School of Education Personnel Policies and Procedures

2011-2012

The School of Education Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the school, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The School mission affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community. For Performance Reviews, Contributions to Strategic Plans of the School, College and University are also evaluated.

The School of Education has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the anchor and guide for interpreting the rubric. These standards, some of which are based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPT), are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation. The candidate submits evidence to align with the elements under each standard (see table of suggested types of evidence). The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Expectations of performance are commensurate with years of service and professorial rank of the candidate. As a result, these varying expectations of development provide a context for utilizing the rubric in performance review and periodic evaluation.

In all areas relating to hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAAtoc.shtml), Title 5 regulations and the University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) (http://www.csuchico.edu/hr/Documents/VPHR-FPPP.doc) govern the School of Education policies. The School Personnel Committee (SPC), the SOE Director, and candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and periodic evaluation must be familiar with these policies and procedures. This document sets the standards by which School of Education faculty are appointed and evaluated.

1.0  SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MISSION

---

1 FPPP Section 8.5. Note especially the descriptions of evaluation ratings in FPPP Section 8.5.b.1.c.
2 The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_proposition.
3 The FPPP 2007/2008 is referred to in this document.
1.1 Mission
The mission of the CSU, Chico School of Education, in collaboration with our community partners, is to develop effective, reflective and engaged educators. We believe in the power of education to create a diverse, democratic, socially responsible society in which every student is valued. As a learning community, we are committed to exemplary education programs that use scholarly inquiry and research-based practice as tools for continual professional growth and renewal.

2.0 SCHOOL OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL/SEARCH COMMITTEE

2.1 Function of the Personnel Committee
The function of the School of Education Personnel Committee (SPC) shall be to review and make recommendations concerning appointment, retention, tenure and promotion. It is also the responsibility of the SPC to review and recommend policies and procedures related to these matters. Recommended policy and practice shall be consistent with approved personnel plans and University personnel documents.

The SPC will consult with the School of Education (SOE) Director on the development, implementation and annual review of the personnel/faculty section of the SOE strategic plan. This discussion shall include a discussion of position allocations and proposals that affect faculty positions.

2.2 Structure of the Personnel Committee
The SPC will consist of five-elected tenured faculty members, at least three of whom are at the rank of Professor. The SPC will select a chair, a secretary, and an Affirmative Action Representative (AAR) from among its membership. The AAR shall assure that all committee actions comply with University affirmative action policies and procedures. Service on the SPC shall be for two years. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve on the SPC more than two years within any three-year period beginning with the Fall, 2011 term. In May of each odd-numbered academic year, two members shall be elected to the SPC to replace the two members who have served for two years. In May of each even-numbered academic year, three members shall be elected to replace the three who have completed two years of service. In 2012, the first year of this voting structure, the three members will have served only one academic year on the committee. Faculty members who are on leave for any part of the academic year will not be eligible to serve on the SPC. Faculty members who are eligible for and elected to the SPC are required to serve and may not serve on any other college or university personnel committee.

2.3 Selection of the Personnel Committee
General voting policy, including election of SPC members, will be consistent with the policy specified in the School of Education Governance Committee. All probationary, tenured, and FERP faculty of the School of Education having at least a .50 appointment in the semester of the election will be eligible to vote. Committee elections will take place in May for the following academic year, except as specified in this document. The following procedures will be used to elect the SPC:
The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee. All probationary, tenured and FERP faculty members having at least a .50 appointment will receive a ballot and be eligible to vote. Those nominees receiving the greatest number of votes will be elected. If a tie vote occurs, a run-off election will be held.

2.4 Operation of the Personnel Committee
A quorum will consist of three (3) of the elected Committee members.

The SPC Chair calls and presides at meetings and carries out other appropriate duties. The secretary keeps minutes. These minutes indicate only time, place, date of meeting, members present, and any action taken.

2.4.1 School Search Committee Structure
The School of Education Search Committee (SSC) will normally be constituted in the spring semester preceding the year of the search process. Members of the committee will serve from the time the committee is constituted through the end of the search.

