MSU DENVER COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES

Department of World Languages

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Effective

August 1, 2026

Approvals:

Department Chair: Jean-François Duclos	Date: 12/01/25
Dean:	Date: 2/27/2026
Provost:	Date:

MSU DENVER College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

DEFINING FACULTY WORK:

VALUES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Faculty work comprises many intersecting roles, chief among them instructor, scholar, and engaged campus & community partner. These roles have been a foundational standard for decades in higher education. However, as faculty respond to the changing needs and expectations of students, colleagues, and others, the nature of these roles has changed and continues to develop.

The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (CLAS) is a large academic unit that houses the foundation of human knowledge (arts, humanities, and sciences). Furthermore, we value the diversity within our programs and the contributions of each department. As such, it is essential that we establish guiding principles and values that align with and recognize the many ways faculty meet obligations and expectations tied to their roles.

The process for evaluation and review continues to be established, upheld, and governed by the Faculty Employment Handbook. As stated in this handbook, and in accordance with AAUP Guidelines, departments establish discipline-specific standards for teaching; research, scholarship, creative work; and service. Those discipline-specific standards are the fundamental tools used for our peer review and evaluation process.

The guiding principles and values listed below are intended to provide an overarching and aspirational view for faculty work in CLAS. Departments should view their own standards through the lens of these shared values as they continue to develop and enhance their specific quantitative and qualitative disciplinary expectations for faculty work standards.

Teaching & Pedagogy

Faculty in the CLAS deeply value teaching as an essential and deeply valued act, encompassing a significant aspect of their professional identity. CLAS faculty provide the foundation of human knowledge through the arts, humanities, and sciences. Faculty engage students in the learning process through pedagogy that provides a fundamental disciplinary knowledge. Additionally, they often demonstrate connection points and applicability of concepts through an interdisciplinary lens and reframe concepts for contemporary audiences through equity-minded and inclusive practices.

As experts in their respective fields, faculty are evaluated on the effectiveness and impact of their teaching through quantitative and qualitative measures. While those measures are department- and discipline-specific, CLAS faculty strive to include, but are not limited to, several of the following goals and principles in their teaching:

- Well-designed courses that clearly align learning outcomes for the course, degree, program, and general studies category/course outcomes where appropriate;
- Conveying their disciplinary expertise in an engaged teaching style, bringing enthusiasm for knowledge and intellectual inquiry to the learning environment. This is a faculty member's most effective approach to attracting and retaining students to the discipline and institution;
- Clear linkages between content, relevance, application, and practice;
- Intentional alignment between assignments, activities, and experiences to the learning outcomes and purpose of the course;
- Use of proven and effective teaching practices (High-Impact Practices as one example) when appropriate and effective;
- Developing and enhancing students' ability to demonstrate intellectual competencies and essential skills within and across disciplinary boundaries;
- Broadening disciplinary foci to include diverse perspectives, historically minoritized voices, anti-racist practices, and/or addressing the absence of marginalized populations within historically homogenized primary sources and/or fields;
- Modernizing and enhancing pedagogy with a focus on inclusive and equity-centered practices; use of new and accessible technology; high-quality low- and no-cost options for student materials (OER as one example); and intentionally designed educational experiences as it pertains to course delivery and modality;
- Effective academic guidance and mentorship in the form of availability through regular, consistent office hours and additional connection opportunities (e.g. hallway conversations, before and after class, separate appointments, etc.). Students are then provided an opportunity not only to discuss topics specific to a class, but also major/career aspirations, course recommendations, and post-graduation pathways. This work complements the work of our institution's professional advisors, with each department and/or discipline making determinations on implementation.

The teaching narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review should move beyond the quantitative listing of courses taught, students enrolled, and SRI scores. These metrics, used broadly, can point to overarching themes and trends, but should not necessarily be used as the only indicator of effective teaching.

The narrative presents the opportunity for faculty to reflect on their teaching and report successes; highlight any modification or innovation in their classroom; describe the application of interdisciplinary approaches and connection points for students; or detail enhancements of current materials, experimentation with new approaches, and any tangible impacts the course might have had on the students, including aspects of DEI pedagogy and practice in these areas.

Research, Scholarship, & Creative Work

The creation, acquisition, and dissemination of new knowledge is a hallmark of higher

education. CLAS faculty are actively involved in creating new knowledge within their fields, integrating existing knowledge to share with new audiences, and applying disciplinary knowledge and expertise to address contemporary problems. Within a college as large and diverse as CLAS, scholarly and disciplinary impact is vast and constantly developing. The products, venues, and vehicles for distribution of research, scholarship, and creative work vary widely across CLAS.

Despite these necessary distinctions, the overarching foci and scope of research, scholarship, and creative work (RSCW) in CLAS includes **one or more** of the following assumptions:

- Meaningful and recognized intellectual and/or artistic contributions to or across disciplines, typically involving a method of peer review and/or peer recognition through traditional publishing, invitations to prestigious venues, impactful disciplinary gatherings, or new and emerging modalities;
- Development, creation, or establishment of new trends or discoveries within or across disciplines (cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary), recognized by peers and/or external audiences for its impact, consequence, and potential to alter, enhance, support, or refute traditional or established assumptions within or across disciplines;
- Interconnectedness between RSCW and the content and/or practice of teaching. This includes, but is not limited to, using RSCW to inform course content, pedagogy, undergraduate research, and attract students to the discipline;
- Demonstrable impact of community-engaged scholarship that improves, enhances, or creates mutually beneficial outcomes for the public good (which may also intersect faculty work in their service category);
- Contributions that elevate the public and intellectual reputation of the institution, college, or department and aligns with the mission, vision, and principles of the institution, college, or department.

