



California State University **Chico**

College of Agriculture 2023-2024

Department Standards: FPPP reference guide to RTP and Evaluation

All general personnel procedures and practices in the department shall be governed and guided by university guidelines set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Unit 3), CSU Chico's Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP), and campus Executive Memoranda. The following guidelines are provided as a reference guide to the FPPP sections that govern evaluations of tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty.

Standards must be compliant with the CBA and the FPPP. Conflicts between these standards and the CBA or the FPPP will be resolved pursuant to the CBA and then FPPP

Provisional Standard approved 8-21-23 for AY 23/24 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 8-21-23 memo and attachments.

Standards must be compliant with the CBA and the FPPP. Conflicts between these standards and the CBA or the FPPP will be resolved pursuant to the CBA and then FPPP.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| GLOSSARY OF TERMS | 3 |
| PART I GENERAL INFORMATION AND DEFINITIONS..... | 4 |
| PART II THE PERSONNEL PROCESS..... | 6 |
| PART III GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES..... | 9 |
| PART IV RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION..... | 11 |
| GENERAL REQUIREMENTS | 11 |
| AREAS REVIEWED | 11 |
| <i>Lecturer Faculty</i> | 11 |
| <i>Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty</i> | 11 |
| PERFORMANCE STANDARDS | 13 |
| <i>Lecturer Faculty</i> | 13 |
| <i>Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty</i> | 13 |
| SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS..... | 15 |
| PART V COLLEGE GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING YOUR CV AND DOSSIER | 16 |
| PART VI EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS..... | 19 |
| INSTRUCTION | 19 |
| <i>Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.</i> | 19 |
| <i>Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.</i> | 19 |
| <i>Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.</i> | 20 |
| <i>Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.</i> | 20 |
| <i>Rubric for Instruction</i> | 22 |
| PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT..... | 23 |
| <i>Area A: Research Agenda Narrative</i> | 23 |
| <i>Area B: High Quality/Impact</i> | 24 |
| <i>Area C: Other Professional Growth and Achievement Activities</i> | 24 |
| <i>Rubric for Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)</i> | 26 |
| SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE) | 28 |
| <i>Standard 1. Service to the Institution</i> | 28 |
| <i>Standard 2. Service Outside the Institution</i> | 29 |
| <i>Rubric for Service</i> | 30 |
| APPENDIX | 33 |
| PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING | 33 |

Glossary of Terms

| <u>Acronym</u> | <u>Translation</u> |
|-----------------------|--|
| AY | Academic Year |
| AA/S | Administrative Assistant/Specialist |
| COA | College of Agriculture |
| CBA | Collective Bargaining Agreement (Union agreement between CSU & faculty, a.k.a. Contract or Agreement) |
| CV | Curriculum Vitae |
| FLRC | First-Level Personnel Review Committee (same as Department Personnel Committee) |
| FPPP | Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (Local Academic Senate, Union, and Administration Agreement, CSU Chico specific) |
| PAF | Personnel Action File |
| RTP | Retention, Tenure, and Promotion |
| SLRC | Second-Level Personnel Review Committee (same as College Personnel Committee) |
| WPAF | Working Personnel Action File |

Part I General Information and Definitions

Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

Faculty are obligated to follow the current CBA. The current CBA for Unit 3 faculty in the California State University system is located at the California Faculty Association (CFA) website <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx>. A link to the CBA may also be found from the Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) website <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/labor-relations-info/collective-bargaining.shtml>.

Dossier

See FPPP Definitions for an explanation of the dossier.

Equivalency

The College of Agriculture does not recognize any equivalent attainment of terminal degree for appointment of tenure track faculty.

Evidentiary Materials

FPPP Section 8.1 *Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence* describes broadly the evidence required for submission to the WPAF. Faculty candidates undergoing review should also submit supporting evidentiary materials corresponding to the Data for Evaluation Rubrics (instruction, professional growth & achievement, and service).

According to FPPP 8.1.1.b.1 the Department should assist the candidate in making certain that the WPAF accurately reflects the full performance record for the evaluation period. Ultimately, though, it is the candidate's responsibility to see that all materials favorable to retention, tenure, and/or promotion are included in the WPAF.

Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP)

Faculty are obligated to follow the current FPPP. The current FPPP is linked from the Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) website <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/labor-relations-info/fppp.shtml>.

Joint Faculty Appointments

Per FPPP 5.1.1.c. an initial tenure-track appointment may be made jointly in more than one academic department or equivalent unit. The proportion of the assignment and subsequent service obligations shall be explicitly defined in the Memorandum of Understanding between the appointee and their Department Chairs and Dean(s), at the time of appointment or as requested by joint appointees. The review of a jointly appointed tenure track faculty shall follow FPPP 10.1.10 and 10.4.4.c.4. For tenured faculty jointly appointed in the College of Agriculture the review should follow FPPP 10.1.10.

Period of Review

The period of review for a faculty candidate shall be in accordance to FPPP 10.1.11, 10.4.4.a and 11.1.2 as applicable to the rank and tenure status of the candidate.

Personnel Action File (PAF)

When a faculty is first hired to work in the College of Agriculture, a Personnel Action File (PAF) is created specifically for that person. If this person teaches in multiple departments or colleges, they will have multiple PAFs, one for each department in which they have an appointment.

