MONTANA
STATE UNIVERSITY

Role, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

Department of Modern Languages and Literatures

College of Letters and Science

Effective Date: July 1, 2025

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
Peter Tillack Department Faculty	*Peter Tillack* 81109A17ECD04DD... Chair, Primary Review Committee	5/4/2025 | 1:06 PM MDT
Galen Brokaw Primary Administrative Reviewer	*Galen Brokaw* 58F5453903384C8... Department Head/Director	5/5/2025 | 9:23 AM MDT
Christine Stoddard Intermediate Review Committee	*[signature]* 609419183A09402... Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	5/5/2025 | 11:08 AM MDT
William Thomas Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	*William G. Thomas III* 4132F0AE3FAF489... College Dean	5/5/2025 | 3:20 PM MDT
Durward Sobek University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	*Durward K. Sobek II* 012C669F1D9F4AD... Chair, University RTP Committee	5/6/2025 | 10:10 AM MDT
Robert Mokwa Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost	*Robert Mokwa* 212A28411AC04BD...	5/6/2025 | 12:17 PM MDT

Role and Scope Document for
The Department of Modern Languages & Literatures

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

The Department of Modern Languages & Literatures (MLL) supports the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission. The faculty in the Department is organized into language sections: Chinese, French, German, Japanese, and Spanish. The department offers language instruction in these languages as well as Arabic. The Department offers a major in Modern Languages & Literatures with both teaching and non-teaching options and minors in French, German, and Hispanic Studies/Spanish. MLL also collaborates with other departments to offer options/majors and minors in Asian Studies and Latin American & Latino Studies, and minors in China Studies and Japan Studies.

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures serves all students through its contribution to a liberal arts education for majors in all areas of study. The Department offers courses that fulfill Diversity, Inquiry in the Humanities, and Research Core requirements. Language courses in the Department also fulfill language requirements in programs in History & Philosophy, Liberal Studies, Art History, American Studies, Geography, Computer Science, and the Honors College. Our language courses also fulfil elective requirements in programs such as Business, Political Science, and Environmental Horticulture.

The Department has a strong research commitment that has received regional, national, and international recognition. Faculty members publish research in all program areas, and research standards are consistent with those found at other research universities.

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures is also engaged in service to the College, the University, the profession, and local and international communities. Faculty members serve on College and University committees, and boards or committees of state, regional, and national organizations. Faculty also engage in international service learning and community outreach in places like France, Morocco, and Latin America.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

MLL does not appoint research faculty.

Article III. Annual Review Process

The annual review process and the procedures for changing assigned percentages of effort are described in the University Faculty Handbook. All tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty are reviewed annually using the Annual Review Form. The annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year. However, given the nature of research and publication timelines, the assessment of research for TT faculty in MLL will also take into account performance over the previous five years.

1. Faculty members must update all information related to teaching, research, and service in the online platform specified by the Provost (e.g., Faculty Success by Watermark) by the end of the calendar year.
2. Documentation of all publications and publication status must be uploaded to Faculty Success: for materials in print, a copy of an article or the front matter of a book; for materials that have been accepted, a copy of the contract; other supporting documentation as needed.

3. Using the Annual Review Form, the Department Head (DH) reviews each TT faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service based on the information submitted to the Faculty Success database, student evaluations, and any other relevant data available. Section Coordinators review the NTTs that they supervise following the same procedures set forth in this section.

4. After an initial assessment, the Department Head meets with the faculty member to discuss the review year and the particular elements of the faculty member's performance that might need further clarification.

5. The Department Head and the faculty member will develop goals and assignments for the next calendar year. The goals and assignments for individual members of the faculty will reflect departmental needs, professional opportunities, and research standards consistent with strategic plans and articulated departmental policies and priorities.

6. The annual review may also address TT faculty members' distribution of effort in accordance with MLL's workload policy.

