INTRODUCTION

Decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion in the Department of Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management (RECR) are based on the department mission, as well as the mission and strategic plan of California State University, Chico, the 2013-2014 Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) manual, and this document.

Mission Statement: The primary mission of the Department of Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management at California State University, Chico is to improve the quality of life for the people of California. A secondary mission is to improve the quality of life for the nation and the international community. This is to be accomplished through: (1) providing high quality educational opportunities for students and professionals in California, the nation, and the world who develop, manage, and evaluate recreation, park, special event, tourism, and hospitality services; (2) providing an environment and resources (technological and other) that facilitate the creation, accumulation, dissemination, application, and conservation of knowledge in these areas; and (3) providing leadership and assistance in addressing these areas as they affect the quality of life, the environment and economic development.

THE CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Department of Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management has the responsibility of evaluating faculty candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion. Faculty elected to serve on the Personnel committee must:

- Maintain confidentiality about candidates, evidence, and deliberations.
- Mentor candidates in the presentation of evidence in the dossier and insure that the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) “accurately reflects the full performance record” (FPPP 8.1.a.6).
- Critically evaluate the quality, quantity (FPPP 8.5.a.16.a), and originality of the faculty member’s performance based upon documented evidence.
- Understand and apply department standards for retention, tenure, and promotion.
- Evaluate a candidate based on the formative or developmental feedback reported in previous performance evaluations created by the department chair and department personnel committee.
- Assign specific FPPP summary evaluation ratings (Superior, Effective, Adequate, and Inadequate) for each of three areas (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community) of faculty performance.
- Justify evaluation ratings in each of the areas by referencing specific criteria for performance evaluation.
- State whether the candidate has provided evidence of Contribution to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University (FPPP8.5.b.1.d).
- Submit a minority report when a committee member does not agree with the approved report.
- Maintain communication with subsequent levels of review throughout the process.

**DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO BE USED IN EVALUATION BY THE DEPARTMENT RTP COMMITTEE**

The committee evaluation will be based upon the evidence presented in the dossier and WPAF. The evaluation should take into consideration the candidate’s rank, workload, assigned time, and previous developmental feedback. Various aspects of documented activities should be considered including the following: quality, quantity, originality, relative role of the faculty member (e.g., authorship, contributor, officer), rigor of external review, and prestige. Specific guidelines for evaluations follow.

**Instruction**

Effective instruction* is indispensable for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty. Instruction is defined as classroom and related instructional activities (in-person and on-line), supervision of internships, and graduate instruction.

1. The candidate’s dossier shall contain material to document undergraduate instructional effectiveness, including, but not limited, to:
   a. Evidence of ability to plan and prepare a course for delivery. Evidence includes course syllabi and course materials in either hard copy or electronic form. This evidence will be evaluated and rated by the personnel committee as “Superior”, “Effective”, “Adequate”, or “Inadequate”. A written rationale must accompany the rating.
   b. Evidence of ability to present content effectively, as demonstrated by peer observations and student evaluations**. Based on this evidence, a rating of “Superior”, “Effective”, “Adequate”, or “Inadequate” will be assigned by the personnel committee. A written rationale must accompany the rating.
   c. Evidence of direct outcomes assessments of course objectives and course adjustments when indicated. The direct outcomes assessments will be presented through outcome assessment rubrics. This evidence will be evaluated and rated by the personnel committee as “Superior”, “Effective”, “Adequate”, or “Inadequate”. A written rationale must accompany the rating.