The School Search Committee will consist of: (1) the SOE Director, (2) the coordinator of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, (3) a member of the SPC appointed by the SPC, (4) two tenured or tenure-track faculty elected by the faculty of the department, (5) one faculty member from the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, and (6) one faculty member from another department. For the on-campus interview, the School Search Committee will be supplemented by at least one program student selected by the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve. In years when searches are to be conducted for more than one program, additional members representing programs of primary employment will be added to the Search Committee. The School Search Committee will select a faculty member to chair the committee, who will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the School of Education.

2.5 School of Education Search Processes

2.5.1 The School Search Committee will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned as an early step in writing a proposal for recruitment.

2.5.2 The proposal for recruitment will include selection criteria for the position that specify minimum qualifications and preferred qualifications. These selection criteria will become the basis for position advertisements and the paper screening of applicants.

2.5.3 Candidates for a probationary faculty position must meet School of Education minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned doctorate in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in

---

4 For a candidate not holding an earned doctorate, the candidate must generally verify that he or she will be able to complete the doctoral degree program within six months (see FPPP section 6).
basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

2.5.4 The proposal for recruitment shall be approved by the School of Education faculty before submission to the dean of the college and provost of the university. If recommendations for changes are made after approval by the faculty, the proposal shall be returned to the faculty and a consultation process will be conducted to arrive at an approvable search proposal.

2.5.5 Once approved, advertising for all positions will occur on a timeline that permits the SSC to review the files of applicants, interview final candidates, and make recommendations to the faculty so that an offer of employment can be approved and made prior to the end of the academic year.

2.5.6 The School Search Committee will conduct a paper screening process. This screening process will be used to determine candidates to be interviewed by phone. Following phone interviews, candidates will be selected and invited for on-campus interviews.

2.5.7 On-campus interviews will only be conducted at times when the Department Search Committee, candidates of the program, the faculty, the program coordinator, the SOE Director, and the dean or associate dean have the availability to interview candidates. SOE faculty and others will be invited to attend an instructional presentation by each faculty candidate related to the position of primary appointment and ask questions of each candidate.

2.5.8 The School Search Committee will recommend candidates for employment to the tenure track faculty. The faculty will recommend the individual faculty for hire to the dean of the college. Candidates may be recommended to the dean only after a majority vote of the faculty. The recommendation of the faculty will be recorded in a written document signed by each tenured member of the faculty.

2.5.9 For issues not addressed in this document, the SPC will follow the university policies and procedures related to appointments.

In order to conduct university required faculty evaluations according to established timelines, the SPC will determine the need for adjunct committees at the beginning of the fall semester, as follows:

**Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee**
The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for collecting data for the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty and reporting findings to the SPC.

---

5 The School of Education faculty, in this case, consists of the SOE tenured faculty.
6 See Appendix D for sample phone interview questions.
7 See Appendix E for a sample interview day agenda. FAAF site.
(procedures for reviews are addressed in Section 7.0 of this document and Section 8.2 of the FPPP). In years when the number of temporary faculty to be evaluated warrants it, the SPC will call for the election of a Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee of at least three members\textsuperscript{8}. All tenured or tenure-track SOE faculty members who are not serving on the SPC or College Personnel Committee shall be eligible to serve on the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee and, if elected, are required to serve. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve more than two years within any three-year period on the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee. The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee.

\textbf{Post Tenure Review Committee}

The Post Tenure Review Committee will conduct periodic evaluations of tenured faculty (see Section 7.0 of this document and Section 8.6 of the FPPP). Tenured faculty members are evaluated at intervals no greater than five years. In the fall semester, the SPC will call a meeting of faculty at the rank of Professor. SOE Professors will produce a slate of review teams to conduct the evaluations scheduled for that year. At least two Professors will be selected to conduct each periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member. The slate of review teams will be brought to the SOE faculty for vote and approval. Faculty members assigned to conduct a periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member are eligible to concurrently serve on the SPC or College Personnel Committee.

3.0 Revision

At the beginning of each academic year, all members of the SPC shall read the current SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures (SPPP) document and the current University Faculty Personnel Policies Procedures (FPPP) document, revise the SOE document so that it reflects any changes in the University document effective for the current Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle, and notify the faculty of the changes.