See CBA, Article 11, for additional CSU information regarding personnel action files. See FPPP Section 7.0 *Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)*, for additional campus information regarding personnel action files.

Range for Lecturer (Temporary) Faculty Contracts

See FPPP Definition of *Range* for description and numeric designations for range equivalencies (e.g. Range/Grade number on Lecturer contract and its equivalent letter). Lecturer Range in the College of Agriculture shall follow FPPP 5.2.5 *University Appointment Standards for Lecturer Ranges*. RTP Process

RTP Calendar

The RTP Deadline Calendar for the current academic year is located in FPPP Appendix 6 and is typically also linked from the main Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) website <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/>

Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

See FPPP Definitions for an explanation of the Working Personnel Action File. See also CBA Article 2 definition of Personnel Action File for additional explanation of the WPAF. The WPAF is a combination of the faculty's PAF and dossier. All recommendations and decisions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion shall be based upon information contained in your WPAF. Once the WPAF has closed per RTP calendar, additional information can be added only under provisions set by FPPP 8.1.2.b. within FPPP 8.1.2 *Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence – The PAF and WPAF*.

Part II The Personnel Process

The College Office assists with coordination of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process with the appropriate faculty member under review and the Personnel Review Committees. According to the FPPP Introduction “No later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term, evaluation criteria, and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee (CBA 15.3). The faculty and COA program coordinator/department chair (Chair) must sign an Affirmation statement that these criteria include the CBA, the FPPP, and the current Department standards. Probationary faculty may retain the right to use the Department standards and procedures that were current when they started their employment.” The same rule shall apply to lecturer (temporary) faculty.

See FPPP Section 4. *Personnel Committees* for information on personnel review committees. See COA Faculty Constitution for information on how the FLRC and SLRC are constituted. In the College of Agriculture, the Program Coordinator or Chair typically serve as a member of the FLRC.

Candidate Review and Preparation of PAF and Dossier (WPAF)

All candidate faculty undergoing review (Lecturer, Tenure-Track, and Tenured) should review their PAF and request additions of documentation as needed (e.g. contracts, special contracts, faculty learning community (FLC) contracts, addition of current CV, etc.). The candidate faculty should prepare their Dossier (component of the WPAF) per the chronological description and instructions on how to prepare the Dossier in the “College Guidelines for Preparing your CV and Dossier” section below.

Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of Probationary Faculty

For more information on the performance and periodic review timeline, see FPPP 10.2 *Evaluation of Probationary Faculty – Performance Reviews*. Probationary tenure-track faculty, who are given a multi-year contract are subject to periodic review during their first, third, and fifth years on campus. Periodic evaluations are primarily developmental in nature and no retention decisions are made at this time. Probationary faculty are required to complete all the PAF and Dossier steps; however, these periodic reviews are completed only by the FLRC and the Dean. Probationary tenure-track faculty, who are given a multi-year contract are subject to performance reviews for the purpose of a retention decision during their second, fourth, and sixth years of employment on campus. Probationary faculty per CBA Article shall have an opportunity to respond to any review level report within the specified timeline.

The following is a brief chronological description of the RTP Process. See FPPP Section 4.2 *Personnel Committees – Procedures* and Section 3.0 *Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning – University Committee and General Procedures*.

During the fall semester faculty receive a timeline for the process based on the campus RTP Calendar published in the FPPP Appendices and modified by the College Office in consultation with OAPL given that the Chair in Agriculture does not write a separate report. There may be several levels of review, pending the type of review being performed. ***Per CBA Article 15 the candidate shall have an opportunity to respond to any review level report within the specified timeline.***

Throughout the process, faculty can consult with their faculty mentor and the Personnel Review Committees as well as these standards for dossier preparation (see FPPP 8.1.1.b.1 within Section 8.1.1 *Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence – General Considerations*). In addition, candidate faculty are encouraged to request dossier pre-submission meetings with the FLRC in the semester prior to dossier submission. The goal of these meetings is to inform candidates whether they meet, or not, the expectations in all areas of evaluation as well as indicate aspects that can be improved before the final evaluation.

Once the WPAF has been officially submitted, the FLRC will review the materials. They will conduct a classroom observation(s) and will hold an interview with the faculty member before submitting their report the candidate faculty member's PAF. Per CBA, copies of peer evaluations and reports will be provided to the faculty member prior to being entered into the candidate's PAF.

For performance reviews, the SLRC will review the candidate, followed by the Dean. At each level of review, the reviewing bodies are expected to review the candidate faculty member WPAF, any applicable report(s) from prior reviewing bodies, and write an independent report that is submitted to the candidate faculty member's PAF.

The final review level is by the President's designee (typically the Provost). The WPAF will be forwarded for review and decision. The Provost will then notify the faculty member of their decision (retention, tenure, or promotion) in writing and copies of this decision are entered into the PAF.

Periodic Evaluations of Tenured Faculty

Per FPPP 11.2, "For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member's effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to periodic evaluation at intervals no greater than five-years. Note that the focus of this review should be on providing developmental feedback and encouragement to maintain a positive level of performance. Where appropriate, the review provides an opportunity for those colleagues to express their appreciation to the faculty member for their continued positive contributions to the University. It is recognized that, where necessary, the review will include corrective feedback."