2. Evidence of effectiveness in graduate instruction. Evaluation of faculty contribution to graduate study requires criteria different from those used at the undergraduate level. Evidence of achievement may include (but is not limited to) the following:
   - Service as chair of theses.
   - Service as a member of thesis committees in the major and in other majors.
   - Supervision of graduate student research through grants, contracts, or independent studies.
   - Supervision of non-credit seminars or other programs for graduate students.
   - Shared authorship with graduate students of papers, presentations, and other scholarly works.
   - Instruction of graduate-level courses
3. In order to assess the effectiveness of instruction in on-line courses, additional and/or substitute methods of data gathering likely will be necessary. For example, while some on-line courses include real-time instruction by the faculty member – allowing for the equivalent of a peer visitation – other courses might consist of asynchronous content exclusively. Keeping with the general principle that the candidate, with the department’s assistance, is to provide a sufficient evidentiary basis for evaluation, the faculty member should keep transcripts of his/her interactions with students via email, virtual office hours, discussion rooms, etc. If recorded “lectures” are available to students as part of the course, those recordings should be made available to evaluators (FPPP 8.5.a.17.b).

In assessing the effectiveness of the candidate’s instruction in on-line courses, evaluators should be guided by the standards implicitly and explicitly stated in the University’s ‘Rubric for Online Instruction’ (http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/roi). Given that a course may not exclusively be on-line, the evaluators should weigh the relevance of the Rubric as appropriate for each course (FPPP 8.5.a.17.c).

4. Additional documentation that may be appropriate to consider under instruction may include, but is not limited to, the following:
   a. Evidence of ability to supervise student research and independent study.
   b. Evidence of ability to relate the discipline to other disciplines and fields of endeavor by participation in interdisciplinary programs, seminars, and forums.

* All three areas of instruction (Planning, Presenting, and Outcomes Assessment) must be rated as at least “effective” to meet the standard of effective instruction.

** Student Evaluations of Faculty data (SETs) shall be used, but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness (FPPP 8.5.a.17.a).

**Professional Growth and Achievement**

Professional growth refers to those activities that have increased the personal academic competence of the faculty member. Professional achievement refers to the faculty member’s contribution to the knowledge base, theoretical and practical, of the field.

Peer, blind-reviewed journal articles are the hallmark of professional growth and achievement. Because of the diverse nature of our profession, other contributions are also recognized. Validation of rigor and quality must be provided by the candidate.

Scholarly contributions are scaled as data. Quality of scholarship is demonstrated by achievement in Area 1 and Area 2 (with Area 1 carrying more weight than Area 2).

**Area 1**
- Peer, blind-reviewed reputable regional, national, or international professional journal articles
- Books (textbook, scholarly book with respected publisher)
- Chapters in edited scholarly books with respected publishers
- Editor or Associate Editor of professional journals or scholarly books with respected publishers
- Peer, blind-reviewed presentations at international or national conferences
- Internationally- and nationally- competitive external grants awarded
Area 2
- Award for academic video/CD/software/web, international, national, regional, or state
- Competitive external and internal grants awarded regionally or at the state level
- Peer, blind-reviewed poster sessions
- Presentations
  - Keynote (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Peer, blind-reviewed presentations at regional and state conferences
  - Non-peer, blind-reviewed presentations (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Invited (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Workshops (international, national, regional, and state)
- Articles
  - Practitioner publications (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Technical reports (international, national, regional, and state)
- Reviewer for professional journals (international, national, regional, and state)
- Reviewer for conference research sessions (international, national, regional, and state)
- Curriculum revision (international, national, or state)
- Relevant professional certifications (international, national, regional, and state)

Area 3
- Presentations (local)
- Non-practitioner publications (e.g., magazines, newsletters, newspapers, technical reports)
- Self-published book in academic area of expertise
- Internationally- or nationally-competitive external grant submissions
- Local academic video/CD/software/web
- Local or internal grants or research contracts awarded
- Local grant proposals submitted
- Professional conference participation
- Continuing education
- Consultations (international, national, regional, state, and local)

Other Contributions to the University and Community
RECR faculty should provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, the profession, and the community beyond the university.
- Department committees and assignments (advising, accreditation, curriculum)
- College committees and assignments
- University committees and assignments
- External or university award for service/advising
- Officer or board member in professional societies (international, national, regional, state)
- Editor of professional website
- Official advisor/sponsor of student organizations or clubs
- Community service
- Student recruitment
- Fundraising
Contributions to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University
The candidate’s dossier shall contain documentary materials to show, where feasible, areas of academic expertise and the relationship of those areas to the approved department and university strategic plans.