7. If the faculty member is in agreement with the assessment, this concludes the annual review. If the faculty member disagrees with parts of the document, they may discuss their concerns with the Department Head. Based on this discussion, the Department Head can either alter or stand by the original assessment. In either case, the faculty member may appeal to the Department Executive Committee within five (5) days of receipt of the annual review. If the Executive Committee finds evidence to support the faculty member's position, the Executive Committee will attempt to come to an agreement with the Department Head. If the difference is resolved, the annual review will reflect only the agreement between the Department Head and the Executive Committee. If a resolution cannot be reached, the review document and statements by the faculty member, the Executive Committee, and the Department Head will be forwarded to the Dean of the College within ten (10) days of receipt of the faculty member's appeal.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01   Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

a. The Department Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (DRTP) consists of three tenured faculty members, two of which will normally be full professors. Assistant professors are not eligible to serve on RTP committees.

b. The Department Head appoints the members of the committee and designates one of them as Chair.

c. The Department Head will not appoint members of the RTP who have known conflicts of interest with the faculty member to be reviewed. Candidates and RTP members will address conflicts of interest that were unknown to the Department Head before the constitution of the RTP committee or that arise thereafter according to the Conflict of Interest Policy in the Faculty Handbook.

Section 4.02   Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator in MLL is the Department Head. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the CLS Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03   Identification of responsible entities

a. The Department Head will appoint members of the Primary Review Committee.

  b. The Chair of the Primary Review Committee and/or the Department Head will select external reviewers, solicit review letters, and ensure that they are placed in the candidate's dossier.

  c. The Department Head will ensure that the following items are placed in the dossier:

    (1) Applicable Role and Scope Document

    (2) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU

    (3) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. A summary of the raw statistical data for these courses will be included in the dossier: number of credits, enrollment, overall evaluation score, and departmental mean for that semester.

    (4) All copies of review committee evaluation letters and internal and external review letters.

  d. The Department Head will maintain copies of all review materials after the review.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 CLS Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee Composition and Appointment

The Intermediate Review Committee is the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, with composition and appointment as described in the CLS Role and Scope.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials

Review materials shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook, "Annual Review: Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," sections 1 and 7.

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

Section 6.01.1 Materials for External Evaluators

For promotion and tenure reviews, the candidate must submit the following materials for the external evaluators:

  a. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate. Different types of products and activities must be separated in the CV based on the type of product or activity and whether or not it was peer-reviewed in the case of publications or invited in the case of presentations. All publications listed in the CV must be either published, accepted, or submitted

for publication. Items accepted for publication must be accompanied by documentation of that acceptance. For any collaborative work, the candidate will indicate the percentage of effort and/or other data such as number of words or pages that indicate their contribution. Sample research categories include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

    (1) Peer-reviewed books
    (2) Peer-reviewed edited volumes
    (3) Peer-reviewed journal articles
    (4) Peer-reviewed articles in edited volumes
    (5) Non-peer-reviewed books
    (6) Non-peer-reviewed articles
    (7) Translations
    (8) Creative works: novels, poems, films
    (9) Documentaries
    (10) Book reviews
    (11) Keynote and invited lectures
    (12) Conference presentations

b. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship; or the candidate's research statement (§6.01.2.e).
c. Completed articles, books, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period listed in the CV that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their scholarship.

Section 6.01.2   Materials for Dossier

The candidate must submit the following materials for the dossier:
a. The completed "Cover Sheet," obtained from the Provost's office.
b. A comprehensive CV with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate. See §6.01.1.a.
c. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
d. Teaching Statement. The candidate will prepare a teaching statement that may include a description of their teaching philosophy, pedagogical approach, teaching agenda, pedagogical innovations, incorporation of new technologies, approaches to learning and assessment, course and curricular design and development, mentoring and supervision of student projects, theses and dissertations, academic and career advising of students, other valuable contributions to the university's instructional enterprise, and a self-assessment that may include an interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative data from the student evaluations. The statement should explain, not merely assert, how the candidate meets the criterion of effectiveness through a narrative referencing the evidence included in the teaching dossier. The statement must include a list of courses taught and any evidence of recognition (e.g., awards) organized by year over the Review Period.
e. Research Statement. A description and self-evaluation of the candidate's scholarly production and larger research program and how they meet the criteria for review. This statement must include a list of the scholarly products and any evidence of recognition (e.g., awards, award nominations) itemized by year over the Review Period.
f. Service Statement. A description and self-evaluation of the candidate's service activities and how they meet the criteria for the review. The description must include a list of service activities and any evidence of recognition (e.g., awards) itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.
g. Integration Statement. A description and self-evaluation of the candidate's integration of at least two areas of responsibility listed in d, e, and f of this section.

