RTP STANDARDS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO

DEPARTMENT OF ART & ART HISTORY

Table of Contents

Introduction to Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Standards

The Department of Art & Art History evaluates faculty performance based on the standards outlined in this document. These standards serve as a guide to candidates and evaluators regarding the inclusion of appropriate evidentiary materials in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). In accordance with the Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP), evaluations and assessments of faculty performance in the RTP process will be *entirely and exclusively* based on documented evidence contained in the candidate's WPAF. The most current FPPP is available on the Faculty Affairs and Success website.

Further Information is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Faculty member shall maintain dossiers concerning their instruction, professional growth and achievement, and service (other contributions to the University).

Department of Art & Art History Mission Statement

The Department of Art & Art History is dedicated to developing students' critical thinking, creativity, visual literacy, technical skills, and knowledge about the history of art. We provide high-quality instruction in Art Education, Art History, Studio Art, and Interior Architecture. In all areas, we endeavor to create an environment which supports professional artistic activities and research in traditional and new media and methodologies.

Our faculty are committed to fostering a sense of community that enables students to be simultaneously nurtured and challenged. The faculty take pride in being easily accessible, eager to explore ideas with students and to help them realize their creative concerns. As teachers, we pride ourselves on maintaining high standards that employ both well-tested and innovative methods. We integrate the investigation of the visual with political, historical, and moral issues. [See Mission Statement – Department of Art & Art History].

Goals of Evaluation

The Department seeks to foster excellence in teaching, professional development, and service work, and to support our colleagues as they pursue these goals. The process is designed to be pedagogic and developmental rather than punitive. We intend to provide information, assistance, and encouragement necessary for candidates to be successful. Honest, clear, and direct critiques are frequently vital, and should be offered in a constructive manner. The Chair and RTP Committee will provide guidance throughout the RTP process, and, if requested, will assign a tenured faculty member to mentor the candidate.

Tenure-Track Evaluation Cycle and Rankings

Tenure-track hires are reviewed in an alternating series of "periodic evaluations" and "performance reviews." As the FPPP (10.1.4-5) explains:

> Probationary faculty are subject to two different types of evaluations. The first, called periodic evaluation, focuses on providing the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by all involved with the process. The second type of evaluation is called the performance review, wherein a critical

assessment of the faculty member's performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal ratings of performance in each area of review are used, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member.

Normally, periodic evaluations are done in the faculty members' first, third, and fifth years; performance reviews are conducted in the faculty members second, fourth, and sixth years. It is in this sixth year that the decision is made to offer tenure or to release the faculty member from employment.

Note that for periodic evaluations, candidate dossiers are due in **February**, whereas for performance reviews, candidate dossiers are due in **September**. This means that most new faculty will have a periodic evaluation dossier due toward the *end* of their first year, and then a performance review dossier due toward the *beginning* of their second year. The Department RTP Committee Chair will send out the exact schedule early in the Fall semester of each year, and it should be available on the [Faculty Affairs and Success site](#).

In each performance review, candidates will be ranked in the three areas of evaluation (explained below). Ratings are "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," and "Does not meet expectations." Note that this applies to all campus probationary and tenured faculty performance evaluations. The [FPPP](#) (10.3.3) defines these three rankings as follows:

Exceeds expectations

The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement in the area being evaluated. Exceeds Expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.

Meets expectations

The candidate has demonstrated competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. An evaluation of "Meets expectations" performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets

Expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).

Does not meet expectations

The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the department's criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction.

Period of Review

For all probationary hires starting from academic year 2020-2021 forward, all levels of review are cumulative. All work from May 31 of the academic year preceding the faculty's appointment should be included. See FPPP 10.1.11 for probationary reviews and 11.1.2 for the period of review for tenured faculty.

For hires who began prior to academic year 2020-2021, consult the RTP Committee Chair to ensure correct dates are used for periodic evaluations and performance reviews.

Areas of Evaluation

There are three primary areas of evaluation considered in the review process for probationary and tenured faculty:

1. Instruction

2. Professional Growth and Achievement

3. Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community

While effective teaching is the primary, essential, and minimum criterion for success at this University, the Department of Art & Art History recognizes that there are various ways for faculty to achieve professional success and contribute to the University. Different types of accomplishments are valued; each candidate is not expected to excel in all areas in order to be retained, tenured, or promoted. To some extent, exceptional performance in one area of review may compensate for lesser contributions in other areas of review, as indicated in the FPPP.

