflects a complete list of all possible scenarios. The department will seriously consider other relevant activities for which the faculty member under review provides evidence of participation.

A faculty member's service roles can be undertaken via leadership and/or participatory roles, and the level of achievement in the area of Service can be determined in a variety of ways, including the following:

1. the degree of initiation and/or consistency of the commitment to a task or tasks;
2. the impact of the service on the University and/or other constituencies;
3. positive feedback received from colleagues and others;
4. tangible products, results, or concrete accomplishments from the service provided.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to articulate the quality and quantity of service in their narrative. The faculty member is encouraged to address any issues of invisible labor, cultural taxation and identity taxation^[8] that have impacted their professional growth and accomplishments in the area of Service.

Requirements for Retention in Service

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent track record of service contributions appropriate to their time at rank and consistent with the three (3) WTUs assigned for this purpose shall earn "On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards" in Service.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence that they have assumed a service load of a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that they have gone beyond both their assigned three (3) WTUs for service and any additional assigned time for service commitments shall earn a rating of "On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards" in Service. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria.

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure in Service

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for a consistent record of service comparable to their three (3) WTUs of release time shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Service. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for sustained participation in service on a scale and depth higher than that which would be aligned with their time at rank or that goes beyond their three (3) assigned WTUs for service shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards”. The candidate shall build a case in their narrative describing how they are on track to meet or exceed these criteria. “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards” shall reflect sustained impact, innovation, leadership, or achievement substantially beyond baseline expectations appropriate to rank and discipline, rather than simply increased quantity of labor or activity.

MENTORSHIP OF STUDENT RESEARCH

Mentorship of undergraduate research activities is recognized in this document as a valuable high-impact practice undertaken by Global Languages and Cultures Department faculty that can inspire students to greater academic success and professional achievement; help improve retention and graduation rates; and lead students to continue their studies of Global Languages and Cultures at the postgraduate level. The following conditions shall govern the presentation of mentorship of student research by Global Languages and Cultures Department faculty who are applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion:

1. Although mentorship of student research is not required as a condition for awarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion, the Global Languages and Cultures Department encourages faculty members to engage in such activities and to submit evidence of said mentorship as part of their RTP portfolio.
2. Faculty members who wish to submit evidence of mentorship of student research shall clearly identify a single performance area (e.g., teaching; scholarly and creative activities; or service) under which to include each discrete example of student research mentorship, and they shall provide a brief explanation for this categorization in the respective self-assessment narrative.
3. If the mentorship of student research is potentially associated with more than one evaluation category, the faculty member in question shall submit the mentorship activities under the most appropriate category to avoid redundancy.
4. Reviewers at all levels shall consider the mentorship of student research under the category identified by the faculty member in question.

SEVERABILITY

Global Languages and Cultures Program Personnel Standards are governed by the University RTP policy and other University policies. Where any discrepancy occurs between this and other University policies, the relevant University policies shall take precedence. If such a discrepancy occurs, all other stipulations contained herein shall remain in force.

Endnotes.

^[1] While “faculty” generally refers to both non-tenure track faculty and tenure-line faculty, for the purposes of the PPS, it refers only to probationary and tenured faculty.

^[2] Stateside teaching refers to courses that are funded in part by the State allocation, while Extended University courses may be self-supported and are not always considered part of a faculty member’s academic year assignment.

^[3] Section 1.7.e (SP 22-11 RTP Policy): “Each program shall indicate in its PPS how faculty use of and participation in high-impact teaching and learning practices that promote student success, especially for historically underrepresented groups, (e.g., culturally-relevant pedagogy, study abroad, embedded research, experiential/service learning, learning communities, anti-racist pedagogical practices/curriculum development, etc.) shall be considered when evaluating faculty contributions in the area of Teaching and/or Professional Activities for purposes of retention, tenure, and/or promotion.”

^[4] Kreitzer, R.J., Sweet-Cushman, J. “Evaluating Student Evaluations of Teaching: A Review of Measurement and Equity Bias in SETs and Recommendations for Ethical Reform.” *Journal of Academic Ethics* 20, 73–84 (2022).

^[5] Peer review is defined as the anonymous evaluation and approval of the faculty member’s scholarly work by other experts who specialize in the same (or a related) field.

^[6] Editorial review is defined as the evaluation and acceptance of a creative work by an editorial board, selection committee, or similar body charged with determining the artistic merit of the work.

^[7] The weighting system used by the California State University to determine the appropriate teaching credit for instructional assignments. According to the CBA, a full load of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service is considered to be 15 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per semester.

^[8] In The term “cultural taxation” was coined in 1994 by scholar Amado Padillo “to describe the expectation placed on faculty of colour to address diversity-related departmental and institutional affairs,” then expanded by Joseph and Hirschfield “to include extra burdens that stem from faculty of colour’s commitment to campus diversity issues and the lack of legitimacy they experience from colleagues challenging their existence in the academy” (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). They later adopted the term “identity taxation” to include and emphasize the extra labour performed by members of a variety of different marginalized groups because of their intersectional identities” (Joseph & Hirschfield, 2023). For further discussion of these terms see, for example: Tiffany D.

Joseph & Laura E. Hirshfield (2023). "Reexamining racism, sexism, and identity taxation in the academy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 46:6, 1101-1108, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2022.2143719