The SPC shall review the SOE PPP document and SOE faculty evaluation forms and make suggestions for revision to the faculty.

The faculty shall vote to approve an official SOE PPP, supervision forms, and any other appropriate evaluation forms. If approved at all university levels, all changes become effective the following academic year.

\textsuperscript{8} The number of members elected to the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee should be related to the number of evaluations to be conducted. A ratio of four reviews per committee member per semester is suggested.
4.0 **DIVERSITY**
There will be a systematic effort to encourage recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates of members of underrepresented groups including women, minorities, individuals with disabilities, and others with the goal of obtaining an employee composition that reflects the representation of these groups in the professional education labor markets from which the University draws.

5.0 **APPOINTMENTS**
The SOE will seek a sufficient number of probationary/tenure-track appointments to insure continuity in program development, sustain the identity of the unit, and maintain a stable core of committed, qualified, and informed faculty.

At the beginning of each academic year, the SOE Director and the SPC shall review, and update as necessary, the personnel portion of the SOE strategic hiring plan (SHP), determining needs for new tenure track positions and the needed areas of expertise.

The normal appointment of a full-time faculty member will be to probationary status. For those seeking a position related to teaching instructional strategies, K-14 teaching experience will be necessary. For other positions, K-14 teaching experience may be desirable. Normally, no one with less than an educationally related M.A. degree or equivalent shall be hired to teach or supervise student teachers.

If any candidate for appointment is to be offered an initial rank higher than Assistant Professor, the SPC's review of this candidate will use the same rigorous procedure and standard for substantiation specified for on-campus promotions to the proposed rank.

Advertising for all positions, probationary and temporary, will occur, if possible, on a timeline that permits the SPC to review the files of applicants and interview final candidates prior to the end of the academic year.

5.1. At least once during each academic year, the SOE Director shall provide a comprehensive department budget report to faculty and staff of the department.

5.2. By the end of the second week of each fall and spring semester, the SOE Director shall provide a list of all school faculty and their appointment level to the SPC.

5.3. In the fall semester, the SOE Director and program coordinators will consult with the SPC regarding utilization of faculty positions and projected program faculty needs. A summary of this consultation will be provided to the School of Education.

5.4. Should annual consultation on faculty utilization (described in step 5.3, above) indicate a potential need for additional-probationary faculty, the SPC will recommend the finding to the School of Education. The decision to constitute a Search Committee(s) will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty per School of Education Bylaws.
6.0 EARLY TENURE AND/OR ACCELERATED PROMOTION
Tenured faculty at the top step of their current rank will be reviewed for promotion unless they request not to be considered.

Request for consideration for accelerated promotion by faculty not at the top step of their current rank must be made in writing to the SPC Chair, with copies to the Dean and SOE Director by the closing date for Personal Data Sheets and Dossiers listed on the current RTP deadline calendar.

A faculty member will be recommended for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion only when he/she is evaluated as Superior in Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and, in at least one category, has been recognized as having recent accomplishments that have brought special regional, state, national, or other professional honor to the individual. The evidence to support such recognition must be provided by the applicant. These guidelines are consistent with the language in FPPP (8.5 b.3.a.3).

7.0 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR ALL REVIEWS
The terminal degree in SOE is the doctorate. A doctorate is required for initial appointment to a tenure track position. An individual with all coursework for the doctorate without having completed the terminal degree will still be considered for hire, if completion occurs within the University's acceptable guidelines.

The SPC shall be responsible for making a recommendation regarding each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. SPC members will review the data and evaluations. Data and evaluations are to be found in the Personal Professional Data Sheet; faculty member’s dossier; student, colleague and administrative evaluations; and the faculty personnel file. Unless expressly excluded in documents governing the RTP process, all responsibilities that comprise faculty workload are eligible for inclusion and consideration in the review process. This is not subject to change while faculty members are undergoing review.