Evaluations of lecturers focus on Instruction. Documentation of Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service *are not required* of lecturer faculty. However, lecturers are welcome to submit documentation of these activities.

For range elevation, lecturer faculty must have achieved professional growth and development since their initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is more recent. Professional growth and development for lecturer range elevation is defined as teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field. To demonstrate teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field, lecturer faculty should provide evidence from the examples of teaching effectiveness listed below. See FPPP 12.1 for more information.

The Department supplies template CVs to facilitate the dossier process:

[Sample CV: Art Education](#)

[Sample CV: Art History](#)

[Sample CV: Art Studio](#)

[Sample CV: Interior Architecture](#)

External Reviews

The [FPPP](#) (10.1.9) allows candidate to request an external review as follows:

A request for an external review of materials submitted by a faculty member may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review (including the faculty member under review.) Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances that necessitate an outside reviewer and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty member. The written external review must be submitted to the file prior to file closure. Additional materials will be added to the file according to [FPPP](#) and [CBA](#) guidelines.

Standards for Evaluating Instruction

Reflective statement on your teaching philosophy

The [FPPP](#) (8.1.3.e.3) requires:

A reflective statement on the candidate's teaching philosophy/ strategies/objectives and how these have impacted the candidate's

teaching, (i.e., how these are evidenced in the candidate's classes, assignments, and other learning experiences provided for students)

Teaching effectiveness is fundamental to the University's mission; it is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion for teaching faculty. Instruction is defined as classroom and related instructional activities, and should incorporate innovative, high quality, student-centered approaches. This may include inclusive pedagogy, and modern technologies, techniques, modalities, and materials. Data beyond the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs) that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance therefore must be provided. The narrative must describe self-reflection and growth as an instructor based on analyzing feedback and improving one's practice. The narrative should also describe instructional commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion by providing examples of how consideration of diverse student needs has improved success in the classroom. (Limit to two pages.)

Examples of evidence of teaching effectiveness (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder):

- Course syllabi, examinations, assignments, reading lists, grading policies, and other course materials that demonstrate effective pedagogy, high expectations of students, and knowledge of the discipline

- Peer evaluations: classroom visitation and observation reports by members of the department faculty, as indicated in the FPPP.

- Evidence of inclusive pedagogy, and other teaching methods proven to improve student success, such as substantial student interaction and involvement with instructors and each other

- Evidence of innovative and/or experiential teaching and assignments (e.g. overseeing students curating exhibitions, producing public art projects, publishing journal issues, etc.)

- Evidence of curriculum development, including creating new courses or revisions, new course delivery modes, and updating of future iterations of syllabi and materials

- Demonstration of use of BlackboardLearn and/or Canvas to provide syllabi, assignments, readings, grading criteria, grades, etc.

- Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs). This data will be carefully considered, but will not weigh excessively in overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness

- Documentary materials: signed letters, emails, or evaluations from students and colleagues, and other documentary materials relevant to the assessment of the candidate's teaching

- Student Outcomes: samples of tests and student responses, paper assignments and samples of student papers, studio assignments and samples of student artwork, and other evidence of outstanding student achievements

- Participation in Faculty Development activities, especially those related to student success

- Alternative student evaluation to be used to demonstrate the candidate's response to midsemester feedback or alternative feedback

- Mentoring of students in a teaching capacity

- Engaging in work to advance HSI-related priorities

- Employing Accessible Technology Initiatives

- Efforts to increase student success, including work to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in or lack of equity gaps in the candidate's courses and work to reduce DFW rates

- Incorporation of culturally inclusive pedagogy, such as the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors

- Completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion

- ***NOTE****: This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence. The candidate is welcome to include additional accomplishments and explain why they should be considered in the review.*

Table of Ranking Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness for Each Review Type