Per FPPP 11.2.1.b, "This policy shall apply to faculty at the rank of Professor (or equivalent) and faculty in ranks below that of Professor (or equivalent) who have not undergone performance review for four years."

The FLRC, or a subcommittee thereof, will serve as the evaluation

committee which in this case shall consist of tenured faculty only of equal or higher rank than the faculty under review. The committee shall consist of at least three members and may contain tenured faculty from other colleges representing related disciplines provided they do not form a majority (unless COA does not have an adequate number of qualified faculty). Members of the committee who are undergoing a fifth-year evaluation cannot participate in their own evaluation.

A. Data for Evaluation

The committee shall collect all data which are pertinent to the evaluation of the quality of instruction, professional development, and service. These data shall be representative of the faculty member's responsibilities and activities since the last performance review. Data shall include those described under Evaluation Criteria and Rankings.

Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer (Temporary) Faculty

For more information on the performance and periodic review timeline, see FPPP Section 9.0 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*. Frequency of Lecturer Faculty evaluations shall follow FPPP 9.1.4 *Evaluation of lecturer Faculty – Procedures*.

Lecturer faculty are required to review their PAF and draft a Dossier. Lecturers should refer to the current RTP calendar for timeline of review cycle, and should inquire with the Chair or College Office on specific review calendar adjustments for the College of Agriculture (FPPP 9.1.4).

According to FPPP 9.1 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness*, the areas of performance to be included in the periodic evaluations of each Lecturer Faculty shall be consistent with, and inclusive of, the individual's assigned duties, as specified at the time of hire. Lecturers should review stipulations stated in their contract for this information (e.g. WTU for instruction or other duties specifically defined).

Per FPPP 9.1.3 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Records*, the periodic evaluation of Lecturer Faculty will result in a performance report, but no recommendation regarding future employment will be made. The FLRC report for years 1-5 will include a narrative as to whether the performance was satisfactory. The FLRC report for 3rd and 6th year Lecturer reviews will include a rating of **satisfactory or unsatisfactory**. The Second-Level Personnel Review Committee and Provost are not involved in periodic evaluations of Lecturer Faculty reviews.

The Personnel Committee will submit a report of its findings to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the College personnel file. The Dean will review the report and enter it into the PAF, with the appropriate notice to the candidate. Lecturer Faculty will be provided with copies of the report and have the right to respond.

A. Data for Evaluation

Data used by the committee will include any documents included in the candidate's dossier, as well as information in the candidate's PAF such as CV, student feedback on teaching and learning (SFOT), peer review by the FLRC and previous evaluations. Upon receipt of the

evaluation report, the faculty member may request a meeting with the committee to discuss it, may file a written reply, or may accept the report as written. Any revision of the report shall be left to the discretion of the Personnel Committee and Dean of the College of Agriculture.

B. Range Elevation Criteria

See FPPP 12.0 *Range Elevation (Lecturers)*.

Part III Guidelines and Procedures of the College of Agriculture Personnel Committees

The Personnel Committees of the College of Agriculture are organized and function in a manner consistent with the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP). In the College of Agriculture, the Department/Unit committee will be referred to as the First Level Review Committee (FLRC). The College personnel committee will be referred to as the Second Level Review Committee (SLRC).

College guidelines for populating personnel committees are located in the College of Agriculture Faculty Constitution and are subject to FPPP regulations per Section 4.1 *Personnel Committees – Composition of Committees*.

Procedures for the personnel committees follow FPPP Section 4.0 *Personnel Committees*, Section 9 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*, Section 10 *Evaluation of Tenure Track (Probationary) Faculty*, and Section 11 *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty* with the following additional provisions. All members of the RTP process shall review these sections and other relevant sections of the FPPP prior to participating in the review process.

- Annually, one faculty member from each of the personnel committees typically volunteers to chair the committee. In the absence of a volunteer, the committee meets to nominate and elect a chair. The chair is responsible for calling the first meeting of the personnel committee to ensure members of the committee are familiar with the CBA, FPPP, and Department Standards, as well as review the list of candidate faculty under review. Generally, each candidate faculty member is assigned three members of the personnel committee which form a subcommittee of the entire personnel committee.
- Within each subcommittee a lead report writer, secretary, and, if needed, a class instruction peer reviewer is selected. The subcommittee communicates, within the appropriate timelines, directly with the candidate faculty regarding any peer evaluations of instruction and meetings with the candidate faculty. The subcommittee is responsible for submitting the draft report and recommendation on the candidate faculty to the entire personnel committee for review.
- Personnel committees shall follow FPPP Section 9 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*, Section 10 *Evaluation of Tenure Track (Probationary) Faculty*, or Section 11 *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty* for processes related to evaluation of the candidate faculty member.