After reviewing all available data, but before writing its final recommendation, the SPC shall meet individually with each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. The purpose of this meeting will be to answer unresolved questions related to the retention, tenure, or promotion process. The faculty member must be afforded an opportunity to respond to these questions and to receive answers to his/her inquiries about the retention, tenure or promotion process. The interview process will also be an opportunity for the SPC to discuss with the candidate his/her future aspirations as a member of SOE and to suggest ways to meet personal/professional goals. The SOE Director, if not a member of the SPC, shall be present at this meeting and may participate in the discussion. A written summary of the interview, containing a summary of the substance of the interview, shall become a part of the current review file. The summary will include all questions and a written digest of each response. The report and recommendation relative to each candidate shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement.
In relation to recommendations on tenure and promotion, the committee should follow the guidelines of FPPP section 8.5. All performance reviews shall be written in an evaluative manner using the following rating adjectives: “superior, effective, adequate, or inadequate.” A rating of inadequate in any area does not meet the minimum level of achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. The overall evaluation must average ‘effective’ across all categories for tenure and promotion. Evaluation ratings may be a combination of adequate, effective and superior the mean of which is effective overall. The following combinations of ratings are equivalent to an overall mean of effective:

- Three ratings of effective;
- One superior, one adequate, and one effective (Instruction must be at least effective);
- or
- Two superiors, one adequate (Instruction must be at least effective).

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member’s capability to be a contributing scholar in education or a related field. SOE values collaborative professional achievement efforts (e.g. writing components of grant proposals or sections of publications), however, each individual contribution must be verified.

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of a consistent line of scholarship over time, including all areas defined in the School of Education personnel document that has resulted in recognition at a state, national, and/or international level. As per FPPP Section 8.5.b.2.e.5, “Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation, and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement."

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion (probationary faculty), reappointment and range elevation (temporary faculty) are reviewed and evaluated in accordance with policies, procedures, and criteria as described in the FPPP (http://www.csuchico.edu/hr/Documents/VPHR-FPPP.pdf). Probationary and tenured faculty should consult both the SOEPPP (especially Section 10) and the FPPP (especially FPPP 3.0, 8.0, and Appendix II) to obtain information on the documents included in their University personnel file, and to help determine the supporting materials they should provide in the dossier they are responsible for submitting.

The College office is the central collection point for all types of probationary faculty evaluation materials. The Dean will establish designated areas for faculty to organize and view/examine their personnel files. Procedures for collecting data shall insure that only
authorized personnel have access to faculty evaluations and files. (Authorized personnel are those identified in the FPPP.)

Temporary faculty will be provided with information about documents included in their University personnel file and the supporting materials they are responsible for submitting in the Temporary Faculty Dossier in semesters they are scheduled for evaluation. The School of Education office will be the collection point for evaluation materials of temporary faculty.

7.1 Procedures for Classroom Observations (for course instructors, face-to-face or online)
A classroom observation will be conducted for each review cycle. A SPC member, as assigned by the SPC chair, will make a formal observation. The SOE Director may also make an observation. Members of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Post Tenure Review Committee may make an observation as appropriate. Procedures for observations follow:

7.1.1 A time for the observation will be determined through consultation between the observer and the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and observer do not agree to a time, the chair of the SPC will determine the time and date for the observation. There will be a five day notice, as per CBA 15.14. For online courses an interview between the faculty member and the observer with access to the online course will substitute for the classroom observation.

7.1.2 The faculty member should inform the observer of the objectives of the lesson and provide a course syllabus and other materials that will enable an informed observation. The observer shall prepare a descriptive and evaluative commentary using the Classroom Observation of Faculty Form (see Appendix B). The observer should not solicit comments from students. A report of the observation, aligned with standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as set forth in SOEPPP 10.1, will be placed in the faculty member's University personnel action file.

7.1.3 The reviewing committee member and the SOE Director will typically not observe the faculty member at the same time. Exceptions will be made with approval of the faculty member. Subsequent to the review, additional classroom visitations may be conducted as needed.

