



COLLEGE OF ARTS & LETTERS

ARTP Workshop Arts & Letters Secondary Committee

October 10, 2025
Shawna Malvini Redden
Interim Associate Dean

Questions? malviniredden@csus.edu

Before we begin...



- This workshop is being recorded.
- Links to this workshop recording, this power point, and the College WPAF Instruction Booklet will be made available and posted on the [A&L ARTP Process Resources](#) page.
- Please post questions on the shared document, so you do not forget. If possible, Sharon will answer them, and or I will address them at the end.



SACRAMENTO
STATE

Thank you for your
service to the College

Agenda

- Purpose
- Workflow
- Role & Responsibilities
- College Peer Review Committee representative process
- Secondary Committee Members & Schedule
- Subcommittees chair election and planning



Purpose

The Secondary Committee provides the College Dean a constructive recommendation that will also help guide their colleagues' ongoing success toward tenure and/or promotion.



Types of Review Cycles

- **P1-P5:** Material from the previous academic year—Fall 2024-Spring 2025
- **P6 (up for tenure):** Material from the previous five academic cycles—A highlight reel
- **Promotion-to-full:** Material from the previous five academic cycles—A comprehensive highlight reel
- **Post-Tenure Review:** Material from the previous five academic cycles—Check your RTP policy for contents



The Review Cycle:

Is considered the Academic Year that the Candidate is going

RETENTION CYCLE

- Probationary/ Tenure-track faculty
- Occurs annually
- P1 – P5 WPAF includes materials for the current review period only
- All ranks are reviewed by the Dept. Primary Committee
- Second Year through Promotion to Associate are reviewed by the Secondary Committee and reviewed by the Dean (Final for P2, P3 & P5) and as appropriate by the Provost (Final for P4 & P6)

TENURE/PROMOTION CYCLE

- Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor
- Occurs in 6th year "toward tenure" (P6 & P5ET)
- WPAF includes materials since time of hire
- Evaluated by Primary, Secondary, Dean, and the final decision by the Provost

PROMOTION CYCLE

- Promotion from Associate to Full Professor
- Offered 5 years after earning tenure
- WPAF includes comprehensive materials since earning tenure
- Evaluated by Primary, Secondary, Dean and the final decision by the Provost

POST-TENURE REVIEW

- Associate and Full Professors (post-tenure)
- Occurs every 5 years after earning tenure whether promoted to Full or not
- WPAF must include comprehensive "Teaching Effectiveness" Materials since last review
- Reviewed by Primary.

For Full Description of Probationary Ranks see the Resources at the end of this presentation



Dates & Deadlines

College of Arts & Letters
2025-2026 Review Cycle Timelines

PERIODIC REVIEW DEADLINES FOR FACULTY IN THEIR FIRST YEAR

WPAF Closure

TBD by Department

Primary/Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates

Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Dean's Review Letter sent to candidates

Wednesday, February 4, 2026

RETENTION REVIEW DEADLINES FOR P-2 CANDIDATES IN THEIR SECOND YEAR

WPAF Closure

TBD by Department

Primary/Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates

Monday, December 1, 2025

Secondary Retention Recommendation Letter sent to candidates

Monday, January 12, 2026

Dean's Retention Decision letter sent to candidates

Friday, February 13, 2026

RETENTION REVIEW DEADLINES FOR P-3 and P-5 CANDIDATES

WPAF Closure	TBD by Department
Primary /Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates	Thursday, February 12, 2026
Secondary Retention Recommendation Letter sent to candidates	Monday, March 16, 2026
Dean's Retention Decision Letter sent to candidates	Thursday, April 23, 2026

RETENTION REVIEW DEADLINES FOR P-4 CANDIDATES

WPAF Closure	TBD by Department
Primary/Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates	Monday, December 1, 2025
Secondary Retention recommendation letter sent to candidates	Monday, January 12, 2026
Dean's retention recommendation letter sent to candidates	Friday, February 20, 2026
Provost Retention Decision Letter sent to candidates	Thursday, April 23, 2026

