

Guidelines and Procedures of the Department of Biological Sciences Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committees of the Department shall be organized and function in a manner consistent with the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) document of California State University, Chico and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Part I. Committee Characteristics and Charge

- A. The Department of Biological Sciences Personnel Committee (DBSPC) shall complete specified periodic evaluations and performance reviews and make recommendations concerning retention, tenure, and promotion.
- B. Operation of the DBSPC shall be in accordance with the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion calendar.
- C. Membership of the DBSPC shall be a minimum of seven tenured members of the Department.
- D. The DBSPC may be composed of a combination of Associate Professors and/or Professors when making recommendations relating to promotion to Associate Professor and shall be composed of Professors when making recommendations relating to promotion to Professor. In the latter case, the minimum size of this subcommittee will be three, as defined by section 4.1.4 of the FPPP.
- E. All eligible faculty will serve on the DBSPC on a rotating basis. Exempt from serving will be faculty who are subject to periodic evaluation or performance review in the current personnel cycle and faculty who are to be on leave in any part of the personnel cycle. Full tenured professors who will undergo periodic evaluation are *not* exempt from serving on either committee. No faculty member shall serve simultaneously on both the Department and College Personnel committees.
- F. Service shall be for three consecutive years. Terms of service normally will be staggered so that at any time at least one person will have served during the previous academic year.
- G. The DBSPC shall have a Chair. The Chair will be responsible for the conduct of all committee activities. The DBSPC shall designate a member to orient the committee to University Affirmative Action Guidelines. One member will act as secretary and take minutes when appropriate.
- H. A quorum of the DBSPC or subcommittee named in section D consists of two-thirds of its members. A quorum consisting of two-thirds of the members must be present during meetings.
- I. Deliberations and recommendations from any faculty review process, including performance reviews and periodic evaluations, shall remain confidential (FPPP 1.3.1.b). Discussions with the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Associate Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Success, Provost, or University Diversity Officer are exempt from this provision. Failure to maintain confidentiality is grounds for immediate removal from the

Committee and possible reprimand or formal discipline (in accordance with the FPPP and CBA). The Dean of the College will examine all reported breaches of confidentiality.

Part II. Committee Procedures

- A. The DBSPC will specify in detail the operating procedures to implement the required periodic evaluations and performance reviews in the Department. The operating procedures are reviewed, revised if necessary, and approved by the DBSPC.
- B. These procedures are presented to full-time tenured and probationary faculty for approval. The approved procedures become the operating document for the Department after approval by the Dean and the Provost.
- C. Approved procedures are given to each person being reviewed, consistent with the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement
- D. The Chair of the DBSPC shall act as liaison between those under review and the DBSPC. The Chair of the DBSPC shall meet with the faculty member(s) as needed over the course of the review to answer questions about file preparation and committee policies and procedures. After reviewing the data and evaluations but before writing its recommendation, the DBSPC shall meet with each candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion on an individual basis. The purpose of this meeting shall be to answer unresolved questions on the part of any of the participants in the RTP process (FPPP 10.2.6).
- E. The DBSPC shall prepare its written report and recommendation. Each member of the committee will vote for or against the report and recommendation. Votes are recorded on the form provided by the Provost (FPPP 10.2.7). The DBSPC's final recommendations are forwarded to the Chair of the Department along with any minority and concurring reports as required by the current FPPP. After the Chair report is completed, candidates view the department level report and may provide a written rebuttal at that level of the report process, no later than 10 calendar days following receipt of the recommendation(s). At all levels of evaluation, in periodic evaluation or performance review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, copies of the report and recommendations are provided to the evaluated faculty member who has a right to respond or submit a rebuttal and/or request an opportunity to discuss the recommendation from each level no later than ten calendar days following receipt of the recommendation.
- F. Members of DBSPC will normally vote in person for or against the proposed report and recommendation before the committee. If a member abstains, the member will provide a written reason for abstention. Committee members who disagree with the report will submit a minority report. Members who agree with the report but who wish to offer additional or alternative analysis and/or interpretation may submit a concurring report. Any minority and concurring reports are signed by their respective authors.

Part III. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. General Requirements

1. Department members conduct themselves in accordance with the provisions on ethical behavior in the current FPPP and the pertinent Chancellor's Office executive orders and applicable campus policies.

2. It is the Candidate's responsibility to be familiar with the procedures and criteria in this document as well as those in the CBA and FPPP. Since the Department RTP Committee's report must be based entirely on evidence in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), the Candidate must ensure that the WPAF includes all appropriate evidence presented in a format that facilitates review. Specifically, it is the Candidate's responsibility to address the criteria in the department RTP Guidelines indicating, when appropriate, the activities or evidence, along with sufficient explanation of the significance of these activities or evidence, to justify why the candidate feels their performance meets the criteria or warrants a specific rating for an area of evaluation.