7.2 Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
All teaching faculty (tenure, tenure-track, and temporary) will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 4.0 and 8.1.b. SET results are filed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in the Office of the Dean. The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETS) section notes that all teaching faculty will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 4.0 and 8.1.b., which states, "Student evaluations of faculty shall be conducted in a minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee, and in classes representative of the faculty’s teaching assignment in accordance with Article 15.15 of the CBA.
7.3. Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision
Forms designed for assessing the quality of supervision will be distributed by the School of Education to credential candidates at their school site, once each year in the spring semester, and to cooperating teachers in the spring semester of even numbered years e.g., 2008, 2010, etc. Supervision evaluation forms will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean for inclusion in the PAF. Forms received after the closing date of a personnel cycle will be held out of the file until the next cycle. (See Appendix A) For faculty members whose appointment is primarily supervision of candidates, an interview shall be conducted.

8.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY
8.01 Definition of a temporary faculty as noted in the FPPP (See 6.2.a1). Part time temporary faculty are appointed to 15 units or less per semester. The procedures for recruitment and appointment of full-time temporary faculty shall conform to CBA Article 12 (FPPP 6.2.c.1).
8.0.2 The SPC is responsible for evaluation of temporary faculty. The primary criterion for the evaluation of temporary faculty is teaching effectiveness as described in SPPP Section 10.1 (See also FPPP Section 8.2.) In addition to the primary criterion of teaching, part-time faculty shall be evaluated as indicated in FPPP 8.2.b.1.b.

8.1 Evaluation of Part-time Temporary Faculty
8.1.1 Each part-time temporary faculty (including 15 unit part-time faculty) will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. Each temporary faculty member will be evaluated in each of the first two semesters of his or her employment and at least every other year thereafter. Members of the SPC will conduct the first two evaluations. Members of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee may conduct data gathering for subsequent evaluations. (See FPPP Section 8.2.d.1)

8.1.2 By the end of the first week of each fall and spring semester, the School of Education administrative support coordinator shall provide the SPC with a list of temporary faculty scheduled for review that semester.

8.1.3 In the fall semester, the SPC will determine the need for a Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee based on the number of temporary faculty to be evaluated that academic year, and when needed, call for election of the committee.

8.1.4 The SPC will provide the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee with a list of temporary faculty to be evaluated each semester. The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for data gathering for periodic evaluation of current School of Education temporary faculty.

9 FPPP Section 8.2.b.
8.1.5 The SPC will provide each temporary faculty member scheduled for evaluation with information about the evaluation criteria, procedures, and documentation (see Appendix C). Temporary faculty members are responsible for reviewing materials in their personnel action files (in the Dean’s Office) and providing supplementary materials for their evaluations in the Temporary Faculty Dossier. The dossier must be submitted to the School of Education Office by October 1 for fall evaluations and March 1 for spring evaluations.

8.1.6 The chair of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will assign a committee member to conduct the classroom observation or supervision interview and draft the initial report of findings. Each member of the Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee shall read the personnel file and dossier of each faculty member being evaluated.

8.1.7 The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet to finalize reports of findings for each temporary faculty member evaluated. (See Appendix C for procedures and materials for evaluation of temporary faculty.)

8.1.8 The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward reports of findings and classroom observation reports, if applicable, to the chair of the SPC by the first Friday in December for fall evaluations and by the first Friday in May for spring evaluations.

8.1.9 Results of the evaluation, including a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation report, if applicable, will be shared with the temporary faculty member by the SPC chair.

8.1.10 Results will be reported to the SOE Director for review. The SOE Director will forward a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation, if applicable, to the Office of the Dean for inclusion in the PAF.

8.2 Evaluation of Full-time Temporary Faculty

8.2.1 Full-time temporary faculty will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. (See FPPP Section 8.3.) The professional growth and achievement criteria and standards for full-time temporary faculty shall be the same as for tenured and tenure-track faculty (FPPP Section 8.4.a)

8.3 Range Elevation for Temporary Faculty (see Appendix A; FPPP Section 8.4.b.1.)

9.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY\(^{10}\)

9.1 Faculty members will have opportunities to update personnel files and submit other materials for review as specified in the FPPP and according to the University RTP calendar. (See FPPP Section 8.1.)

9.2 The SPC shall follow these procedures in conducting reviews:

\(^{10}\) Refer also to FPPP Section 8.5
9.2.1. The chair of the SPC will assign a member of the SPC to draft the initial periodic evaluation or performance review report. Each member of the SPC shall read the personnel file and dossier of the faculty member under review. After reviewing all available data, the SPC shall interview the faculty member.