h. Syllabi for courses taught and other relevant teaching materials (assignments, exams, sample student work, etc.)

i. Electronic copies in .pdf format of all scholarship/research that was published or accepted for publication during the review period. For work that has been accepted for publication, the faculty member must also submit a copy of the contract. For edited volumes, a copy of the front matter and any portion of the volume (e.g., the introduction) authored or co-authored by the candidate will be sufficient.

Section 6.02   Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

In the case of collaborative work, the entry for the publication or grant in the CV will include the percentage of effort and/or other data such as number of words or pages to indicate the candidate's contribution. Work for which the candidate contributed at least 50% of the effort will be counted the same as single-authored products.

Section 6.03   Peer Review and Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

All tenure and/or promotion reviews require external letters that assess the candidate's scholarship. Retention Reviews do not require external letters.

Section 6.03.1 External Reviews

a. For promotion and tenure reviews, four external review letters are required, but the Chair of the Department RPT Committee will make every attempt to acquire at least five (5) reviews from respected scholars who specialize in the Candidate's area of scholarship. Per the Faculty Handbook, the evaluators "may not have a personal, business, or professional relationship [with the candidate] that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment."

b. The candidate may submit names of potential external reviewers, but at least half of the external reviewers must be persons other than those recommended by the candidate.

c. The reviewers will be provided with a copy of the candidate's materials as required by §6.01, a copy of the relevant criteria for scholarship from the Role & Scope document, and a letter describing the type of review and the expectations of the University, the College, and the Department for the review being solicited. The solicitation letter must ask the reviewers to identify any knowledge of, or relationship to, the candidate. The letter does not ask the external reviewers to recommend for or against promotion but rather to assess the candidate's record of scholarship during the review period using the indicators and standards established in the Department's Role & Scope document.

d. The Chair of the Department RPT will include in the dossier a report containing a description of the procedure used to select the external evaluators, the review letters, and a bio-sketch or CV for each reviewer.

Section 6.03.2 Internal Reviews

a. Internal letters of teaching observation will form part of the teaching folder in the dossier. The Department Head will select peer observers and ensure that the candidate has at least four peer observations of teaching from the review period.

b. Other internal review letters are optional and solicited at the discretion of the Department RTP Committee when the materials in the dossier indicate the need for additional information about a particular issue or some aspect of the candidate's performance.

Section 6.03.3   Confidentiality of Review Letters

The Department will maintain the anonymity of the external and internal reviewers to the extent allowed by law. Review Committees and Review Administrators should include in their evaluations the elements from the external letters upon which their assessments are based while maintaining reviewer anonymity.

Section 6.04   Materials Submitted by the Department

The Department Head will provide all other required and optional materials per §4.03.c.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01   Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the MLL Role and Scope Document in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the chair of the Department RTP Committee.

Section 7.02   Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the MLL Role and Scope Document in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select any more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the Department Head and the chair of the Department RTP Committee.

Section 7.03   Promotion to Professor Review

A candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Document in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion. Candidates may select any more recent, approved Role & Scope document by notifying the Department Head and the chair of the Department RPT Committee.

Article VIII. Performance Indicators

Section 8.01   Performance Indicators for Teaching
Performance Indicators for teaching include but are not necessarily limited to:
   a. The use of appropriate methods and the delivery of quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission.
   b. Professional conduct in the delivery of instruction and advising.
   c. Development and/or implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials.