The RCSW narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review is an opportunity to provide context for RSCW, not solely list activities. If we are to understand and value our colleagues work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the impact of work on a variety of audiences, including those outside MSU Denver; acknowledge academic work that may be forging new trends or ways of thought in our disciplines; recognize promising new mediums and modalities for the distribution of RSCW; and provide overarching reasons why the work is important and worthy of recognition.

Service

Service to the institution and profession is an essential facet of faculty work, it is expected of individuals in faculty roles, and much of service supports the academic institution’s foundation of faculty governance. At its most basic level, it ensures that the governance and operational aspects of running an institution are in place and the academy continues to function and thrive. At a more meaningful level, service is how we give back to our students, our colleagues, and our disciplines. Furthermore, building

networks, partnerships, and community is a foundational part of faculty work that takes time, care, and reciprocity. Building networks and partnerships through attending and organizing events as well as contributing to a network's communications helps actualize the university and college mission.

For service to be a consequential endeavor, the responsibilities should align with a faculty member's interests and passions whenever possible. It is important to acknowledge that service is not always visible, nor is it always tied to committees. When making service assignments, department chairs should assure that the work is equally distributed and truly valued in the evaluation process.

Service is recognized and evaluated as a **collection** of the following factors:

- **Time Commitment**. Estimate a proportion of time spent in conjunction with the service percentage expectation in a faculty member's workload. This can then be broken down into hours per week, weeks per semester, etc. Acknowledging that most academic work is cyclical, there will be weeks when time commitment for service is great, and weeks when it is far less.
- **Scope**. The nature of faculty governance and service lends itself to hierarchies among work that divides into groups: university, college, department/program; curriculum, policy, events; national, state, local; etc. Department guidelines should address scope of work when assessing service commitments and obligations.
- **Outcome & Impact**. Consider the product or outcome generated from the work and the impact on its intended recipients. Department guidelines should acknowledge impact through the lens of their disciplinary values, purpose, and common good.
- **Role**. Serving as a chair or leader of a committee, project, or engagement effort will typically increase the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation for the faculty member. Defining roles on committees and in other service is an important element in establishing efficient, equitable, and meaningful service expectations.
- **Special Project or Task Force**. Serving on an ad-hoc group to solve long-standing or immediate issues beyond the typical role of a service commitment (committee, professional organization, community engagement group) typically increases the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation.
- **Student Guidance and Mentorship (non-academic)**. CLAS acknowledges that women, faculty of color, LGBTQIA+ faculty, and other historically minoritized faculty groups often find themselves with increased time commitments serving students that identify with them. This work often falls under the category of "Invisible Service." Due to a need for service across the institution, a faculty member's entire service component cannot be exclusively dedicated to this type of service. It is, however, an important part of faculty work and should be acknowledged in a manner that best suits the different departments and disciplines in CLAS.

The Service narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure

review is an opportunity to provide context for faculty work, as well as how it aligns with a faculty member's overall/future career trajectory and passions. If we are to understand and value our colleagues' work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the complex and varied intersection of service commitments. This will be presented as a collection of service work that can be both quantified and qualified, culminating as an impactful and meaningful part of the faculty portfolio.

Table of Contents

I. DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW 9

A. Introduction 9
B. Department Mission Statement 9
C. Preamble 9

II. AREAS OF EVALUATION 9

A. Teaching: General Evaluation Standards 10
1. Instruction 10
2. Peer Feedback on Teaching 11
3. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) 11
B. Scholarly Activities: General Evaluation Standards for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work (RSCW) 12
1. Scope and Foci 12
2. Types 12
C. Service: General Evaluation Standards 13
1. Scope and Foci 13
2. Types 14

III. TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY 15

A. Professional Responsibilities 15
B. Retention, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor 15
1. Teaching 15
2. Scholarly Activities 16
3. Service 17
C. Promotion to Professor 17
2. Scholarly Activities 18
3. Service 18
D. Post-Tenure Review 19
1. Teaching 19
2. Scholarly Activities 19
3. Service 20

IV. NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY 20

A. Professional Responsibilities 20
1. Teaching 20
2. Scholarly Activities 21
3. Service 21
B. Portfolio Submission 21
1. Cover Sheet 21
2. Narrative 21
3. Annotated Curriculum Vitae 22
4. Student Ratings of Instruction, evaluated in context, as described below. 22
5. Peer Observations of Instruction as delineated below. 22
6. Submission 22
C. Reappointment 22
1. Teaching 22

2. Scholarly Activities *23*
3. Service *23*
D. PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER 23
1. Eligibility *23*
2. Criteria *23*
E. MULTI-YEAR CONTRACT 23
V. ADJUNCT FACULTY 24
A. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES 24
B. REAPPOINTMENT 24
VI. EMERITUS STATUS 25

I. Department Overview

A. Introduction

In accordance with institutional guidelines, the performance of each faculty member of the Department of World Languages shall be evaluated in the following areas: teaching, which includes advising; scholarly activity; and service at the departmental, school, university, community, and professional organization level. Faculty seeking promotion and tenure must demonstrate performance that meets standards defined by the guidelines of the department in these three areas of professional responsibility.

B. Department Mission Statement

The Department of World Languages transforms students' lives through instruction and mentorship, participation in critical dialog, and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity. Engagement with language, literature and culture raises global awareness and develops inclusive communities; our programs cultivate linguistically capable, culturally competent, and intellectually inquisitive individuals. This endeavor supports students' community involvement, lifelong learning, and transferable skills for professional success in diverse fields in the global economy.