9.2.2. At the time of the interview the following statement of purpose and procedure will be shared with the faculty member being interviewed. Written permission for audio recording the interview will be obtained prior to reading the following statement. Audio recordings will be kept for three years, and then returned to the faculty member.

“The purpose of the personnel interview is to answer any unresolved questions by committee members about the evidence in the record, or by the candidate about the review process or the committee’s understanding of the evidence. The SOE Director may be present at the interview but may not act as a member of the committee. Minutes of the interview will include questions asked and responses and answers. An audio recording of the interview will be made to facilitate the writing of an accurate interview summary. The interview summary will be added to the personnel action file and become a part of the record. A copy of the interview summary will be provided to you.”

9.2.3. The report and recommendation relative to each faculty member shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement. Endorsement is arrived at by majority vote of the SPC. If a member abstains from voting, that member shall submit a written reason for the abstention. Written abstention reasons shall be attached to the report.

10. EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY
The SOE Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the School of Education, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE mission affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community. For Performance Reviews, Contributions to Strategic Plans of the School, College and University\(^1\) are also evaluated.

10.0.1. Faculty who wish to be considered for early tenure or accelerated promotion must make a request in writing to the SPC chair, with copies to the SOE Director and college dean by the candidate closing date for promotion in that cycle. The Department defines “exceptional” as superior in all four categories.\(^2\) In addition, this individual, through his or her scholarly work, has made a unique contribution to the university.

\(^1\) FPPP Section 8.5. Note especially the descriptions of evaluation ratings in FPPP Section 8.5.b.1.c.
\(^2\) FPPP Sections 8.5.b.2.c.3 and 8.5.b.3.c
10.1. **Evaluation Categories and Standards**

The School of Education has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the foundation and context for interpreting the rubric. These standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.13 The elements under each standard are examples of how each standard can be demonstrated in teaching practice. The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

---

13 The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_proposition.
Within each of the three categories of Instruction, Professional Growth, and Other Contributions to the University, the candidate submits a narrative illustrating how the evidence aligns with each standard, but not necessarily each element (see table of suggested types of evidence). Included in this narrative is an instructional growth plan (a description of your plan for growth in each area, including goals, action steps and a timeline that responds to evidence from multiple sources).

The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_proposition.

**INSTRUCTION**
Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty. The area of Instruction seeks evidence of the faculty member’s professionalism and skill as an educator with respect to methodology, materials, learning activities and School standards. Models of effective teaching are complex and diversified. While the following areas related to instruction may not be exhaustive, it suggests the complexity of teaching roles. All activities legitimately a part of a candidate’s instructional assignment must be considered in the evaluation process.

**Standard 1. The candidate is committed to students and their learning.**
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
- a. Treat students equitably.
- b. Recognize individual differences.
- c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
- d. Develop students’ cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
- e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

**Standard 2. The candidate knows the content he or she teaches and how to teach the content to adult learners.**
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
- a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
- b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
- c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
- d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
- e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
- f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
- g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
- h. Create multiple paths for learning.
- i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.
Standard 3. The candidate is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to
a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student
   interest and motivation.
b. Make effective use of time.
c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.
g. Employ multiple methods for assessing and evaluating student growth and
   performance.

Standard 4. The candidate thinks systematically about his or her practice and learns from
experience.
Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to
a. Model the professional dispositions he/she seeks to inspire in students (e.g., curiosity,
   honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth
   (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take
   risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).
c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning,
   content, and instruction.
d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment,
   and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the
following types and sources of evidence. The faculty member’s narrative for Instruction should
explain how the submitted evidence meets each standard. All required evidence elements must
be included. Elements listed as Additional Evidence are suggested items that may or may not be
included, at faculty discretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations of teaching by Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection upon Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET’s)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development, including creating new courses, substantial course revision,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
new courses, substantial course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement or program cohesion

Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement and inclusion of diverse experiences

University Supervision evaluations

Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g. team teaching or guest presentations)

Reflections on Peer Observations (conducted by either university colleagues or K-12 personnel)

Evidence of using data to inform instructional practices (e.g., student outcome data)