- Per FPPP 10.2.6 and 11.2.4.a the personnel committee members, or the subcommittee members thereof, shall meet with the candidate faculty member after review of the WPAF but before writing its report and recommendation. The purpose of this meeting shall be to answer unresolved questions on the part of any of the participants in the retention, tenure, or promotion process. Minutes of the questions, responses and answers shall be kept. At a minimum, such minutes shall contain a written digest of the substance of the interview. Meeting minutes shall be reviewed by all members of the meeting prior to submission to the Dean's designee for administrative processing to the candidate faculty WPAF.
- The chair of the personnel committee ensures that comments and feedback from all members of the committee are considered and addressed before taking a final vote on the report and recommendation prior to submission to the Dean's designee for administrative processing to the candidate faculty PAF.
- Per FPPP 10.3.7 and 11.2.4.c committee members will normally vote for or against the report and recommendation. If a member abstains from voting, the member shall submit a written reason for the abstention. Any concurring or minority reports and recommendations shall be in writing and attached to the report.
- The report and recommendation of the SLRC may be developed in consultation with the FLRC.
- The College Dean may request consultation from the SLRC on personnel matters outside the normal retention, tenure, and promotion cycle.

Part IV Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

General Requirements

1. College members are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with the provisions on ethical behavior in the current FPPP and the pertinent campus executive orders.
2. Candidates are expected to construct their Dossier in a manner that reflects the Guidelines for Preparing your CV and Dossier (below). Materials other than those required in the Dossier can be submitted in a separate appendix.

Areas Reviewed

Lecturer Faculty

Individuals under periodic review will be evaluated on their performance and contributions in the areas below.

- Teaching performance
- Performance in non-teaching work assignments (if applicable)
- Currency in the field
- Activities or achievement that contribute to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, university and community

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

Faculty members will only be recommended for promotion on consideration of merit, with a higher degree of excellence and involvement expected at each successive rank. The concept of time is not interpreted to mean that individuals will be rewarded on the basis of length of service.

Performance reviews for most faculty will take place in years two, four, and six (unless service credit is given upon hire). Individuals under review for promotion will be evaluated on their performance and contributions in the three areas below.

- Instruction.
- Professional growth and achievement.
- Service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community (service)

Examples of evidence that will be examined by the Committee in the process of performance evaluation are described “College Guidelines for Preparing your CV and Dossier” section. Candidates may submit additional evidence not included in the rubrics for consideration.

Performance Standards

Lecturer Faculty

See FPPP 9.1.3 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Record*.

a) Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

According to FPPP 9.1.3.b, “the [FLRC] report shall contain an evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty in their work assignment(s) and a statement as to whether the performance is satisfactory. If the faculty member has not performed satisfactorily, then the reasons for this conclusion shall be included in the report.”

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

See FPPP 10.3 *Evaluation of Probationary Faculty – Performance Review Process* and 11.1.2 under *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – Performance Reviews for Promotion*.

a) Instruction:

Exceeds Expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this document (FPPP), and the CBA.

Meets expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. An evaluation of “Meets expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.

Does not meet expectations

The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.

b) 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).

- c) Service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community (service):

Exceeds expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. "Exceeds expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) assuming key roles on significant committees, (2) high levels of involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating significant activities as well as demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Meets expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's on-going involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA, participating on committees and/or in the community, "Meets expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) occasionally assuming roles on significant committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities, as well as demonstrating on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Does not meet expectations

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. "Does not

meet expectations” performance is evidenced by a lack of (1) assuming roles on committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities as well as demonstrating limited contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Specific Requirements

1. Retention, Promotion and/or Tenure
 - a. “Meets expectations” in all three areas of evaluation are the minimum requirements to warrant a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure.
2. Accelerated Tenure and Promotion for Probationary Faculty See FPPP 10.5 *Evaluation of Probationary Faculty – Outcomes: Granting of Accelerated Tenure or Promotion*
 - a. Consideration of tenure before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of early or accelerated tenure.
 - b. Any faculty member wishing to be so considered may request consideration of early tenure in writing. The FLRC may initiate early tenure consideration.
 - c. According to FPPP 10.5.3, “to qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) have been rated Exceeds expectations in a Performance Review 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.”
 - d. In as much as consideration of early tenure is not the normal pattern, each level of review must address in its reports whether the candidate's file meets the definition of exceptional record. Ultimately, the president will decide whether the candidate is granted accelerated tenure or promotion (see FPPP 10.5.5 – 10.5.8).
3. Early Promotion for Tenured Faculty

See FPPP 11.1.3. under *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – Performance Reviews for Promotion*.

The College Committees shall submit a report that clearly substantiates why a candidate Exceeds Expectations beyond the normal criteria established in the RTP cycle for all three categories of review, and demonstrate a likelihood of continued performance, and demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University.

Part V College Guidelines for Preparing your CV and Dossier

The following COA outline will assist you in formatting your Dossier to meet both the COA guidelines and the Provost's "Model Outline for a Faculty Dossier" referred to as AAO2-04.

Outline for Faculty Dossier:

See FPPP Section 8.1.3 *Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence – Dossiers*

- I. College Standards: This section will include a copy of the College RTP standards.
- II. Curriculum Vitae – **The Faculty's CV should be a comprehensive running summary of your entire academic and professional history.** It should include clearly labeled sections detailing your accomplishments.

Nearly every academic discipline follows somewhat different conventions in content and format of the *Curriculum Vitae (CV)*. Such variation is to be expected and need not present problems for readers from other disciplines, provided that the CV is well organized, neatly prepared, current, and non-redundant. Following the general guidelines below, in conjunction with the usual practices of your discipline and your College's RTP guidelines, will result in a CV that provides reviewers with the information they need about your professional accomplishments.