To accomplish its mission, the Department offers or has offered a variety of world language programs, including ASL, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. The Department offers two types of majors in World Languages: Option I with an emphasis area of either French or Spanish, and Option I, a dual-language composite program which features emphasis areas in French or Spanish as primary languages, and French, German, Italian, Japanese or Spanish as secondary languages. The Department also offers minors in French, German, Italian, Japanese and Spanish.

In addition, the Department supports Individualized Degree Programs (IDPs) especially designed to meet the needs of students with an interest in a specific area of concentration, such as translation and government service. Students successfully completing all department requirements for a major in Modern Foreign Languages and those established by the MSU Denver Teacher Licensure Program are eligible for certification in K-12 education by the Colorado Department of Education.

C. Preamble

Where examples are cited for fulfillment of each area of evaluation, they are, indeed, illustrative examples. Faculty members may cite other comparable activities to support a claim for a particular level of evaluation. Furthermore, departmental review of each portfolio will be performed with the understanding that the composition of the portfolio may reflect parameters established by prior departmental guidelines and that portfolios submitted for consideration during the current year should be evaluated with those parameters in mind.

II. Areas of Evaluation

A. Teaching: General Evaluation Standards

The department acknowledges the importance of the six areas of teaching included in the Faculty Employment Handbook: 1. Content expertise conveyed with effective pedagogies and praxis; 2. Inclusive pedagogy; 3. Instructional design; 4. Instructional delivery and learning environment; 5. Assessment; and 6. Advising in and beyond the classroom.

Teaching is the act of creating and maintaining an environment which enhances the opportunities for student learning and discipline-related growth; it includes advising students to facilitate graduation and to transition to post baccalaureate careers or further educational opportunities. Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.

According to the Faculty Handbook: "Teaching is a complex and reflective human activity that, in a higher education context, is offered in a forum that is advanced, semi-public, and essentially critical in nature. No single definition can possibly suffice to cover the range of talents that go into excellent teaching or that could be found across the board in the varied departments and disciplines of an entire college or university. Effective teachers are scholars, researchers, inventors, scientists, creators, artists, professionals, investigators, practitioners or those with advanced expertise or experience who share knowledge, using appropriate methodologies. Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, provide audiences for student work, and demonstrate effective pedagogies. Furthermore, this work of faculty should align with MSU Denver's mission and values."

1. Instruction

The following examples of involvement in curriculum development and maintenance are benchmarking supplements that faculty members may choose to incorporate into their portfolio and narrative. They highlight innovation in the classroom, application of interdisciplinary approaches and connection points for students, enhancement of existing materials, experimentation with new methods and techniques, and any tangible impacts a course might have on students. Examples include, but are not limited to:

a. <u>Design of new courses</u>:
   i. Clear alignment of the course learning outcomes with the degree outcomes in World Languages (majors and minors).
   ii. Clear links between theory and application.
   iii. Intentional alignment between assignments, activities, and experiences to the learning outcomes and purpose of the course.
   iv. Broadening disciplinary foci to include diverse perspectives and historically marginalized voices.
b. <u>Variety of courses taught</u>:
   i. Conveying disciplinary expertise in an engaging teaching style.

ii. Developing and enhancing students' ability to apply intellectual competencies and essential skills within and across disciplines.

c. Modernizing and enhancing pedagogy:
   i. Creating online versions of courses and/or use of new and emerging technologies.
   ii. Implementing Low- and No-Cost options for student materials.
   iii. Developing open educational resources (OER)* or wrapping course design around high-quality OERs.
d. Employing inclusive and equity-centered practices
e. Proposing and implementing programmatic changes

*NOTE: If OERs are authored or co-authored by the faculty member, and are peer-reviewed/refereed, they may count towards a publication in the Scholarly Activities category. If OERs are authored or co-authored by the faculty member and are a comprehensive non-refereed text (workbook, manual, interactive website, etc.) they may count as a contribution to the *Conferences/Journals/Pedagogical Materials/Short Form Publications* subcategory under Scholarly Activities.

2. Peer Feedback on Teaching

All World Languages faculty will receive and provide evidence of peer feedback on teaching. Such feedback will be based on samples of direct teaching. The frequency will depend on the faculty category and period of evaluation. A sample of direct teaching will be defined as follows:

a. A standard face-to-face class session or a synchronous-online class of no less than 40 and no more than 75 min. duration;
b. A video recording of a standard face-to-face class session or a synchronous-online class of no less than 40 and no more than 75 min. duration;
c. An asynchronous-online course presented to an observer during a conference of no less than 40 and no more than 75 min. duration.

3. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs)

SRIs for classes are compared to same level courses (lower or upper division) within the prefix. The Department of World Languages recognizes that student evaluations of teaching have been reported in academic literature to reflect race and gender bias, and to have diminished correlation to teaching effectiveness. In addition, low response rates and mode of instruction can skew results. Therefore, SRIs are to be viewed as one of many facets in evaluating teaching contributions. Their main value is that they provide information on trends. SRIs will be viewed in the context of factors known to directly impact scores, such as course difficulty, mode of instruction (online, hybrid, face-to-face and their variations), and student motivation (required course vs. elective; general studies vs. major or minor, etc.). A score of 4 on the current 6-point scale in the majority of courses taught is a recommended aspirational benchmark. Faculty with a majority of SRI scores below 4 on the current 6-point scale are expected to take note of the circumstances that impact their SRIs and to address those factors. Reflections on SRI results (numeric scores and/or written comments) must be included either in the narrative or in the portfolio annotations.