Review Type	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2nd Year Performance Review	The candidate addressed suggestions from peer observations and previous RTP reports. If the candidate decided not to follow these suggestions, they explained their decision. The candidate engaged in one or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate reflected on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and explained how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate received generally positive SFOTs, with most scores over 3.0 and at least a balance of positive and critical narrative comments.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate received strong peer observations. The candidate demonstrated effective implementation of one or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate received strong SFOTs, with scores generally over 4.0 and primarily positive narrative comments.
4th Year Performance Review	The candidate addressed suggestions from peer observations and previous RTP reports. If the candidate decided not to follow these suggestions, they explained their decision. The candidate engaged in one or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate demonstrated steps taken to improve their teaching since their hire. The candidate discussed their role within their area, and explained how their teaching contributes to the department's mission and programs. The candidate reflected on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate received strong peer observations. The candidate demonstrated effective implementation of two or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate demonstrated their effective role in their area and demonstrated how their teaching advances the department's mission and programs. The candidate received strong SFOTs, with scores generally over 4.0 and primarily positive narrative comments.

		explained how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate received generally positive SFOTs, with most scores over 3.0 and at least a balance of positive and critical narrative comments. If the candidate has low SFOTS (frequently below 3.0, and with primarily negative narrative comments), they demonstrated improvement over time or addressed this and demonstrated efforts to improve their SFOTs. If the candidate has higher initial SFOTS, they demonstrated consistency.	
6th Year Performance Review (Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor year)		The candidate addressed suggestions from peer observations and previous RTP reports. If the candidate decided not to follow these suggestions, they explained their decision. The candidate engaged in three or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate demonstrated steps taken to improve their teaching since their hire. The candidate discussed their role within their area, and explained how their teaching contributes to the department's mission and programs. The candidate received generally positive SFOTs, with most scores over 3.0 and at least a balance of positive and critical narrative comments. If the candidate began with low SFOTS (frequently below 3.0, and with primarily negative narrative comments), they addressed the causes and demonstrated improvement over time.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate received strong peer observations. The candidate demonstrated effective implementation of three or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, such as those enumerated above. The candidate demonstrated their effective role in their area and demonstrated how their teaching advances the department's mission and programs. The candidate received strong SFOTs, with scores generally over 4.0 and primarily positive narrative comments.

	If the candidate has higher initial SFOTS, they demonstrated consistency. The candidate reflected on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and explained how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement.	
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed for 6th year review. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Worked a minimum of one academic year under conditions similar to their typical full-time assignment.	
Promotion to Full Professor	Candidate continued their record of successful teaching as demonstrated through peer observations, teaching materials, continued work to improve their effectiveness in the classroom, and SFOTs.	Candidate continued their record of teaching excellence or improved on their effective record of teaching, as demonstrated through peer observations, teaching materials, continued work to improve their effectiveness in the classroom, and SFOTs.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed above for Promotion to Full Professor. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Clearly demonstrated substantial professional recognition beyond the University itself.	
5-Year Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	*No rating system.*	

Standards for Evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement (Optional for lecturer faculty)

Reflective statement on your professional growth and achievement

The FPPP (8.1.3.e.3) requires:

> A reflective statement on the candidate's professional development, describing what they do and why, how it has evolved and where it might be going in the next few years, and how it has impacted the candidate's teaching.

A primary purpose of professional activity among faculty is to enhance the quality of teaching by ensuring that content is substantial and current. Professional growth and achievements are essential considerations for retention, tenure, and promotion. For professional achievements in all areas, as relevant, we consider quality, quantity, location, venue, and media. We therefore ask that candidates provide *clearly annotated* details in their dossiers. Since members of the Department RTP Committee review colleagues from all four departmental areas (Art Education, Art History, Art Studio, and Interior Architecture), and for Performance Evaluations, a subsequent review is conducted by the College of Humanities & Fine Arts RTP Committee, candidates must explain to those outside of their fields the significance of their accomplishments (e.g. "the flagship journal in my field"; "a prestigious national gallery specializing in my medium"; "the annual award for innovation by the main national organization in my field"; etc.). The Department Chair and RTP Committee will provide advice on if the candidate is achieving an appropriate amount of quality, professional activities.

"Predatory" journals and vanity galleries

Acceptance into "predatory" journals and vanity galleries are not considered quality achievements. These "predatory" journals and galleries solicit work, sending emails offering a smooth path to publication or exhibition, which is appealing to those who feel they need more entries on their CV, but they should be avoided, and *will not* count as contributions toward Professional Growth and Achievement. *Nature* published a thorough article on the subject, which reads:

> Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices.

The clearest indicator that a venue is predatory is "Aggressive, indiscriminate solicitation":

> Although legitimate journals might solicit submissions, predatory journals often use aggressive solicitation such as repeated e-mails. These might be excessively flattering in tone, or might mention researchers' past publications while noting that related submissions are urgently needed for a forthcoming issue. A clear warning sign is that the invitee's expertise is outside the journal's scope.