Section 8.02   Scholarship Indicators

Section 8.02.1   Primary scholarship performance indicators (Group 1)

    a. Peer-reviewed single and co-authored scholarly articles in academic journals or in edited volumes published by a university or other reputable academic press.
    b. Peer-reviewed single- and co-authored monographic books published by a university or other reputable academic press.
    c. Edited or co-edited volumes of essays published by a university or other reputable academic press.
    d. Other forms of scholarship such as non-peer-reviewed articles and books, textbooks, translations, documentary films, collections of interviews, websites, podcasts, or other digital humanities projects may be considered primary indicators based on the nature of the projects and how they fit into the faculty member's research program. For example, documentary films, translations, collections of interviews may be considered primary indicators, but candidates must supply documentation of these products that will allow a comparison with the products listed in a, b, or c of this section.

Section 8.02.2   Secondary scholarship performance indicators (Group 2)

Secondary scholarship indicators include but are not necessarily limited to:
    a. Invited talks and keynote lectures
    b. Conference papers
    c. Review essays
    d. Non-peer-reviewed articles
    e. Non-peer-reviewed books and edited volumes
    f. Journalistic articles
    g. Short translations
    h. Book reviews

Section 8.03   Performance Indicators for Service

Service indicators include but are not necessarily limited to:
    a. Departmental committees
    b. Coordination of a Language Section in the Department
    c. Directorship of an Academic Program
    d. College and University committee work
    e. Directorship of study abroad programs
    f. Organization of university or community events
    g. Leadership roles in professional organizations
    h. Participation on boards and/or committees of professional organizations
    i. Participation on boards/committees of academic journals
    j. Service in leadership roles of professional organizations
    k. Service as external evaluator for grants, fellowships, promotion & tenure, etc.
    l. Work on local, state, national, or international community outreach initiatives

Section 8.04   Integration Indicators

The indicator for integration will consist of a statement by the candidate describing the way in which the candidate has integrated at least two areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and/or service).

Section 8.05   Evidence of Performance Indicators

Section 8.05.1 Evidence of Performance Indicators in Teaching

Evidence of performance indicators in teaching include but are not limited to:
a. The candidate's Teaching Statement
b. Syllabi and other course materials
c. Peer observation reports
d. Teaching, advising, and mentorship awards
e. Student evaluations

Section 8.05.2 Evidence of Performance Indicators in Scholarship

The evidence of performance indicators in scholarship are the same as the indicators themselves. See §8.02.

Section 8.05.3 Evidence of Performance Indicators in Service

The candidate's CV and Service Statement will serve as evidence of performance indicators in service. Candidates may also submit any other documentation related to their service activities.

Section 8.05.4 Evidence of Performance Indicators in Integration

The candidate's Integration Statement will serve as evidence of performance in integration.

Section 8.05.5   Status of Scholarly Products

The candidate must provide documentation for the status of all scholarly products (submitted, accepted, published).

Article IX. Retention Review

Section 9.01   Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02   University Standards

a. Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period.
b. Integration of at least two of the following: teaching, scholarship, and service.
c. Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 9.03   Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Section 9.03.1 Effectiveness in teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the delivery of courses,

curricular design, mentoring of student projects, and academic and career advising.

    a. Qualitative Assessment. Qualitative effectiveness is judged primarily by means of multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom during the review period and the evaluation by the MLL RPTC of the candidate's dossier.

    b. Quantitative Assessment.

        (1) Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student satisfaction. As such, they are vulnerable to various forms of bias that often result in the use of criteria other than quality of instruction. Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness. In particular, the written comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement, or as signs of possible problems that may need to be investigated; but they are not to be considered a form of evaluation in and of themselves.

        (2) Keeping the above caveat in mind, the general minimum expectation is that for each course the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is normally not less than the indicator for "Average." For example, 3.0 is the "average" evaluation score for "Overall Effectiveness" on an instrument with 5 categories (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent). However, generally in MLL scores below 4 on the 5-point scale often indicate issues that need to be addressed.

        (3) The candidate must address in the Teaching Statement any overall mean score below 4.