B. Scholarly Activities: General Evaluation Standards for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work (RSCW)

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop ideas, frame explorations and debates, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore enduring questions related to the human condition. The RSCW narrative portion of the promotion/retention/tenure and post-tenure review is an opportunity to provide context and address the impact of work on a variety of audiences, including those beyond the academic world; acknowledge academic work that may be forging new trends in established disciplines; recognize new mediums and modalities for the distribution of RSCW; and provide overarching reasons why the work is important and worthy of recognition.

1. Scope and Foci

In accordance with the Values and Guiding Principles of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, RSCW includes but is not limited to:

a. Meaningful and recognized intellectual and/or artistic contributions to or across disciplines, typically involving a method of peer review and/or peer recognition through traditional publishing, invitations to prestigious venues, impactful disciplinary gatherings, or new and emerging modalities.
b. Interconnectedness between RSCW and the content and/or practice of teaching, using RSCW to inform pedagogy and attract students to the discipline.
c. Demonstrable impact of community-engaged scholarship that improves, enhances, or creates mutually beneficial outcomes for the public good in alignment with the mission, vision and principles of the institution, college, or department.

2. Types

a. Peer-Reviewed Publications and Contributions**.** Examples of peer-reviewed publications include journal articles, books, book chapters, educational and/or scholarly media products that have gone through a blind evaluation process by at least two separate experts in the field who have critically assessed the quality and merit of the work and have recommended it for publication. A type of a peer-reviewed contribution is a published article in a journal that requires blind review or applying for and receiving an extramural grant.
b. Peer-Refereed Publications and Contributions**.** Journal articles, books, book chapters, book reviews, conference proceedings, invited submissions, educational materials, educational and/or scholarly media products that have been approved and accepted for publication by a qualified editor/editorial board without being subject to an additional formal external assessment. A type of a peer-refereed contribution is a publication in editor-approved conference proceedings.
c. Peer Refereed Presentations**.** Conference/colloquia/symposia presentations that have undergone an approval process to be accepted as part of the conference/colloquium/symposium program. Discipline-specific invited presentations and keynote addresses are also included in this category.
d. Non-Peer Refereed Presentations**.** Participation in professional or other formal

gatherings that did not require an evaluation process, as well as invited presentations indirectly related to the area of disciplinary expertise.

e. Public-Facing Humanities Projects (including Humanities-informed interdisciplinary projects)**.** According to the 2022 MLA Ad Hoc Committee report on Valuing the Public Humanities (also referred to as Publicly Engaged Humanities or Public-Facing Humanities), publicly engaged humanities scholarship "takes many forms," "is expansive in nature and includes, but is not limited to: print and digital forms of individual and collective scholarship published in venues that reach broad audiences, such as op-eds; community events, such as speaker series or community reading events; analog projects, like exhibits in public spaces, interpretive material, and cultural heritage sites; and digital projects like podcasts, websites, or apps—and some projects may appear in more than one of these iterations." (https://www.mla.org/content/download/187094/file/Guidelines-Evaluating-Public-Humanities.pdf) The guiding principles in evaluating publicly engaged humanities scholarship include: scope and impact of contribution; form and dissemination of contribution; extent of existing deliverables; ethical collection, distribution and use of knowledge.
    i. Quantitatively, a "significant contribution" will be defined as either of the following: project lead; project coordinator; concept developer (if concept originator, must also contribute to the buildout of the project infrastructure); main researcher; content contributor of the equivalent to no less than the average extent of a scholarly article typical for the discipline.
    ii. Quantitatively, a "contribution" will be defined as either of the following: project participant, contact or liaison; credited concept originator; project consultant; project referee or external reviewer; limited-content contributor.

C. Service: General Evaluation Standards

Faculty engage in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution; service to the institution can be at the program, department, school, or University level. Beyond the institution, faculty engage in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, nonprofit organizations, or government agencies. According to the Values and Guiding Principles of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, for service to be a meaningful and consequential endeavor, it is best that activities align with a faculty member's interests and passions, whenever possible. It is also important to acknowledge that service is not always visible, nor is it always tied to committee work.

1. Scope and Foci

Service is recognized and evaluated as a collection of the following factors:

a. Time commitment. One way of gauging service work is to think about it in proportion of hours per week in a standard, full-time 40-hour week model. It must be acknowledged that said proportion will vary according to faculty loads, and that due to the cyclical nature of most academic work it will not be equally distributed from week to week.
b. Scope. The nature of faculty service lends itself to hierarchies among service types: level (department, college, university, community); area (curriculum,

faculty evaluation, policy, events); and extramural reach (local, state, national, international). Such distinctions must be addressed in the narrative.

c. Outcome and Impact. Meaningful service is best assessed when considering the product or outcome generated, as well as the impact on its intended recipients. Serving on a special project or task force typically increases the impact of the service obligation. Non-academic student guidance and mentorship (often falling under the category of "invisible service") such as service outside regular committees, mentoring, emotional labor, should also be acknowledged as an impactful and taken into account.

d. Role. Serving as a chair or leader of a committee, project, initiative, or engagement effort typically increases the impact and time commitment of the service obligation.