RATINGS

Following the evaluation, the committee must select the corresponding ratings (Superior, Effective, Adequate, and Inadequate) based on the descriptions in the FPPP section 8.5.b.1.c. Key adjectives and phrases from this section of the FPPP for each rating are in quotation marks, with typical examples below:

Superior: “excellence” and an “evidentiary record”
Instruction: “consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards”
Consistently high peer, chair, and SET’s evaluations
Meets or exceeds an overall 90% average of the outcomes for all courses taught
Professional Growth and Achievement: “significant and highly regarded”
“consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community”
Record of multiple and high-quality Area 1 contributions
Other Contributions to the University: “high level of involvement” and “key roles on significant university-, college-, or department-level committees”
Consistent leadership in university, college or department committees

Effective: “competence” and “impressive and valued contribution”
Instruction: “substantial professionalism and competence”
Strong peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials
Meets or exceeds an overall 80% average of the outcomes for all courses taught
Professional Growth and Achievement: “substantial significant scholarly achievement”
Multiple Area 1 contributions and some Area 2 contributions
Other Contributions to the University: “consistent” and “occasional assumption of key roles”
Service with some leadership on department, college, or university committees

Adequate: “satisfactory and acceptable”
Instruction: “satisfactory level of professionalism”
Average peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials
Meets or exceeds an overall 70% average of the outcomes for all courses taught
Professional Growth and Achievement: “some scholarly achievement”
Minimal Area 1 contributions and some Area 2 contributions
Other Contributions to the University: “occasional involvement” and “infrequent assumption of key roles”
Consistent attendance and contributions to committees
Inadequate: “less-than-satisfactory”

Instruction: “evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level”
Substantially low peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials
Meets less than an overall 70% average of the outcomes for all courses taught
Professional Growth and Achievement: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly achievement”
Minimal evidence of contributions at Area 1 or 2 during the first two years. No evidence of contributions in Area 1 by the third year.
Other Contributions to the University: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement”
Inconsistent or non-participation in department and committee meetings

EXPECTATIONS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

In relation to recommendations on retention, tenure and promotion the committee should follow the guidelines of FPPP. Specific guidelines for retention, tenure and promotion in RECR include:

- **Retention** – Candidate must be rated “Effective” in “Instruction” and “Adequate” in the other two RTP categories. During the first two years of the normal six-year tenure-track probation period, evidence of contributions in Area 3 will be accepted as demonstrating movement toward Area 1 and/or Area 2 contributions in Professional Growth and Achievement. After the third year, the candidate must provide evidence of work in-progress or completed that will result in original, peer, blind-reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the candidate’s capability to be an independent, contributing scholar in Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management in Area 1.

- **Tenure** – Candidate must be rated “Superior” in one and at least “Effective” in the other two RTP categories. Candidate must provide evidence of original peer, blind-reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the candidate’s capability to be an independent, contributing scholar in Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management. Candidate must have a minimum of 12 points during the period of review in Professional Growth and Achievement of which 6 points must be in Area 1. The other 6 points may be from Area 1 and Area 2. The policies and guidelines in FPPP 8.5.b.2.d determine the “period of review” for tenure.

Candidate is referred to the “Other Contributions to the University Points” section later in this document to determine the number of points needed for various ratings in the “Other Contributions to the University” category.

- **Promotion to Associate Professor** – Candidate must be rated “Superior” in one and at least “Effective” in the other two RTP categories. Candidate must provide evidence of original peer, blind-reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the candidate’s capability to be an independent, contributing scholar in Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management. Candidate must have a minimum of 12 points during the period of review.
in Professional Growth and Achievement of which 6 points must be in Area 1. The other 6 points may be from Area 1 and Area 2. The policies and guidelines in FPPP 8.5.b.2.e determine the “period of review” for promotion.