Forthcoming work

Note, as stated in the [College of HFA Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion](#) (A.4):

> Claims made by candidates about specific achievements should be accurately identified [i.e., the claim of a candidate that a book or article or anthology entry or encyclopedia entry, etc. as "forthcoming" should be supported by appropriate documentation that the publisher has accepted the work (not "tentatively accepted" or "conditionally accepted")].

This recommendation is applicable to all levels and periods of review, not only Accelerated Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion.

Extraordinary levels of service

The Department acknowledges that faculty members from underserved groups are often asked to participate in a disproportionately high number of service activities, such as individual mentoring of underserved students; advising of underserved and social justice-oriented student groups; recruitment and retention of underserved students and faculty; outreach and advocacy within underserved communities; and activism at various levels. We value this work highly and realize that it takes time and energy from typical professional growth and achievement activities (e.g., publications, exhibitions, grant writing). The department therefore considers extraordinary levels of service to and with our underserved students and colleagues as a contribution to professional growth and achievement, if clearly described and documented.

The [FPPP](#) (10.3.3) enumerates the following criteria for each ranking within the category of Professional Growth and Achievement:

Exceeds expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Meets expectations

The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Does not meet expectations

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Each of the four areas in the Department (Art Education, Art History, Art Studio, and Interior Architecture) has somewhat different, discipline-specific criteria for Professional Growth and Achievement. The following are *typical* activities considered relevant to department faculty in each area.

Examples of evidence of Professional Growth and Achievement (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder) include, but are not limited to:

- **Major Professional Accomplishments**
    - Creative activity resulting in national or international exhibitions of work, film screenings, and distributions, in significant galleries, museums, and festivals, and selection into relevant collections. An annotated list must be provided; for example, activities that are peer reviewed, juried, or invitational, regional, national, or international must be clear
    - Publications in peer reviewed journals, collections of essays, solo- or team-authored monographs, and digital resources
    - Professional curatorial projects resulting in exhibitions in galleries, museums, and alternative art spaces
    - Installation of large-scale public artwork

- National or international artists' residencies

- Essays and substantial entries in museum collections or exhibition catalogs

- Receipt of national and international awards, fellowships, prizes, grants, commissions, honors, and contracts in the candidate's professional area(s) of expertise

- Service as editor of books, journals, and series

- Extensive research mentorship of undergraduate or graduate students

- Extraordinary support of retention of underserved students, such as establishing and administering a new and effective program, outside of that expected as service work, and clearly distinguished from it in all documentation. While such work is usually counted at Service to Department, College, University, and Community, we acknowledge that especially high levels of service are meritorious, and that they diminish the time and energy available for Professional Development

- Other major items of professional activity (e.g. serving as juror for competitive exhibitions, the tenure of significant and special appointments such as visiting professorships and lectureships)

- ***NOTE***: *This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable major professional activities. The candidate is welcome to include additional accomplishments and explain why they should be considered in the review.*

- **Standard Professional Accomplishments**

  - Creative activity resulting in campus and local exhibitions of work, film screenings, and distributions, in campus and local galleries, museums, and festivals, and selection into relevant collections. An annotated list must be provided; for example, activities that are peer reviewed, juried, or invitational must be clear

  - Regional or local artists' residencies

  - Receipt of campus and local awards, fellowships, prizes, grants, commissions, honors, and contracts in the candidate's professional area(s) of expertise

○ Evidence of progress toward publication of articles, chapters, solo- or team-authored monographs, and digital resources

○ Publication of works of public scholarship (e.g. newspaper editorials, podcast interviews, and public-facing blogs and websites)

○ Small publications (e.g. book reviews and encyclopedia entries)

○ Service on committees and boards of professional societies and organizations

○ Presentation of papers, artist lectures, and other participation in seminars, conferences, professional meetings, and other activities that lead to growth in the candidate's area(s) of expertise

○ Presentation of visiting lectures, running of workshops, and undertaking of short-term visiting artist stays at other colleges, universities, museums, and other institutions

○ Peer reviews for professional journals, magazines, and presses

○ Consultation of a professional nature relevant to the candidate's area of expertise

○ Other standard items of professional activity (e.g. public lectures)

○ *NOTE: This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable standard professional activities. The candidate is welcome to include additional accomplishments and explain why they should be considered in the review.*

○ *NOTE: Candidates are welcome to argue for the major significance of particular accomplishments here listed as "standard."*

NOTE: The following chart has the appearance of a simple counting exercise. However, the RTP Committee may rely on professional expertise in assessing all accomplishments enumerated by the candidate.