Evidence of student growth in response to faculty feedback on an assignment

Letters from students (unsolicited) and/or public school personnel (for supervisors of student teachers) that address strengths not otherwise addressed in the evidence

Short audio or video footage of instruction, with reflective commentary

*Student evaluations of faculty data shall be used, but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate’s knowledge of his/her field. The candidate should provide a summary of student evaluation of faculty data (from SET) that includes calculation of averages.¹⁴

Rubric for Category I. Instruction

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or <strong>minimal</strong> evidence that the faculty member has met all four standards. Some or all of the <strong>required</strong> evidences are missing.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all four standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards. All four of the <strong>required</strong></td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level and one or more <strong>approaching an exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by all</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at an <strong>exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁴ FPPP Section 8.5.a.16.
| types of evidence are included. | standards is substantiated by all four of the required types of evidence and some additional types of evidence. | four of the required types of evidence and some additional types of evidence. |

**PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT**

The area of Professional Growth and Achievement seeks evidence of the faculty member’s professional development through scholarly activity, including independent scholarship and scholarship undertaken in collaboration with professional colleagues and students, related to professional contributions to students, the discipline of education and the professional community, in accordance with the School of Education mission. Research agendas that benefit from collaborative and interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and recognized accordingly in the evaluation process.

**Standard 1. The candidate contributes to scholarship related to his or her area of expertise.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:

- a. Engage in professional research and writing
- b. Exhibit or present scholarly or discipline-based products
- c. Demonstrate currency in his or her field
- d. Contribute to changing theory, practice or policy

**Standard 2. The candidate contributes professionally to the discipline and the professional community.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:

- a. Participate in professional organizations
- b. Enhance scholarship and resources through grants and contracts
- c. Provide scholarly leadership in the education community
- d. Engage in interdisciplinary and collaborative activities

For the duration of the appointment, professional growth and achievement will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The column on the left lists specific examples of achievement in each category (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), not necessarily in order of importance. Some of the examples represent a range of significance to the field. In those cases, the example on the right is considered to have a greater weight than the example on the left. Items on the right and those without a separating line may be viewed as examples of the “exemplary” types of criteria included in the rubric below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Types of Evidence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Examples of Achievement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles published in professional journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter in book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in local media or newsletters that help to educate others about the school’s mission/work, such as articles that relate to diversity and civic engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Presentations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at professional conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grants and contracts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship related to grant or contract work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Scholarly Activity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author of reviews of other’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly collaboration with students such as joint research and publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of accreditation documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and consulting in the education community including the CSU, Chico service area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional awards for scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce research and publications related to service learning, such as measuring the effectiveness of service-learning and discussing the results in the context of a broader subject matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or <strong>minimal</strong> evidence that the faculty member has met both standards. Some or all of the <strong>required</strong> evidences are missing.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level and one or more <strong>approaching an exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is substantiated by the evidence.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met both standards at an <strong>exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by the evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY
The area of Other Contributions to the University and Community evaluates the faculty member’s service to the department, college, university and community especially in regard to active participation as a team member in the department, especially in regard to active participation as a team member in the department (which may include mentoring of incoming faculty), and service in governance on department, college and university committees. The School of Education encourages civic engagement and values mutually beneficial partnerships that align the teaching and research agenda of the university and the self-identified interests of the communities of its region.

**Standard 1. The candidate engages collaboratively, creatively and productively in the work of the department, college, and university.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Provide service to the institution through committee work.
   b. Provide service to the institution through advising.
   c. Provide service to the institution through department, college or university leadership.
   d. Provide service to the institution through active participation in institutional, state and national accreditation and program reviews.