2. Types

Service units are service activities viewed in two broad categories, Intense Commitment and Moderate Commitment. For service activities that are ongoing over multiple years, each year counts as a unit of service.

a. Intense Commitment activities include but are not limited to service as:

i. Chair or Co-Chair of the department Curriculum & Assessment or RTP/PTR Committee.
ii. Chair or Co-Chair of a college or university-level committee.
iii. Chair or Co-Chair of an active committee/task force for a professional organization.
iv. Member of a Faculty Senate committee/task force/workgroup, or member of college-level Curriculum or RTP/PTR Committee; or member of university-level Curriculum or General Studies or RTP/PTR Committee.
v. Coordinator/director of ongoing project for the department, or college, or university, or a professional organization. Department-level examples are:
    - Language Coordinator (coordinating program-level multi-section lower-division courses and department-level General Studies assessment);
    - Program coordinator (coordinating all level courses within a language program and supervising adjunct faculty);
    - Translation Certificate Coordinator;
    - Directed Independent Language Studies Coordinator.
vi. Officer at a regional, national, or international professional organization.
vii. Editor or Assistant Editor of a scholarly journal.
viii. Faculty sponsor for a student organization.
ix. Provider of professional expertise to develop and/or carry forward projects with intense commitment (e.g. academic program review; community-serving initiatives, organizing an undergraduate research forum, etc.).
x. Any other comparable service activity.

b. Moderate Commitment activities include but are not limited to service as:

i. Member of committees or special projects at the department, or college, or university level that require moderate level of commitment.
ii. Member of an ongoing committee/task force for a professional organization that requires moderate level of commitment.
iii. Member of Faculty Senate.
iv. Contributor to shorter-duration or less-involving special projects at the

department, or college, or university level.

v. Chair or Co-Chair of a committee requiring short-term or moderate commitment
vi. Member of a panel, board, or council requiring moderate or low time commitment.
vii. Mentor to junior faculty.
viii. Any other comparable service activity.

III. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

A. Professional Responsibilities

Tenured and tenure-track faculty must meet the contractual responsibilities defined in the MSU Denver Faculty Employment Handbook, as a prerequisite to a satisfactory performance rating. In addition, the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (CLAS) establishes general standards of performance for all faculty members within the college. The MSU Denver Faculty Employment Handbook and the CLAS General Standards of Performance are maintained by the University and College respectively, and available online.

1. Faculty shall perform responsibilities specified in the Handbook (in accordance with the academic calendar) and adhere to accepted standards of professional conduct, including: the conduct of assigned classes; providing the chair with timely notice (in writing) in the event they cannot conduct a class (or classes); and shall arrange when possible, prior instruction to be provided when they cannot be present—either by a substitute or by a class assignment.
2. Faculty shall present to all students attending class a course description, class schedule, grading criteria, and special notices required by law or instructional policy (ADA statement, for example).
3. Faculty shall adopt such procedures as necessary to assure that adequate and accurate records of student performance, and attendance if mandated by the syllabus, are maintained.
4. Faculty shall establish, post, and keep a minimum of four (4) office hours each week during each academic term of the regular academic year. Faculty members shall prepare for classes, evaluate students' performance, confer with and advise students, and participate in committee work, professional development, service, and other appropriate professional activities.

B. Retention, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Teaching

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate professor in the Area of teaching:

a. Courses. Courses are kept current through review of instructional resources and addition of new materials, as appropriate. The narrative describes how the faculty member has designed and taught courses, using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the tenure candidate uses student learning objectives/outcomes as one means to facilitate student learning and assessment. The faculty member shows appropriate work on

developing new or reviewing existing curriculum. The faculty member uses professional expertise, along with course and/or program assessment results, as available, to improve courses. The faculty member advises students, participates in a variety of departmental advising activities, and uses professional knowledge and contacts where appropriate in writing letters of recommendation.

b. Peer feedback. Tenure-track faculty will receive peer feedback each semester during the first two years of hire, and once per academic year for the remainder of the probationary period. The signature pages of each observation form will need to be included in the required Portfolio materials for the category of Teaching. The full observation forms can be included under the Portfolio's Additional Materials category.
c. Third-Year Review. The following benchmarks are used for illustrative purposes only and aim to aid faculty in building their narrative and portfolio.
    i. The faculty member shows progress toward a variety of course preparations, including work in General Studies and program courses as appropriate for the candidate's particular discipline.
    ii. The faculty member has adapted courses to meet student needs and improve learning for students, has participated in assessment activities, has learned the advising process, and shows progress toward advising students effectively. The faculty member shows work toward moving student evaluations (SRIs) nearer or above 4 on the current 6-point scale. Student comments, where available, are a valued part of the portfolio and can be considered. (See Section II.A.3. of the current document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback). Advising activities include participation in advising events, recording advising, becoming informed and keeping current in advising issues.
    iii. Formative, developmental evaluations of faculty teaching, performed by peers of by the department chair, are optional benchmarking supplements that the faculty member may choose to incorporate into the portfolio.
d. Tenure Year. The faculty member has a record of a variety of course preparations, as appropriate to the member's particular discipline, including revisions of specific courses to meet student, departmental and University needs. The faculty member has a record of effective participation in course and program review, departmental assessment activities, and advising. The faculty member shows examination of teaching practices with evidence of improved teaching, including quantitative and qualitative student evaluations (see Section II.A.3. of the current document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback). Formative, developmental observations of faculty teaching, performed by peers or by the department chair, must be included in the application for tenure and promotion: the signature pages of each observation form must be included in the required Portfolio materials for the category of Teaching; the full observation forms can be included under the Portfolio's Additional Materials category.