PERFORMANCE REVIEW DEADLINES FOR TENURE & PROMOTION CANDIDATES

WPAF Closure

TBD by Department

Primary/Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates

Monday, January 5, 2026

Secondary Retention Recommendation Letter to candidates

Thursday, February 5, 2026

Dean's Retention Recommendation Letter to candidates

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

Provost's Retention Decision Letter to candidates

Wednesday, May 27, 2026

PERIODIC REVIEW DEADLINES FOR POST-TENURE FACULTY

WPAF Closure

TBD by Department

Primary/Department Chair Retention Recommendation letter sent to candidates

Friday, April 24, 2026

Workflow

1. Once access to digital WPAF is closed to the faculty member, the review process begins.
2. The Dean's Office opens/closes the WPAF for each committee level.
3. Committee Chairs email the Recommendation letters to the Dean's Office for distribution. The committee chairs should email them to AD Malvini (malviniredden@csus.edu) and cc Sharon Hopkins-Bright (hopkins-bright@csus.edu)
4. Any rebuttal statements will be uploaded to the "Current RTP Evaluations" folder for review by the next level or

 Name ▾

 01. Attestation

 02. Curriculum Vitae

 03. Current ARTP Evaluations

 04. ARTP History

 05. Faculty Development Plan

 06. Index

 07.1. Teaching Effectiveness-Student Evalua...

 07.2. Teaching Effectiveness-Peer Evaluation...

 07.3. Teaching Effectiveness-Syllabi

 07.4. Teaching Effectiveness-Supporting Docs

 08. Scholarship and Creative Activities Sup...

 09. University Service Supporting Documents

 10. Community Service Supporting Docume...

 11. OTHER - RENAME IF NEEDED

 PAF Access Log 2024-25.xlsx

Roles & Responsibilities

- Review the College RTP calendar and candidate lists
- Align the sub-committee deadlines/timelines with the College's
- Review College Secondary Committee policy & charge
- Review, as relevant, the UARTP
- Review, as relevant, Department/School ARTP policies

Roles & Responsibilities

- Each subcommittee member should read/review every WPAF assigned to the subcommittee.*
- While letter writing may be distributed, each subcommittee member must approve each evaluation letter. *
- Sub Committee Chair signs & submits the recommendation in a timely fashion

*If you are from the home department of a candidate that is assigned to your subcommittee, then you recuse yourself from reviewing/voting on that candidate's file.



Roles & Responsibilities

- **Maintain confidentiality**
- **Do not discuss WPAF content with anyone outside of the Committee in official meetings**

Assistance

- Faculty upload documents into respective folders and/or provide live/accessible hyperlinks on the Index to identify/reference to online materials.
- Ask for assistance from the College if:
 - There is a problem with any link
 - Any listed material on the index is missing
 - The College contacts the faculty candidate, allows them 48 hours to provide the item electronically, and then uploads it to the digital WPAF.



What is being Reviewed

- WPAFs include:
 - Tenure Track materials for current evaluation cycle, i.e. AY 2024-2025
 - Application for Tenure materials since time of appointment
 - Promotion to Full materials since tenure (usually the past 5 years)

Context vs Content

- Primary Committee provides the context and reviews the disciplinary merit of WPAF.
 - Creative/Scholarly Activity
 - Analogous disciplinary terminology
Peer-reviewed = Juried = Invited = Curated
 - Community Service (service to disciplinary community):
 - Coaching Kid's Basketball Team vs. Teaching a workshop at a local community center
- Secondary Committee evaluates the content of the WPAF and the assembly/inclusion of required materials.

CV

Resume

Current Evals

CONTEXT

Discipline-specific
recommendation
evaluation

ARTP History

Larger context for
understanding
professional growth
and progress

Faculty**Development Plan**

Cycle Self Evaluation
Successes, Goals
Challenges, etc.

Index

Table of Contents

**Student Evals of
Teaching**

What students are
learning; effective
pedagogy

Peer Evaluations

Program curriculum;
class format (lecture,
studio, senior seminar,
etc.)

Syllabi

Course structure,
assignments, learning
objectives, etc.

**Supporting
Documents**

Examples of best
work; Illustrated Index



Disciplinary Differences

- Departments have their own policies with specific expectations.

Disciplinary Differences

- Faculty Development Plan is a narrative summary/reflective statement and action plan/goals that address each area of evaluation, including a statement of teaching philosophy
 - Recommended length for annual reviews: a maximum of 3 pages
 - Expectation that FDP is longer for tenure and promotion years
- Recognize that Department ARTP policies may have specific requirements for the narrative



Disciplinary Differences

- Supporting documents may fall into more than one category
- Some departments recognize achievement/credit in each area provided that the faculty member clearly states how the document/service/activity shows evidence of achievement in each respective category.