Your CV should include clearly labeled sections detailing your accomplishments in the areas of instruction, professional growth and achievement, and other contributions to the University and Community (see each rubric for examples).

Within each section, list entries in *reverse* chronological order. That is, list your most recent accomplishments first and your earliest accomplishments last.

III. Narrative

- A. Reflection on Integration of Teaching and Scholarship: In just a few paragraphs, please provide an overview of your professional efforts and explain how your teaching and scholarly interests relate to and support each other.
- B. Teaching Philosophy: Teaching is a reflective practice aimed at constant improvement. We would like to know the goals you set for yourself and your students, what you do to attain them, and what you do that is most effective in helping students learn. Please use the Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education or a similar framework that your department provides to guide your response.

IV. Instruction Data and Interpretation for Lecturer Faculty

See FPPP 9.1.2 *Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Categories*. Lecturers should review the details of their contract to complete sections as relevant to their appointment.

A. Teaching performance

1. Reflections on prior FLRC reviews, peer evaluations, examples of teaching improvements, syllabi, exemplar course modules,

reflections on SFOT. Per FPPP 9.1.2.c.1 “Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) shall be used, but shall not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching performance and shall not be used to determine a candidate’s knowledge of their discipline.”

2. Participation in relevant faculty learning communities (FLCs), etc.

B. Performance in non-teaching work assignments (if applicable)

1. Evidence of performance with judging teams, farm unit oversight, or other duties as specified in the contract.

2. See also FPPP 9.1.2.c.2.

C. Currency in the field

1. This section should reflect disciplinary expertise relevant to the teaching assignment and may refer to expertise included in CV.

2. See also FPPP 9.1.2.c.3 A variety of means may be used to support currency, including, but not limited to, continued education, research (broadly defined, including applied research in education), scholarship, and other creative and professional activities (e.g. conferences, conventions, congresses, webinars, etc). Expectations for activities supporting currency must be consistent with the candidate’s Range classification and responsibilities.

D. Activities or achievement that contribute to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, university and community

1. See also FPPP 9.1.2.c.4 Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, and civic engagement, and service to the North State.

2. Participation in relevant faculty learning communities (FLCs), etc.

V. Instruction Data and Interpretation for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

A. Instruction Narrative to include reflection and analysis of peer evaluations, SFOTs, and prior RTP reports (if applicable). Also include a brief description of additional course materials included in required evidence.

B. Itemized list of required evidence aligned to the four standards of teaching which includes the following:

a) Course syllabi and materials

b) Curriculum development

c) SFOTs

d) Teaching assignments

See *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings* for an in-depth description of required evidence.

- C. Itemized list of additional evidence aligned to the four standards of teaching. See *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings* for an in-depth description of additional evidence.

VI. Professional Growth and Achievement Data and Interpretation for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- A. Research agenda narrative (Area A) as described in *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings*.
- B. Itemized list of High Quality/Impact (Area B) activities, if applicable. See *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings*
- C. Itemized list of other professional growth and achievement activities (Area C) as described in *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings*.

VII. Service Data and Interpretation for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- A. Itemized list of service activities to the College and University (Standard 1) as described in *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings*
- B. Itemized list of service activities to professional or industry organizations (Standard 2) as described in *Evaluation Criteria and Ratings*.

IV. Appendix

Include any supplemental information that help to strengthen your argument for retention, tenure, and promotion. Suggestions include, syllabi, some select pieces of course content, publications, manuscripts in progress, grant notification, letters of support, etc.

Part VI Evaluation Criteria and Ratings

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 COA 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 that are a part of a candidate's instructional assignment will be considered in the evaluation process. The format below includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation drawn from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Standard 1. The faculty member 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 faculty member knows the content 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 faculty member 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 faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.

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

- a. Model the professional dispositions and to inspire these dispositions 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, performance for INSTRUCTION will be assessed for each of the four standards based on the **Rubric for Instruction** and considering the candidate's narrative as well as evidence provided (Tables 1 and 2).

The faculty member's narrative should provide a thorough justification using analysis of and reflection on their teaching practice, and reference their submitted required and additional evidence. The candidate's narrative should explicitly reference and align with the following documents: FPPP, COA PPP, the COA mission/vision, and the University Strategic Plan, and provide evidence for consideration of retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It is recommended that a candidate also review and reference previous RTP reports as appropriate.

The narrative should include, but is not limited to, a reflection and analysis

of the following:

- Peer observations
- Prior RTP reports
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) reports
- Course material provided in required evidence.

All Required Evidence (Table 1) must be included for a candidate to be considered for “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations.” Additional Evidence (Table 2) is suggested and may or may not be included at each candidate’s discretion.

| Table 1: Required Evidence (Instruction) |
|---|
| Course Syllabi (including course content) and Materials are a representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials used by the instructor to facilitate their teaching. This is where faculty provide evidence of effective pedagogy, high expectations for students, and knowledge of the discipline. |
| Evidence of curriculum development, including creating new courses, course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement, or program cohesion. |
| Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning: Using the statistical summaries for each course, as well as patterns of student comments, the reviewers shall provide an evaluation of Teaching based on the SFOT scale, with the final ranking taking into consideration patterns of student comments. |
| Teaching Assignments are a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, the number of students enrolled, and the unit value. |
| Table 2: Additional Evidence (Instruction) |
| Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules. |
| Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback. |
| Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement and inclusion of diverse experiences |
| Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g., team teaching or guest presentations). |

| |
|--|
| Reflections on invited 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 credential candidates) that address strengths not otherwise addressed in the evidence |
| Short audio or video footage of instruction, with reflective commentary |
| K-12 instruction |
| Supervision of student research, projects, and internships |
| Advisement of student organization |
| Guest lecturer on or off campus |

According to FPPP Section 9.1.2.c.1, 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 the field. The candidate should provide a summary of data from the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning surveys that includes calculation of averages.