**Standard 2. The candidate contributes to the learning community through outreach and services. Reviewers will assess quality, quantity and relevance of these activities.**

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to:
   a. Participate in K-12 schools.
   b. Participate in the community at large.
For the duration of the appointment, other contributions to the university and community will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence (not listed in order of importance or weight). Elements are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of participation in the teamwork of School of Education programs and projects, (especially as they relate to the SOE mission, university strategic priorities, and campus diversity action plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments of program coordinators and others on participation in department programs and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising of credential candidates and chairing MA advisory committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal advising of students, particularly those from under-represented populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on MA advisory committees for graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected or appointed membership on department, college and university committees, committee leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of teaching, collaboration and service, in and outside the School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in activities with K-12 schools and the community at large, including work that promotes democratic education principles and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of accreditation materials for national and state reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric for Category III. Other Contributions to the University and Community

For the duration of the appointment, performance in Other Contributions will be assessed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or <strong>minimal</strong> evidence that the faculty member has met all four standards. Some or all of the <strong>required</strong> evidences are missing.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all four standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards. All five of the <strong>required</strong> types of evidence are included.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at a <strong>satisfactory</strong> level and one or more <strong>approaching an exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is substantiated by all five of the <strong>required</strong> types of evidence and some <strong>additional</strong> types of evidence.</td>
<td>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at an <strong>exemplary</strong> level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by all five of the <strong>required</strong> types of evidence and some <strong>additional</strong> types of evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTRIBUTIONS TO STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (Addressed for Performance Reviews Only)
Standard 1. The candidate demonstrates responsibility for assisting the department in sustaining and advancing its mission and goals and conforming to university strategic plans. \(^{15}\)

The candidate is expected to address how data in Categories I - III provide evidence of involvement in accomplishing the mission of the SOE as well as university strategic plans. As part of a Performance Review, the SPC is charged with determining whether the faculty member has met this responsibility.

Elements for Standard 1. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to
a. Contribute to achieving the SOE’s missions.
b. Contribute to achieving university strategic plans.

Suggested Types of Evidence
Evidence of contributions to goals and plans should include a brief narrative that guides the SPC to accomplishments and activities related to specific department and university goals and plans related to diversity, civic engagement, and sustainability. This narrative will normally include items that have been referenced in evaluation Categories I through III. Refer to Section 1 for the School of Education mission statement. See Appendix D for the University Strategic Plan for the Future.

11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

11.1 As per FPPP Section 8.5.a.17 and DPPP Section 10.2. “Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty.” In the area of Instruction, “an evaluation of ‘effective’ is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.”

11.2 As per FPPP Section 8.5.b.2.e.5, “Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation, and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.”

11.3 In all areas of evaluation, ratings must be adequate, effective, or superior for tenure and promotion to Associate or full Professor. A rating of inadequate in any area does not meet the minimum level of achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. The overall evaluation must average ‘effective’ across all categories for tenure and promotion. Evaluation ratings may be a combination of adequate, effective and superior the mean of which is effective overall. The following combinations of ratings are equivalent to an overall mean of effective:
- Three ratings of effective;
- One superior, one adequate, and one effective (Instruction must be at least effective);
- or
- Two superiors, one adequate (Instruction must be at least effective).

\(^{15}\) The University Strategic Plan is available at [http://www.esuchico.edu/prs/](http://www.esuchico.edu/prs/).
12.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY
Tenured faculty members undergoing periodic evaluation are reviewed in accordance with policies, procedures and criteria as described in the FPPP, Section 8.6.c. Faculty members should also consult the DPPP (especially Sections 7 and 10) for departmental standards. Reviews are conducted on a timeline that insures completion and filing of the evaluation report in the spring semester by the date established by the university.

12.1. The Post Tenure Review Committee contacts each faculty member to be evaluated in writing during the fall semester with procedures for the evaluation, a list of materials requested by the committee, and the assignment of a committee member to make a classroom observation.

12.2. Faculty members submit, to the chair of their review committee, a brief summary of academic activities aligned with evaluation areas in Section 10 of this document, a current professional vita, syllabi of current courses, and descriptions of student assignments and assessments.

12.3. A member of the Post Tenure Review Committee makes a classroom observation of the faculty member following procedures in Section 7 of this document.

12.4. The Post Tenure Review Committee examines materials submitted by the faculty member and the Working Personnel Action File, meets with the faculty member, and writes a report as described in FPPP Section 8.6.b.4. The committee report is forwarded to the college dean.

13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED
For policies and procedures not addressed in this document the School of Education will apply policies and procedures in the FPPP.