Section 9.03.2 Effectiveness in scholarship

    a. Effectiveness in scholarship requires that the faculty member demonstrate adequate progress toward the research requirements for tenure and promotion. Adequate progress may be demonstrated by meeting one of three criteria during the review period:

        (1) The completion of at least one-half of a substantive, single- or co-authored monographic book manuscript; or

        (2) One peer-reviewed article published or accepted for publication and the completion of at least one third of a single- or co-authored monographic book manuscript; or

        (3) One peer-reviewed article published or accepted for publication and two articles submitted for publication; or

        (4) A combination of other forms of completed and/or published scholarship per §8.03.2.1.d that are equivalent or analogous to (1), (2), or (3) of this section.

    b. These standards correlate to the criteria for accomplishment in scholarship under §10.04.2.a, but the evaluation of effectiveness in scholarship for retention is independent from the evaluation of accomplishment in scholarship for tenure. If a candidate meets the requirements for retention on the basis of standard §9.04.2.a(1), for example, this does not imply an obligation to meet standard 10.04.2.a(1) for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

    c. Extraordinary delays in the review, acceptance, and/or publication of research products that were submitted by the candidate in a timely manner may justify a modification of the quantitative standard.

Section 9.03.3 Effectiveness in service

For retention review, the faculty member must participate adequately and constructively in departmental governance and other departmental projects and initiatives (e.g., assessment), and s/he must participate in

some form of service/engagement at the college and/or university level. For Assistant Professors in single-member sections with major programs, coordinating the section within the department along with its associated responsibilities (program building, curriculum development, assessment, supervision of NTTs, etc.) will constitute the primary service expectation for retention.

Section 9.03.4   Integration

For retention review, integration will be deemed effective if the candidate integrates or formulates a clear plan for how to integrate at least two areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and/or service).

Article X. Tenure Review

Section 10.01   Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy. Faculty members who wish to initiate a review for early tenure must notify the primary review administrator(s) by the date established by the provost. For mandatory reviews (i.e., retention and tenure), the provost will notify candidates, heads, and deans of the faculty scheduled for mandatory reviews each year.

Section 10.02   University Standards for Tenure

The University standards for the award of tenure are sustained effectiveness in teaching and service; sustained integration of at least two areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and/or service); and accomplishment in scholarship as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

Section 10.03   Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Section 10.03.1   Sustained effectiveness in Teaching

Sustained effectiveness in teaching is consistent successful performance over time and across course offerings and different student populations as appropriate to the faculty member's appointment.

Section 10.03.2   Accomplishment in Scholarship

a. Accomplishment in scholarship will normally require the faculty member to meet one of the following quantitative standards during the review period:

    (1)   One substantive, peer-reviewed monographic book in print with a university or other reputable academic press for which the faculty member was responsible for at least 50%; engagement in an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program; or

    (2)   One completed, substantive, single or 50% co-authored, peer-reviewed monographic book manuscript that has been contracted for publication with a university or other reputable academic press; two peer-reviewed articles in print with reputable journals or edited volumes published by a university or other reputable academic press; an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program; or

(3) At least four substantive, peer-reviewed articles published or accepted for publication in reputable academic journals or in edited volumes published by a university or other reputable academic press; an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program; or

(4) A combination of other forms of completed and published scholarship per §8.02.1.d equivalent to (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this section.

b. Secondary scholarship indicators, particularly conference presentations, are expected but do not substitute for primary indicators. The consideration of secondary scholarship indicators such as conference participation will also take into account the availability of funding for such activities.

c. These quantitative standards may be adjusted based on qualitative factors. The qualitative assessment will take into account the venues of publication, the length and substantive nature of the publications, their impact as evidenced by citations and published reviews when such data is available, and the assessment of external evaluators. For standard a(3), for example, a faculty member who publishes three lengthy, substantive, high-quality articles in top tier journals may be considered to have met the standard of accomplishment. Conversely, a faculty member who publishes five short and/or less substantive articles in lower tier journals may not meet the standard of accomplishment based on a qualitative assessment.

d. The faculty member's scholarship must demonstrate a sustained level of performance over the review period and evidence of an ongoing research program. A research dossier in which the majority of the publications are produced and accepted immediately prior to the review may not be considered to have achieved accomplishment in research on the basis that it fails to demonstrate sustained performance even if it meets the quantitative standard.

e. Extraordinary delays in the review, acceptance, and/or publication of research products that were submitted by the candidate in a timely manner may also justify a modification of the quantitative standard.