2. Scholarly Activities

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate professor in the area of scholarly activities, the tenure candidate must demonstrate an ongoing scholarship agenda that has resulted in following specific deliverables:

a. Major Contributions. One major contribution, in any combination
   i. A peer-reviewed or peer-refereed publication (published or admitted for publication).
   ii. A funded external grant.
   iii. A significant contribution to a public humanities project or an interdisciplinary project.
b. Conferences/Journals/Pedagogical Materials/Short Form Publications. Two contributions, in any combination. Each item listed below counts as one contribution.
   i. A comprehensive review of an article submitted for publication, as member of an editorial board or outside reviewer.
   ii. Three short or one comprehensive book reviews.
   iii. Editor of a collection of essays.
   iv. Author of a comprehensive non-refereed OER.
   v. Two peer-refereed presentations:
      - Two non-refereed presentations can substitute for one peer-refereed presentation.
      - Serving as panel organizer and/or chair at a conference/colloquium/symposium counts as one peer-refereed presentation.

3. Service

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor in the area of service, the tenure candidate must demonstrate ongoing and meaningful contributions to shared governance at the University or contributions within his/her disciplinary organization or contributions that use his/her disciplinary expertise to the community outside of the University.

a. Quantitative Benchmark. Across the probationary period, the faculty member must engage in 9 service units (1 year of service on an ongoing committee counts as one unit of service), of which at least one must be an intense commitment activity, as outlined in Section II. C., and defined and described in the narrative.
b. Qualitative Benchmark. Across the probationary period, the faculty candidate shows leadership, such as making meaningful contributions to a committee or task force, participating in a major committee initiative, contributing to the writing of a major report, or serving as committee liaison to other members of the department or university bodies outside of the department.

C. Promotion to Professor

1. Teaching

a. Courses. The faculty member has a strong record of a variety of course preparations, as appropriate to the member's particular discipline and departmental needs, including the revision of particular courses to meet student, departmental and University needs. The faculty member has a record of highly effective participation in course and curriculum development and revision, whether as part of committee, task force, or updating of a particular course, and/or program review, departmental assessment activities, and

advising.

b. Student Feedback. The faculty member shows examination of teaching practices with clear evidence of strong teaching, including student evaluations that demonstrate a score of 4 out of 6 possible points in the majority of courses taught. The narrative or annotations include reflections on student comments if such are available. (See Section II.1.c. of the current document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback).
c. Peer Feedback. Faculty applying for promotion will receive peer feedback no less than three times between the last major review and the application for promotion. The signature pages of each observation form must be included in the required Portfolio materials for the category of Teaching. The full observation forms can be included under the Portfolio's Additional Materials category.

2. Scholarly Activities

The faculty member has a solid record of research, scholarship, and creative work by offering new insight, knowledge, applications or pedagogical approaches. RSCW activities can take many forms, including peer-reviewed/refereed research, public-oriented projects, interdisciplinary projects, funded grants, as well as contributions to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). *To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for promotion to Professor in the area of Scholarship*, the candidate must demonstrate an ongoing scholarship agenda that has resulted in the following specific deliverables:

a. Major Contributions. One major contribution, in any combination
   i. A peer-reviewed or peer-refereed publication (published or admitted for publication).
   ii. A funded external grant.
   iii. A significant contribution to a public humanities project or an interdisciplinary project.
b. Conferences/Journals/Pedagogical Materials/Short Form Publications. Two contributions, in any combination. Each item listed below counts as one contribution.
   i. A comprehensive review of an article submitted for publication, as member of an editorial board or outside reviewer.
   ii. Three short book reviews or one comprehensive book review.
   iii. Editor of a collection of essays.
   iv. Author of a comprehensive non-refereed OER.
   v. Two peer-refereed presentations:
      - Two non-refereed presentations can substitute for one peer-refereed presentation.
      - Serving as panel organizer and/or chair at a conference/colloquium/symposium counts as one peer-refereed presentation.

3. Service

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for promotion to Professor in the area of service, the faculty member continues to engage in meaningful service endeavors.

a. Quantitative Benchmark. Across the evaluation period, the faculty member must engage in 10 service units, of which at least one must be an intense commitment activity, as outlined in Section II. C., and defined and described in the narrative.
b. Qualitative Benchmark. Across the evaluation period, the faculty member continues to show leadership in his or her service activities (such as chairing a committee, writing a major report for a committee, task force, or other shared governance or community or professional group) and meaningfully integrates service activities with the other areas of professional commitment and performance.

D. Post-Tenure Review

1. Teaching

a. Courses**.** The faculty member teaches a range of courses appropriate to the member's particular discipline and keeps those courses up to date. The faculty member has a record of participation in course review and assessment for the Department. The faculty member advises students.
b. Student Feedback. In the majority of courses taught, the faculty member has student evaluations that demonstrate a score of 4 out of 6 possible points, and the narrative or annotations include reflections on student comments if such are available. (See Section II.1.c. of the current document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback).
c. Peer Feedback. The faculty member will receive peer feedback no less than two times between the last major review and the post-tenure review. The signature pages of each observation form will need to be included in the required Portfolio materials for the category of Teaching. The full observation forms can be included under the Portfolio's Additional Materials category.

2. Scholarly Activities

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for Post-Tenure Review in the area of Scholarship, the faculty member must demonstrate continuing engagement in scholarly activities, including presentations and/or publications. The faculty member demonstrates progress towards at least one disciplinary, pedagogical, or creative work, or a substantial contribution to an interdisciplinary or a publicly engaged humanities project. The faculty member actively participates in professional forums and/or collaborations. Evidence must be presented for two deliverables, in any combination, including two of the same kind as listed below:

a. A peer-reviewed or peer-refereed publication (published, accepted, or submitted for publication).
b. An external grant.
c. A contribution to a publicly engaged humanities project or other interdisciplinary projects.
d. Conferences/Journals/Pedagogical Materials/Short Form Publications
    vi. A comprehensive review of an article submitted for publication, as member of an editorial board or outside reviewer.
    vii. Three short or one comprehensive book reviews.
    viii. Editor of a collection of essays.

ix. Author of an OER.
x. Two peer-refereed presentations:
    - Two non-refereed presentations can substitute for one peer-refereed presentation.
    - Serving as panel organizer and/or chair at a conference / colloquium / symposium counts as one peer-refereed presentation.