Rubric for Instruction

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

| Does not meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|--|
| <p>The narrative and evidence demonstrate the faculty member has not met all four standards and expectations. Some or all <i>required</i> evidence (Table 1) is missing.</p> <p>Per FPPP 2022-23 10.3.3, The evidence does not demonstrate the expected level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this</p> | <p>The narrative and evidence demonstrate the faculty member has performed at a level meeting all four standards and expectations. All required evidence (Table 1) is present in the dossier.</p> <p>Per FPPP 2022-23 10.3.3, The evidence demonstrates the expected professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities,</p> | <p>The narrative and evidence demonstrate analysis and reflection of the faculty member’s teaching practice. Analysis and reflection on evidence demonstrates the faculty member has performed at a level that exceeds all four standards and expectations. All required evidence (Table 1) is</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>FPPP, and the CBA.</p> <p><i>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</i></p> | <p>and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.</p> <p><i>An evaluation of "meets expectations" performance is the minimum level of achievement required to award tenure and/or promotion.</i></p> | <p>present in the dossier.</p> <p>Per FPPP 2022-23 10.3.3, The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this document (FPPP), and the CBA.</p> |
|---|--|---|

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 and the professional community, in accordance with the COA strategic plan. Research agendas that benefit from collaborative and interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and recognized accordingly in the evaluation process.

For the duration of the appointment, Professional Growth and Achievement will be assessed using the **Rubric for Professional Growth and Achievement** based on the candidate's narrative and the types and sources of evidence provided for Areas A – C below. The items in Area A - C list specific examples in each category (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), not necessarily in order of importance. Achievements have a range of significance to the field, and the examples in Area B are considered to have a greater significance than in Area C. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to write a narrative explaining the impact of achievements. For areas B and C, multiple accomplishments of the same item are acceptable.

The candidate's narrative shall explicitly reference and align with the following documents: FPPP, COA PPP, the COA mission/vision, and the University Strategic Plan, and provide evidence for consideration of retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It is recommended that a candidate also review and reference previous RTP reports as appropriate.

Area A: Research Agenda Narrative

NOTE: this is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

Evidence of an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress. Evidence in the narrative includes the following:

- a. Purpose and audience of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative work in general (suggestion: listed as objectives).
- b. Scholarship objectives and related accomplishments toward objectives met and unmet.
- c. Potential funding sources, if applicable, contextualized to content area/discipline.
- d. Likely target venues for publications and presentations (including but not limited to conferences, workshops, and professional development venues).
- e. Likely timeline for the aforementioned outcomes.

Area B: High Quality/Impact

Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable. NOTE: this is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

- a. Author or co-author of a published book in a peer-review press (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- b. Author or co-author of a published article in a refereed journal (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- c. Author or co-author of a published book chapter (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- d. Edited or co-edited a book or special issue of a journal
- e. Secured a substantial external grant (approximately \$50,000 or more)
- f. Development of a new technology, crop, or animal variety, diagnostic technique for organism, product, or procedure

Area C: Other Professional Growth and Achievement Activities

Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable. NOTE: This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

- a. Presentation/workshop at peer-reviewed national or international conferences
- b. Acceptance or publication of at least 5 agriculture-related articles/op-eds in a newspaper or magazine
- c. Disseminated education-related research results/new ideas in a peer-review electronic venue
- d. Acceptance or publication of an encyclopedia or reference book entry of 2+ pages, or at least 3 shorter entries

- e. Acceptance or publication of a research report
- f. Acceptance or publication in an education-review anthology, journal, or other peer- review (inter)national method of dissemination
- g. Acceptance of agricultural-related art into a juried exhibition outside of the university
- h. Evidence of significant impact of previously published work/scholarly activity/juried exhibits, installations, or creative works
- i. Acceptance or publication of computer software/manual/workbook or other non-printed medium
- j. Scholarly collaboration with students such as joint research and publications/presentations
- k. Participation at state, national or international levels of accreditation
- l. Serve on a MA/PhD committee for 2 students outside of Chico State
- m. Two submissions of written work for consideration in above-listed categories, unpublished (only one submission may count toward the required number of instances)
- n. Work in progress: manuscripts or ongoing data collection for peer-reviewed article or book (only one work in progress may count toward the required number of instances)
- o. Accepted or presented a peer-reviewed paper at a national or international conference
- p. Accepted or presented two papers at a local/regional conference or meeting
- q. Presented two poster sessions at regional/national conferences
- r. Two invited presentations at a conference, campus event, symposium, workshop, or community event (not counted elsewhere)
- s. Three instances of being panelist or moderator at a professional meeting or conference
- t. Submitted an external grant proposal that was not funded (one greater than \$50k or two less than \$50k)
- u. Secured an external grant less than \$50,000
- v. Served as co-operator on a funded grant or contract (one greater than \$50k or two less than \$50k)
- k. Scholarly collaboration with students such as joint research and publications/presentations
- w. Reviewed 2 articles or books for a publisher or journal (if not listed under service)
- x. Member of a journal editorial board (if not listed under service)
- y. Member of an editorial board for an academic or literary press (if not listed under service)
- z. Panel manager or panelist of competitive grant reviews