Table of Ranking Criteria for Professional Growth and Achievement for Each Review Type

Review Type	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

2nd Year Performance Review	Evidence of progress toward major or standard professional accomplishments.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* Evidence of major or standard professional accomplishments.
4th Year Performance Review	Evidence of at least two standard professional accomplishments and progress toward major professional accomplishments.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* Evidence of at least two major professional accomplishments.
6th Year Performance Review (Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor year)	Evidence of at least three standard professional accomplishments and progress toward major professional accomplishments.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* Evidence of at least three major professional accomplishments.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed for 6th year review. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Worked a minimum of one academic year under conditions similar to their typical full-time assignment.	
Promotion to Full Professor	Candidate continued their record of successful professional development as demonstrated through evidence of at least three standard professional accomplishments and two major professional accomplishments since the previous promotion.	Evidence of at least three major professional accomplishments since the previous promotion and of clearly demonstrated substantial professional recognition at the national level.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed above for Promotion to Full Professor. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue.	

	AND Clearly demonstrated substantial professional recognition at the international level.
5-Year Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	*No rating system.*

Standards for Evaluating Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community (Optional for lecturer faculty)

Part 1: Service to Department, College, University, and Community

The FPPP (8.1.3.e.4) requires:

> Other materials that would help evaluators assess the candidate's performance and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University and to the Community should be included. When compiling these materials, the candidate should keep in mind that the reviewers will assess the quality as well as the quantity of activities; therefore, this section of the dossier should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments about such quality and quantity.

All candidates are required to participate in committee work and other activities necessary for the normal functioning of the Department and College. New tenure-track faculty should begin with lighter departmental work (e.g. Scholarship Committee; Honors Program Advisor), and build up to heavier departmental work starting in their third year (e.g. Curriculum Committee; Hiring Committees; BFA Coordinator/Advisor). The Department Chair and RTP Committee will provide advice on reasonable and appropriate service work.

To achieve tenure and promotion, College and/or University level committee work is also expected.

The Department has mandatory advising of all students in all majors, and every tenure-track and tenured faculty member is expected to participate actively by advising students in their areas. CSU Chico is a Hispanic-Serving Institution, with greater than 50% of our students First-Generation, Pell Grant eligible, and students of color. Service work that demonstrates evidence of contributions to

such historically underserved populations will be given particular weight in the process of evaluation.

In addition to the required service work noted above, typical activities (to be documented in the Supplemental Materials folder) include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership/officer positions in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success (e.g. Black Faculty & Staff Association, Chican@/Latin@ Council, 1st Generation Faculty & Staff Association, LGBTQ+ Faculty and Staff Association, Asian & Pacific Islander Council)

- Participation and/or presentations in diversity, equity, and inclusion professional development venues (e.g. Faculty Learning Community on Inclusive Pedagogy, Diversity Academy and/or Certificate Program, Safe Zone Ally Training)

- Extraordinary time advising and/or mentoring students

- Contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI-related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, and Basic Needs Initiative priorities

- Advocacy work for the arts

- Curriculum and program innovation and development, such as significant contributions to the Department curricular reviews, accreditation reviews, and development of new program options and degrees

- Student advising support, such as BFA, MA, and MFA student committee assignments; advising of student organizations, clubs, and activities; advising students regarding career objectives; overseeing internships and other experiential programs

- Representing the Department at campus-wide and department-specific student recruitment and retention events

- Participation in College or University student recruitment and retention efforts

- Service to the Community, such as campus and community exhibitions of creative work, workshops, lectures, and seminars open to the general public and community on and off campus

Part 2: Contributions to Strategic Plan

The FPPP (8.1.3.e.4) notes that:

> The candidate may add a statement that guides reviewers to the evidence in the dossier that relates to strategic plans and goals. Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, civic engagement, and service to the North State.

While the areas of review listed above (**Part 1: Service to Department, College, University, and Community**) will address much of the candidate's performance relative to strategic plans and goals, the candidate should ensure that any additional evidence regarding performance towards the Strategic Plan is included and explicitly described as such.