Examples:

- Publishing a book (Scholarship) and giving a book talk at the public library (Community Service).
- Directing a play (Creative Activity) at a community theatre (Community Service).



Disciplinary Differences

- Supporting documents may fall into more than one category
- Some departments recognize achievement/credit in each area provided that the faculty member clearly states how the document/service/activity shows evidence of achievement in each respective category.

Examples:

- Publishing a book (Scholarship) and giving a book talk at the public library (Community Service).
- Directing a play (Creative Activity) at a community theatre (Community Service).



Disciplinary Differences

- Recognize that some Departmental ARTP policies range in specificity
- Faculty may defer, as needed, to the UARTP
- <https://sacramentostate.policystat.com/policy/11444962>

Digital WPAF Access

When access is granted, Subcommittee members receive an email that includes:

- List of relevant faculty WPAFs
- Link to digital WPAFs with "read only" access
- Recommendation letter template

Each time you view a WPAF, it is mandatory that you sign the Access Log.

SACRAMENTO STATE		TRANSFER OF CUSTODY AND ACCESS DISCLOSURE LOG FOR WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE 2022-2023 REVIEW CYCLE		A&L OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	
Candidate:		Department:			
Review:		Current Rank:			
<p>The Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures of California State University, Sacramento Require that custody of faculty <i>Personnel/Action Files</i> be transferred from the regular file custodian to various committees and individuals in the normal process of review for retention, tenure, and promotion. Concurrently, <i>The Information Practices Act of 1977</i> requires that security, both physical and informational, be continued. In addition a record of disclosures of each file must be maintained.</p> <p><i>This document serves as record of Working Personnel Action File access through OneDrive, and must be signed every time a reviewer accesses a candidate's WPAF.</i></p>					
		Signature of WPAF Reviewer		Date	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					

Recommendation Letters should...



- Only address/reference materials in the WPAF
- Be thoughtful, truthful, and encouraging
- Be clear, organized, and precise

Recommendation Letters should...



- Give appropriate time and weight to each area of evaluation
- Consider intent vs. impact
 - Consider how the candidate will receive the recommendation
- Focus on progress, achievement, and improving the future

Recommendation Letters should...



- Ensure that the primary level of review followed Departmental, College, and University procedures
- Identify and address potential areas of bias or concern in the primary level of review

Recommendation Letters should not...



- Consider information outside of the WPAF
- Assume the Dean/Candidate will understand or agree with your perspective
- Focus on issues related to personality
- Belabor the past

Recommendation Letters should not...



- Reflect bias in evaluation language
- Be oppressive or overly negative
- Use inappropriate humor or unfair criticism

University ARTP Peer Review Committee (PRC)

- OFA requests each college's Secondary Committee select a representative to serve on Peer Review Committee per UARTP Policy:
 - *Section 4.03.F. calls for the establishment of a Peer Review Committee to review requests for late submission of materials to Working Personnel Action Files.*
The Peer Review Committee consists of "one member from each secondary committee, chosen by the secondary committee."
- The committee reviews requests for late submissions, re-opening of files post-closure, etc.
- Minimal workload throughout the year—historically all done via email

Floor open to nominations/volunteers...



Secondary Committee

2025-26 CURRENT SECONDARY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RANK	NAME	DEPT
Assoc.	Peter Williams	ART
Full	Rachel Clark	ART
Assoc.	Dan Janos	ComS
Full	David Zuckerman	ComS
Assoc.	Kikuko Omori	ComS
Full	Mario Estioko	DSGN
Full	Nigel Poor	DSGN
Assoc.	Angela Clark-Oates	ENGL
Assoc.	Jonas Cope	ENGL
Full	Reiko Komiyama	ENGL
FERP	Sheree Meyer	ENGL
Assoc.	Chloe Burke	HIST
Full	Joseph Palermo	HIST
Full	Nikolaos Lazaridis	HIST
Assoc.	Serpil Atamaz Topcu	HIST
Full	Joel DuBois	HRS
Full	Anna Presler	MUSC
Full	Chantal Frankenbach	MUSC
FERP	Robin Fisher	MUSC
Full	Russell DiSilvestro	PHIL
Assoc.	Saray Ayala-Lopez	PHIL
Full	Lorelei Bayne	THEA
Full	Brenda Romero	WLL
Full	Kazue Masuyama	WLL

Secondary Committee Assignments

- Secondary Committee is divided into 5 subcommittees
- No more than 2 members from same department per subcommittee
- You may not review files from your department. You must completely recuse yourself from those conversations/recommendations.
- You may only serve on PTF subcommittee if Full Professor.