- aa. Secured an internal grant (other than travel and/or seed funding grants)
- bb. Developed a film or other non-print media that is peer-reviewed or nationally recognized
- cc. Grant writing for an agriculture-related organization related to an area of professional interest
- dd. Organization of a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
- ee. At least 5 agriculture-related lectures to campus/class/community groups
- ff. Year-long participation and/or leadership in active coalitions or substantive collaborative work with other faculty, focusing on agriculture-related issues
- gg. Grassroots organizing with underserved communities, such as co-organizing a campaign with community leaders
- hh. Holding an appointment or being an officer in an agriculture-related organization outside of the university (if not listed under service)
- ii. Extraordinary support of retention of underserved students (not counted in the service area), such as establishing and administering a new and effective program
- jj. Curriculum materials published in a journal or book (peer-reviewed lesson plans, units, course design)
- kk. Honorary appointment such as visiting or adjunct professor
- ll. Local, state, or national award for professional activity
- mm. Participation in 3 agriculture/outreach activities in field of expertise (not counted elsewhere)
- nn. Participation in 3 professional development activities for grant writing or research publications

Rubric for Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)

For the duration of the appointment, performance in PG&A will be assessed using the following criteria:

| Performance Review | Does Not Meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>2nd Year Review</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Areas A, B and C has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations.</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND Evidence of effort/achievement in Area C (0 – 3 activities).</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND evidence in Area B in progress toward publication.</p> |
| <p>4th Year Review</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A has not met the level of expectations AND/OR the evidence in Area B is not progress toward publication.</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND evidence of progress toward publication in Area B AND evidence in Area C (1-3 activities).</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND at least 1 Area B as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> |
| <p>6th Year Retention AND Promotion Review</p> | <p>The evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A has not met the level of expectations AND/OR is missing at least 1 Area B as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectation is insufficient for granting tenure and promotion.</i></p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND lead authorship on a journal article or book (Area B) AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND at least 2 in Area B (1 as a lead author on a publication) AND at least 5 in Area C.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Full Professor Review (5 Years - during the review period)</p> | <p>The evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A has not met the level of expectations AND/OR is missing at least 1 Area B as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND at least 1 lead authorship on a journal article /book (Area B) AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> | <p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area A AND at least 2 in Area B (1 as a lead author on a publication) AND at least 5 in Area C. Additionally, the evidence clearly demonstrates substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.</p> |
|---|--|---|--|

Service That Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community (Service)

The area of Service 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 (which may include mentoring of incoming faculty), and service in governance on department, college and university committees. The COA 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.

For the duration of the appointment, performance in Service will be assessed using the **Rubric for Service** based on the candidate’s narrative and the evidence as it pertains to Standards 1 and 2 below. In each written performance review report, the evaluator(s) shall state whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to conform to University, College, and Department/Unit plans, and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College’s, and Department's/Unit’s abilities to meet their standards and strategic goals

The candidate’s narrative shall explicitly reference and align with the following documents: FPPP, COA PPP, the COA mission/vision, and the University Strategic Plan, and provide evidence for consideration of retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It is recommended that a candidate also review and reference previous RTP reports as appropriate.

Standard 1. Service to the Institution

The faculty member engages collaboratively, creatively and productively in the work of the department, college, and university that contributes to the University Strategic Plan and the COA Mission, Vision and Conceptual Framework.

Reviewers will assess quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities. Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s contributions in one or more of the following areas:

- 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. Service Outside the Institution

The faculty member contributes to the learning community and/or area of professional expertise through outreach and services that contribute to the University Strategic Plan and the COA Mission, Vision and Conceptual Framework.

Reviewers will assess quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities. Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate’s contributions in one or more of the following areas:

- a. Provide significant service through professional development, program development, or clinical services to schools or other educational agencies/organizations
- b. Making contributions in community development, such as participation in community outreach activities, and fundraising and program promotion.
- c. Consulting, providing technical assistance, and/or providing services to public and/or private organizations (uncompensated).
- d. Significant contributions/service on national organization boards.
- e. Peer-reviews/Editor (if not listed under PG&A).
- f. Mass media contributions (such as op-eds, letters to the editor not listed under PG&A).