University Goals and Strategic Priorities:

- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion

- Civic & Global Engagement

- Resilient & Sustainable Systems

University Enduring Commitments:

- Academic Distinction

- Transformative Student Experience

- Prominent Scholarship and Innovation

- Culture of Excellence and Accountability

The College of Humanities & Fine Arts has its own Mission, Values & Strategic Plan that can also be addressed in this section.

Table of Ranking Criteria for Service for Each Review Type

Review Type	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2nd Year Performance Review	The candidate documented evidence of department committee work. AND	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate documented evidence of leadership and/or

	The candidate documented evidence of service to the profession and/or community. AND The candidate documented evidence of other service activity.	significant contribution in a committee and/or service role.
4th Year Performance Review	The candidate documented evidence of department and college or university committee work. AND The candidate documented evidence of service to the profession and/or community. AND The candidate documented evidence of other service activity.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate documented evidence of leadership and/or significant contribution in at least two committee and/or service roles.
6th Year Performance Review (Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor year)	The candidate documented evidence of department, college, and university committee work. AND The candidate documented evidence of service to the profession and/or community. AND The candidate documented evidence of other service activity.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate documented evidence of leadership and/or significant contribution in at least three committee and/or service roles.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed for 6th year review. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND	

	Worked a minimum of one academic year under conditions similar to their typical full-time assignment.	
Promotion to Full Professor	Candidate continued their record of consistent service at all levels of service.	*In addition to the criteria for "Meets Expectations":* The candidate documented evidence of leadership and/or significant contribution at all levels of service.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor	The candidate met all criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed above for Promotion to Full Professor. AND Demonstrated the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Clearly demonstrated particular dedication to service at all levels.	
5-Year Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	*No rating system.*	

Department Standard for Accelerated Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion

Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, the FPPP (10.5.3) states that:

> To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) be rated "Exceeds expectations" as defined in 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment.

College of HFA Criteria for Early Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion allow for such "only in cases of exceptional merit, i.e., when in addition to meeting the criteria normally expected for promotion, the candidate has received professional

recognition from off and/or on campus that is professionally meritorious beyond question."

In line with these guidelines, the Department of Art & Art History determines that a faculty who achieves positive ratings ("Exceeds expectations" and "Meets expectations") in all three categories (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Services) in each performance review, who is deemed to "Exceed expectations" in all three categories at the time of application for Accelerated Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion, and who documents meritorious professional recognition shall be considered exceptional for the purposes of consideration for Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion.

Note that the FPPP (10.5.3) states that a candidate for accelerated tenure and/or accelerated promotion must have "worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment." For most tenure-track faculty, the third year is the first with "conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment" because this is the year that new hire course releases typically end. This means that candidates are generally eligible to apply for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion in their fourth year.

Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor

For Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor, the FPPP (11.1.3) states that:

> To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must:
> (1) be ranked Exceeds Expectations in all three categories of evaluation:
> Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review.

For Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at *and beyond* the University, as well as evidence of the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue. Inasmuch as consideration of Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as well as an exceptional record at each level of review.

Candidates wishing to be considered for Accelerated Tenure and/or Accelerated Promotion must supply to the Chair and Dean a letter of intent that includes a clear statement of how they have met the Department, College, and University criteria. It is highly recommended that faculty considering this option speak with the RTP Committee Chair, Department Chair, and Dean of HFA before submitting their letter of intent.

Right of Rebuttal

Candidates are entitled to submit rebuttals to each level of review in each cycle, as established by the FPPP (10.2.8), which reads in part:

> At all levels of evaluation, in periodic evaluation or performance review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, a faculty member being evaluated shall be given a copy of the report(s) and recommendation(s), which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation(s). The faculty member shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request an opportunity to discuss the recommendation(s) from each level no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation(s).

Additional resources can be found in the CBA 15.5:

> At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, faculty unit employees shall be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons therefore. The faculty unit employee may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the Working Personnel Action File and also be sent to all previous levels of review. New review materials shall be inserted into the Working Personnel Action File per Provision 15.12 (b). This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.

b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.

c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;

d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.

e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.

f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved Date* footer to the document and:

   a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,

   b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and

   c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

_____

Chair/Director Approval: _Rachel Middleman (May 6, 2024 17:24 PDT)_____ Date: _May 6, 2024___

Dean Review: _____ Date: _May 7, 2024___

Provost/Designee Approval: _____ Date: _May 7, 2024___