Sub-Committee Assignments & Deadlines

Subcommittee A		Subcommittee B		Subcommittee C		
Rank & # of Files	P2 & P3* (4 files)	P3 & P5 (10 files)	P4 (6 files)			
Committee review period	12/12/25 – 1/9/2026	2/24/26 - 3/13/26	12/12/25-1/9/26			
Date to submit letters to college	1/9/2026	3/13/2026	1/9/2026			
Faculty Subcommittee Members	Sheree Meyer	ENGL	David Zuckerman	COMS	Angela Clark-Oates	ENGL
	Serpil Atamaz Topcu	HIST	Chantal Frankenbach	MUSC	Joseph Palermo	HIST
	Dan Janos	COMS	Lorelei Bayne	THEA	Joel DuBois	HRS
	Peter Williams	ART	Nikolaos Lazaridis	HIST	Saray Ayala-Lopez	PHIL
			Reiko Komiyama	ENGL	Chloe Burke	HIST
			Mario Estioko	DSGN		
Assignments						
Faculty Candidates Up for Review	Faculty	Dept	Faculty	Dept	Faculty	Dept
	Aierken, Yipaer	ART	Jeong, Rey (Cho Rong)	ART	April Morley, Morgan	COMS
	Pollard, Amari	COMS	Willard, Adero	ART	Myslik, Barbara A	COMS
	Murray, Ryan	MUSC	Wacker, Marcy	DSGN	Ojeda-Beck, Rodrigo	COMS
	Orooji, Fatemeh	DSGN	Ibarra, Clarissa	HIST	Woo, Nathan T	COMS
			Johnson, Greg	MUSC	Gregory, Eliza N	DSGN
			Zullinger, Chad	MUSC	Williams, Darius	THEA
			Ardeni, Viola	WLL		
			Qin, Ying "Amilia"	HIST/HRS		
			Li, Shuying	MUSC		
		Lam, Sheung-Tak	PHIL			

Subcommittee D		Subcommittee E		
Rank & # of Files	P5* & P6 (Tenure) (4 files)	Promotion to Full (7 files)		
Date Committee review begins	1/15/26 - 2/4/26	1/15/26 - 2/4/26		
Date to submit letters to college	2/4/2026	2/4/2026		
Faculty Subcommittee Members	Brenda Romero	WLL	Nigel Poor	DSGN
	Jonas Cope	ENGL	Anna Presler	MUSC
	Kikuko Omori	COMS	Russell DiSilvestro	PHIL
	Robin Fisher	MUSC	Kazue Masuyama	WLL
			Rachel Clarke	ART
Assignments				
Faculty Candidates Up for Review	Faculty	Dept	Faculty	Dept
	Carlino, Philip (PJ)	DSGN	Atamaz Topcu, Serpil T	HIST
	Flores, Carlos	COMS	Clark-Oates, Angela R	ENGLISH
	Mulholland, Rebekkah	HIST	Janos, Daniel J	COMS
	Barrantes, Manuel	PHIL	Lupo Montgomery, Christine M	ENGLISH
			Perkins, Scott	MUSC
			Stark, Harvey	HRS
			Williams, Peter	ART
		Atamaz Topcu, Serpil T	HIST	

Break out – 15 minutes

1. Elect a Subcommittee Chair to:
 - Contact the Dean's office with any questions or concerns
 - Lead Subcommittee meeting(s)
 - Supervise the completion of recommendations
 - Submit recommendation letters to the Dean's Office

Break out – 15 minutes

2. Make a plan

- Who is writing which letters
- Meeting schedule
- Deadlines for review of candidate files
- Modality of meetings

3. Inform the Office of the Dean by emailing Sharon Hopkins-Bright at hopkins-bright@csus.edu

Follow-up

- Each subcommittee will receive an email with instructions, due dates, templates and WPAF access links to each assigned faculty candidate from Sharon at the beginning of the review period.

ARTP POLICIES

- The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for Unit 3 faculty <https://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#article-15>
- The University Appointment, Retention, tenure and Promotion Policy (UARTP) https://www.csus.edu/umannual/hr/uartp%201-2013_final.pdf
- The College of Arts and Letters ARTP Policy <https://www.csus.edu/college/arts-letters/internal/artp-process.html>