For the duration of the appointment, performance for Service will be assessed using the **Rubric for Service** based on the candidate’s narrative and the evidence provided (Table 3) as they pertain to Standards 1 and 2.

| |
|---|
| <p>Table 3: Suggested Types of Evidence (Service)</p> <p>Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on department, college, and university committees. Narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or COA Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on community-based committees or boards. Narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or COA Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework. |
| Other leadership roles could include but not limited to intellectual, organizational, policy, community based, cultural, social justice, and ecological justice leadership roles. |
| Documentation of participation in the teamwork of COA programs and projects, especially as they relate to the University Strategic Plan and/or COA Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework. |
| Letter of support from program coordinator, committee chair, or other supervisor- type person with written comments of participation and contribution on committees, programs, and projects. |
| Advising of credential candidates and/or Master's students. |
| Informal advising of students, particularly those from under-represented populations |
| Chairing MS thesis or project |
| Service on MS advisory committees |
| Documentation of teaching, collaboration, and service in- and outside the COA |
| Participation in activities with K-12 schools and the community at large, including work that promotes democratic education principles and practices |
| Preparation of accreditation materials for national and state reviews |
| Farm unit or lab supervisor/manager |
| Organization or supervision of a youth field day/contests |
| Organization or participation with agricultural literacy program |
| Organization or participation in student recruitment and retention events |

Rubric for Service

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

| Performance Review | Does Not Meet Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2nd Year Review | No or minimal evidence of listed criteria. | Evidence of Service in standards 1 or 2. | Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2. |
| 4th Year Review | Has not demonstrated adequate progress in developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2. | Evidence of Service in both standards, AND evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in Standards 1 or 2. | Evidence of service in standard 1 AND evidence of service in standard 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership. |
| 6th Year Retention and Promotion Review | The evidence of service has not met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND/OR does not have evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard <i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectation is insufficient for granting tenure and promotion.</i> | Evidence of service in both standards AND evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in at least one area of each standard. | The evidence of service has exceeded the level of expectation demonstrating active participation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of leadership and/or substantive responsibility in the area(s) under both standards. |
| Full Professor Review (5 Years - during the review period) | The evidence of service has not met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND/OR does not have evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard. | Evidence of service in both standards AND evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in at least one area of each | The evidence of service has exceeded the level of expectation demonstrating active and <i>sustained</i> participation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of <i>sustained</i> leadership and/or substantive responsibility in the area(s) under both standards. |

Provisional Standard approved 8-21-23 for AY 23/24 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 8-23-23 memo and attachments.

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|
| | | standard. | Additionally, the evidence clearly demonstrates substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. |
|--|--|-----------|--|

Provisional Standard approved 8-21-23 for AY 23/24 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 8-23-23 memo and attachments.

APPENDIX

Peer Review of Teaching

Instructor: _____ Course: _____
Peer Reviewer: _____ Date: _____
Lesson Topic: _____
Class Size: _____ Delivery Format: _____

Lesson Planning, Organization, and Content

- Evidence:
- a. Includes relevant, up-to-date factual information
 - b. Class period is logically organized
 - c. Evidence of preparation and planning

Reviewer's Observations: _____

Lesson Presentation

- Evidence:
- a. Clearly stated learning goals
 - b. Connected previous learning to present topic/activity
 - c. Holds attention with enthusiasm, energy, and effective use of voice
 - d. Information clearly presented to students
 - e. Materials presented in multiple ways
 - f. Student learning is assessed throughout the lesson
 - g. Instructor adjusts lesson to student level of comprehension
 - h. Culturally responsive to student audience

Reviewer's Observations: _____

Professionalism

- Evidence:
- a. Exhibits a rapport with students (Instruction Standard 4)
 - b. Students are encouraged to share opinions and questions (Instruction Standard 2)
 - c. Time is managed effectively (Instruction Standard 3)
 - d. Professional conduct (Instruction Standard 4)

Reviewer's Observations: _____

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Overall Rating: | | |
|------------------------|--|--|

| Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|

| |
|-----------------|
| Summary: |
|-----------------|

Narrative should support/explain the rating given above, referencing Standards 1-4 of the Rubric for Instruction where appropriate/necessary. Attach additional sheets if needed.

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Consultation Date: _____

Faculty/Instructor Signature: _____

Peer Reviewer Signature: _____



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 OAPL via email for review.
- c) OAPL 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 OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost 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 OAPL Department Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to OAPL website location.

Chair/Director Approval: Eric Houk Date: Aug 21, 2023

Dean Review: S. Patrick Doyle Date: Aug 22, 2023

OAPL Review: Mahalley D. Allen Date: Aug 24, 2023

Provost Approval:  Date: Aug 24, 2023
[Terence Lau \(Aug 24, 2023 16:32 PDT\)](#)



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 21, 2023
TO: Eric Houk, Department Chair
CC: Patrick Doyle, Interim Dean
FROM: Mahalley Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Success
SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of Department RTP Standards

Thank you for submitting revised department RTP standards incorporating the [three new evaluation ratings](#) in each area of faculty performance.

Interim Provost Lau has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2023-2024 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

1. Specify lecturer range election criteria and procedures.
2. Provide criteria for lecturer evaluation ratings of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
3. Provide more specificity to categories of does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations as noted in comments.
4. Address additional comments in document.
5. Please re-submit as a Word document, not pdf.

Based on our review of recently reviewed department standards, we offer these general observations, which we highly recommend departments consider as they work on revising their provisionally approved standards.

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.
4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Friday, December 1, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and the Provost have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2024-2025 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

Our office will route for signatures your provisionally approved department standards in Adobe Sign and will post them to the [Department Standards page](#). You may now provide these provisionally approved standards to faculty in your department. Our office is happy to meet with your Department or Personnel Committee to help answer any questions you may have.