Section 10.03.3   Effectiveness in Service

Sustained effectiveness in service is consistent successful performance over time and across a range of duties appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. The candidate may demonstrate effectiveness in service through adequate and constructive participation in departmental governance and other departmental initiatives (e.g. assessment) and some form of service/engagement in the college, university, and/or community. For Assistant Professors in single-member sections with major programs, coordinating the section within the department along with its associated responsibilities (program building, curriculum development, assessment, supervision of NTTs, etc.) will constitute the primary service expectation.

Section 10.03.4   Integration

Integration will be deemed effective if the candidate integrates at least two areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) as documented in the Integration Statement.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for tenure.

Article XII. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 12.01   Timing of Review

All MLL faculty members must complete at least two years at the rank of Associate Professor at MSU before they are eligible for promotion to Full Professor. Unless otherwise specified in the letter of hire, the review period for promotion to Full Professor is the period of employment at MSU in the rank of Associate Professor (plus the time that the candidate's MSU tenure dossier was under review) through the deadline established by the provost for submission of the dossier for promotion to professor.

Section 12.02   University Standard

The university standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are sustained effectiveness in teaching and service; sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service; and excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

Section 12.03   Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Section 12.03.1   Sustained effectiveness in Teaching

Sustained effectiveness in teaching is consistent successful performance over time and across course offerings and different student populations as appropriate to the faculty member's appointment.

Section 12.03.2   Excellence in Scholarship

a. Excellence in scholarship will normally require the faculty member to meet one of the following quantitative standards during the review period:
   (1) One substantive, peer-reviewed monographic book in print with a university or other reputable academic press for which the faculty member was responsible for at least 50%; engagement in an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program; or
   (2) One completed, substantive, single- or 50% co-authored, peer-reviewed monographic book manuscript that has been contracted for publication with a university or other reputable academic press; two peer-reviewed articles in print with reputable journals or edited volumes published by a university or other reputable academic press; engagement in an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program; or
   (3) At least four peer-reviewed articles in print and two accepted for publication in reputable academic journals or in edited volumes published by a university or other reputable academic press; engagement in an appropriate number of secondary indicators such as conference presentations; and evidence of an ongoing research program.
   (4) A combination of other forms of completed and published scholarship per §8.02.1.d equivalent or analogous to (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this section.
b. Secondary scholarship indicators, particularly conference presentations, are expected but do not substitute for primary indicators.

c. These quantitative standards may be adjusted based on qualitative factors, e.g., venues of publication, the length and substantive nature of the publications, their impact as evidenced by numbers of citations and published reviews when such data is available, and the assessment of external evaluators. For standard a(3), for example, a faculty member who publishes three lengthy, substantive, high quality articles in top tier journals may be considered to have met the standard of accomplishment. Conversely, a faculty member who publishes five short or less substantive articles in lower tier journals may not meet the standard of accomplishment based on a qualitative assessment.

Section 12.03.3   Effectiveness in Service

Sustained effectiveness in service is consistent successful performance over time and across a range of duties appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. The candidate may demonstrate effectiveness in service through adequate and constructive participation in departmental governance and other departmental initiatives (e.g. assessment) and at least two forms of sustained service/engagement in the college, university, and/or community appropriate to the assigned POE. For faculty in single-member sections with major programs, coordinating the section within the department along with its associated responsibilities (program building, curriculum development, assessment, supervision of NTTs, etc.) may substitute for one form of engagement in the college, university, or community.

Section 12.03.4   Integration

Integration will be deemed effective if the candidate integrates at least two areas of responsibility (teaching, research, and/or service) as documented in the Integration Statement.

Article XIII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Review Committee members or administrators that identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to an academic unit's Role and Scope documents may submit the request for changes to the Chair of the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC). The URTPC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the URTPC Chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the URTPC Chair and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

Article XIV. Role & Scope Approval Process

1. Tenure-track faculty in MLL
2. College of Letters & Science Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
3. College of Letters & Science Dean
4. University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
5. Provost

Revised 5/1/25
Effective Date 7/1/25