3. Service

To achieve a rating of Meets Standards for post-tenure review in the area of service, the faculty member continues to engage in meaningful service endeavors.

a. Quantitative Benchmark. Across the evaluation period, the faculty member must engage in at least 8 service units, as outlined in Section II.
b. Qualitative Benchmark. Across the evaluation period, the faculty member continues to participate in at least one major committee at the Department, College or University level, or provides consequential service to the community by using disciplinary expertise. The faculty member meaningfully integrates service activities with the other areas of professional commitment and performance.

IV. Non-Tenure Track Faculty

In accordance with evolving institutional guidelines, the performance of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (formerly classified as Category II faculty) shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching (80%), and scholarly activities and service (20% divided between the two), according to the department standards outlined below. Where examples are cited for the fulfillment of the evaluation standards, they are illustrative examples. Non-Tenure Track faculty members may cite other comparable activities to support a claim for a particular area or level of evaluation. Furthermore, departmental review of each portfolio will be performed with the understanding that the composition of the portfolio may reflect parameters established by prior departmental guidelines and that portfolios submitted for consideration during a transitional period should be evaluated with that in mind.

A. Professional Responsibilities

Non-Tenure Track Faculty shall perform responsibilities specified in the Handbook for Professional Personnel, set forth by the Board of Trustees (in accordance with the academic calendar) and adhere to accepted standards of professional conduct. Non-Tenure Track Faculty are subject to the norms and expectations of academic freedom befitting an institution of higher education. Furthermore, they serve as contingent faculty appointed for defined terms. Non-Tenure Track Faculty are hired most often to teach full-time under contracts of a duration from between one and three years and are eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Dean and Department Chair, respectively. Decisions to reappoint are based upon the needs of the department or program, and also take into consideration the candidate's qualifications and performance. Performance evaluation, therefore, is done in part to support reappointment decisions and in part to foster improvement among Category II faculty members.

1. Teaching

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Shall:

a. Conduct assigned classes, providing the chair with timely notice (in writing) in the event they cannot conduct a class (or classes); and shall arrange, when possible, for instruction to be provided when they cannot be present—either by a substitute or by a class assignment.
b. Present to all students attending class a course description, class schedule, grading criteria, and special notices required by law or institutional policy (ADA statement, for example).
c. Adopt such procedures as necessary to assure that adequate and accurate records of student performance, and attendance if mandated by the syllabus, are maintained.
d. Establish, post, and keep a minimum of four (4) hours each week during each academic term of the regular academic year. Non-Tenure Track Faculty members shall prepare for classes, evaluate students' performance, confer with and advise students, and participate in other appropriate professional activities that support the above.

2. Scholarly Activities

There is no expectation of scholarly activities other than that related to maintaining currency in discipline.

3. Service

There is no expectation of service activities except as determined by administrative necessity.

B. Portfolio Submission

Any Non-Tenure Track Faculty member who wishes to be reappointed will undergo a review by submitting a Portfolio to the Department Chair. Portfolios will include the following:

1. Cover Sheet

a. Published by the Office of the Provost; and
b. Used to record recommendations for/against reappointment, promotion, or multi-year contracts.

2. Narrative

a. Is a one-page statement describing how the faculty member has met expectations for assigned duties/responsibilities;
b. Presents a reflective self-assessment, highlights accomplishments, and indicates plans for the future;
c. Should present one's best case to disciplinary colleagues and administrative levels of review; and
d. If seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer or a Multi-Year Contract, should be noted in the first paragraph of the statement.

3. Annotated Curriculum Vitae

For a minimum of the past six years. The CV must also include full educational information including the dates and institutions of all degrees. See Chapter V for definition of Annotated Curriculum Vitae.

4. Student Ratings of Instruction, evaluated in context, as described below.

5. Peer Observations of Instruction as delineated below.

6. Submission

Portfolios will be submitted using the same tool or format as Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty and in accordance with the Academic Calendar.

C. Reappointment

Areas of growth and achievement include: Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service.

1. Teaching

Evaluation criteria follow the general guidelines on teaching, as outlined in Section II. A. Areas considered are: 1) content expertise; 2) content design; 3) pedagogical methods that integrate best practices and perspectives in foreign language teaching and learning; and 4) the use of assessment to improve courses. Evidence used for the evaluation of teaching relies on the faculty narrative but also consists of the following:

a. Course Design. For reappointment, **one example of each** in the faculty member's portfolio is required: course syllabus, course assignment, assessment, evidence of how the course content is current.
b. Student Ratings of Instruction. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) for courses taught by Non-Tenure Track Faculty will be administered and reviewed consistent with the practice for tenure-line faculty. The faculty member shows work toward moving student evaluations (SRIs) nearer or above 4 on the current 6-point scale in the majority of courses taught. Student comments, where available, are a valued part of the portfolio and can be considered. When interpreting SRI scores, special consideration will be given to cases where faculty teach more than one-third of their assigned credit hours in an online format. (See Section II.1.c. of the current document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback).
c. Peer Feedback on Teaching. Non-Tenure Track Faculty will receive peer feedback on teaching at a minimum once per academic year. For reappointment, NTT Faculty will include the signature pages of each observation form in the required Portfolio materials for the category of Teaching. The full observation forms can be included under the portfolio's Additional Materials category.