Candidate is referred to the “Other Contributions to the University Points” section later in this document to determine the number of points needed for various ratings in the “Other Contributions to the University” category.

- **Promotion to Professor** - Candidate must be rated “Superior” in at least one two of the three RTP categories, and at least “Effective” in the other RTP category. Candidate must have a minimum of 14 points during the period of review in Professional Growth and Achievement since promotion to Associate Professor. A minimum of 8 of the 14 points must be from Area 1. The other 6 points may be from Area 1 and Area 2. The policies and guidelines in FPPP 8.5.b.2.e determine the “period of review” for promotion.

Candidate is referred to the “Other Contributions to the University Points” section later in this document to determine the number of points needed for various ratings in the “Other Contributions to the University” category.

- **Early Tenure and/or Promotion** – The FPPP states that candidates applying for early tenure or promotion must meet a higher standard of “exceptional merit.” RECR will consider these cases where there is abundant and unequivocal evidence of exceptional merit. Exceptional merit is defined as “Superior” performance in all three RTP categories.

### Professional Growth and Achievement Points:

#### Area 1

**Two Points**
- Peer, blind-reviewed reputable national or international professional journal articles (Sole author or lead author)
- Books (textbook, scholarly book with respected publisher)
- Editor of professional journals or scholarly books with respected publishers

**One Point**
- Peer, blind-reviewed reputable national or international professional journal articles (Non-lead author)
- Peer, blind-reviewed reputable regional professional journal articles (Sole author or lead author)
- Chapters in edited scholarly books with respected publishers
- Associate editor of professional journals or scholarly books with respected publishers
- Peer, blind reviewed presentations at international or national conference
- Competitive grants awarded internationally and nationally

#### Area 2

**One-Half (1/2) Point**
- Peer, blind-reviewed reputable regional professional journal articles (Non-lead author)
- Award for academic video/CD/software/web at international, national, regional, or state level
• Competitive grants awarded regionally or at the state level
• Peer, blind-reviewed poster sessions
• Presentations
  - Keynote (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Peer, blind-reviewed presentations at regional and state conferences
  - Non-peer, blind-reviewed presentations (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Invited (international, national, regional, and state)
  - Workshops (international, national, regional, and state)
• Articles
  - Practitioner publications (international, national, regional, and state level)
  - Technical reports (international, national, regional, and state level)
• Reviewer for professional journals (international, national, regional, and state level)
• Reviewer for conference research sessions (international, national, regional, and state level)
• Curriculum revision (international, national, or state level)
• Relevant professional certifications (international, national, regional, and state level)

Other Contributions to the University Points:

Points are calculated on an annual basis. A minimum of 50% of the required annual points must be from within the university. The other 50% may be from within and/or outside the university.

For consideration for Tenure, Associate Professor, and Professor, the candidate must achieve the following average of annual points for the period of review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate (Below)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points from within the university:

Five Points
- Department Chair
- Member Academic Senate

Four Points
- Chair Department Personnel Committee
- Chair College Personnel Committee
- Lead on Department Accreditation Report
- Chair, Dean Search Committee

Three Points
- Member Department Personnel Committee
- Member College Personnel Committee
- Chair Department Curriculum Committee
- Lead on Department Outcomes reporting
- Member Dean Search Committee

Two Points
- Member Department Curriculum Committee
- Chair Faculty Search Committee

One Point
- All other University, College or Department Committees

**Points from outside the university:** (Note: For the points below to count, the organizations listed below need to relate to the profession and/or the faculty member’s teaching assignment or research)

Four Points
- Officer Professional International or National Organization

Three Points
- Committee Chair Professional International or National Organization
- Officer Professional Regional or State Organization

Two Points
- Committee Member Professional International or National Organization
- Committee Chair Professional Regional or State Organization
- Board Member related to the profession

One Point
- Advisory Committee Member of organization related to the profession
- University/Department promotion booths at external fairs, trade shows, and/or professional conferences
- Committee Member Professional State or Regional Organization