2. Scholarly Activities

Evaluation criteria follow the general guidelines on scholarly activities, as outlined in Section II. B. Chair-approved adjustments in the proportion of scholarly activities work must be reflected in the narrative.

3. Service

Evaluation criteria follow the general guidelines on service, as outlined in Section II. C. Chair-approved adjustments in the proportion of service activities work must be reflected in the narrative.

D. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

1. Eligibility

Lecturers with a total of six years of exemplary service to MSU Denver at that rank, may be reappointed as a Senior Lecturer, based on a recommendation from department faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the provost. To be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, the candidate must have taught consecutively at least 3 of the required 6 years, and at least one of these consecutive years must have been within 18 months of the forthcoming Senior Lecturer appointment. In addition, to be promoted to Senior Lecturer, the faculty member needs to have:

a. taught a variety of courses (a minimum of 3 different classes, and at least one beyond the 1000-level);
b. Shown evidence of pedagogical innovations such as, but not limited to online and hybrid class formats, applied learning modalities, as well as special projects, assignments, assessments, etc.
c. Shown evidence of active involvement in either curriculum development or student advising, or other meaningful service to the department.

2. Criteria

The areas of evaluation and the associated supporting documentation are the same as those for reappointment, with the addition of: two (2) additional peer observations of teaching are required: one by the department chair and one by a tenure/tenure track faculty.

E. Multi-Year Contract

A faculty member must serve a minimum probationary period of three successive one-academic-year contracts before being eligible for a multi-year contract. At the discretion of the Department, Non-Tenure Track Faculty may be given credit toward eligibility for a multi-year contract if they have previously taught as an Adjunct faculty member. In such cases, the equivalent of one year credit as a Non-Tenure Track Faculty member may be granted for every two years as an affiliate faculty member teaching a maximum allowable load of credit hours per academic year. Credit for teaching loads of less than the allowable maximum for affiliate faculty will be prorated accordingly. Non-Tenure Track Faculty are

eligible to receive up to a maximum of two years of credit toward eligibility through Adjunct teaching.

V. Adjunct Faculty

A. Professional Responsibilities

The faculty member must meet the contractual responsibilities defined in the Handbook for Professional Personnel, set forth by the Board of Trustees. Additionally, it is the faculty member's responsibility to be aware of, and comply with, any revisions to that document. Additionally, it is the faculty member's responsibility to be aware of, and comply with, any revisions to that document. The faculty member must also adhere to all Departmental guidelines for Affiliate Faculty, as a prerequisite to a satisfactory performance rating. Adjunct Faculty are subject to the norms and expectations of academic freedom befitting an institution of higher education. Furthermore, they serve as contingent faculty appointed for defined terms. Adjunct faculty and are eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Dean and Department Chair, respectively. Decisions to reappoint are based upon the needs of the department or program and also take into consideration the candidate's qualifications and performance. Performance evaluation, therefore, is done in part to rehire Adjunct Faculty members.

B. Reappointment

The general guidelines on teaching, as outlined in Section II. A. are applicable to the evaluation of Adjunct Faculty.

a. Specific Considerations:

i. Courses follow the official course syllabus (i.e., Regular Course Syllabus) and the Affiliate Faculty member adheres to university policies regarding ADA accommodations.

ii. Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new material on an annual basis.

iii. Courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning.

iv. Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in the syllabi, and the faculty member uses the stated student learning outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment.

v. An Adjunct Faculty member relies on professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses. For any General Studies courses taught, the faculty member designs their course activities in accordance with the official course syllabus that meets Departmental and University expectations. Assessment of General Studies courses complies with Departmental and University requirements.

b. Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) for courses taught by Adjunct Faculty will be administered consistent with the practice for faculty as outlined in the Handbook for Professional Personnel Chapter V. The faculty member shows work toward moving student evaluations (SRIs) nearer or above 4 the current 6-point scale in the majority of courses taught. Student comments, where available, are a valued part of the portfolio and can be considered. When interpreting SRI scores, special consideration will be given to cases where faculty teach more than one-third of their assigned credit hours in an online format. (See Section II.1.c. of the current

document for general department guidelines on how to interpret SRI scores and written feedback).

c. Peer Feedback on Teaching: A Formative Peer Observation must occur within the first semester the Affiliate is appointed and at least once per year thereafter. The Formative Peer Observation is conducted by the Language Coordinator or another faculty member and pertains to various aspects related to pedagogical knowledge, presentation, and classroom teaching skills.

d. Additional documentation: No additional documents are required for evaluation unless requested by the Department Chair.

VI. Emeritus Status

The Department of World Languages adheres to the emeritus status requirements listed in the *Handbook for Professional Personnel*. To be considered for emeritus status, a candidate must meet the following conditions:

A. The candidate has completed ten years or more of full-time service at the University;
B. Faculty who participate in the transitional retirement program or who continue to teach full-time at the University after retirement are considered to be members of the faculty and therefore are not yet eligible for emeritus status;
C. The candidate must be nominated by the department chair or any faculty member in the Department of World Languages;
D. The nomination should be substantiated in terms of length of service, excellence in teaching, and other contributions to the University;
E. The nomination must be endorsed by a majority of the tenured members of the Department of World Languages.

The benefits for an Emeritus Faculty member are outlined in the *Handbook for Professional Personnel*.