3. Candidates follow the [Sample Dossier provided by Faculty Affairs and Success](#).

4. In all retention, tenure, or promotion decisions, a minimum rating of meets expectations (ME) in teaching effectiveness is required (See FPPP 10.2.5.a)

5. In consideration of periodic evaluations and performance reviews, the review process shall only consider the candidate's record of performance during their period of review inclusive of service credit as appropriate, as outlined in the CBA and FPPP.

B. Areas Reviewed

1. Teaching and related activities

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty.

The evaluation of instruction is based on the courses taught during the regular fall and spring sessions; in addition, special session and extension courses can be evaluated. For its deliberations, the Committee will review the following:

a. Instruction (not in order of significance)

- i. Self-evaluation. a) Overview of teaching activities, student, and peer evaluations; b) Innovations in instruction; c) Support of student learning; d) Assessment of student learning
- ii. Written course material
- iii. Peer evaluations (a minimum of two independent evaluations)
- iv. Evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom
- v. Student feedback on teaching and learning
- vi. Written input from individuals or organizations

The candidate's dossier establishes the context for the evaluation of teaching. This document will address teaching philosophy, goals, methods, strengths and weaknesses in the practice of teaching and in the knowledge of the professional discipline as it relates to the candidate's teaching assignments.

Written course material should include course syllabus, learning objectives, lecture and laboratory outlines, examination material, text selections and reading lists, handouts, and various exercises and assignments. Course materials should show organization, relevant learning experiences, grading policy, and evaluation procedures. Samples of written comments on student work may be included. Evidence of student achievement of learning objectives in the candidate's courses may be included.

Peer evaluations of instruction will include committee deliberations and reports of findings of classroom visitations. There will be a minimum of two classroom visitations, which will be by members of the DBSPC or one by a committee member and one by the Department Chair (as requested by the committee, the chair, or the candidate). Peer evaluations by colleagues who are not on the personnel review committees are encouraged. If possible, peer evaluation reports should include whether the candidate encourages student-faculty contact and students to work together, promotes active learning both in and out of the classroom, provides prompt feedback on assignments, and uses class time wisely.

Evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion will include evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance, including one or more of the following: 1) include a variety of learning materials in various formats, 2) encourage interaction and community-building among students, 3) provide assignment options, 4) relating course content to real world examples of inequity and disparity, 5) provide a space for students to ask anonymous questions, 6) help students connect science to their personal experience, 7) make accommodations/alternative assignments when appropriate based on student cultures and belief systems. Data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses may be used as evidence (FPPP 10.2.5.b).

Student feedback on teaching and learning (SFOT) will include SFOT scores and written comments submitted by students to the Personnel File. These evaluations and comments will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching and may not determine a candidate's knowledge of the field (FPPP 10.2.5.a).

The candidate may submit letters of commendation from individuals or organizations for evaluation. The signed letters must include the name of the individual submitting the letter.

- b. Innovation in instruction (not in general order of significance)
- i. Contribution to K-14 and general education
 - ii. Coordination or collaboration on course development or delivery
 - iii. Demonstrated innovation in the classroom
 - v. New courses or syllabi developed
 - vi. Responsibility for major reform of curriculum (new degree programs, options, GE themes)
 - vii. Responsibility for minor reform of curriculum
 - viii. Participation in a faculty learning community
 - ix. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through a variety of in-class pedagogical means (e.g., cooperative learning, case study presentation, debate, etc.)
 - x. Efforts to enhance learning through the introduction and use of various instructional technologies
 - xi. Efforts to enhance student learning through the development of instruments/techniques that assess student outcomes
 - xii. Demonstration of pedagogical currency via incorporation of new methods and updating and revising course materials

xiii. Teaching recognition

Examples of the above may include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- Participation in course and curriculum development and implementation
- Development of new teaching skills and teaching areas (e.g., teaching skills to enhance student learning, involving students in the analysis of primary literature, etc.)
- Introduction of web-based technology into teaching.
- Use/development of surveys, essays, pre- and post-course exams, etc., that are designed to assess student learning

c. Support of Student Learning and Teaching Scholarship

- i. Supervision of graduate student research in the laboratory or field leading to a thesis and other scholarly activities (i.e., Biol 697, 699T)
- ii. Supervision of undergraduate student research in the laboratory or field, especially those leading to presentation or publication (i.e., Biol 399, 499H)
- iii. Supervision of student research projects in the classroom (e.g., Course-Based Undergraduate Research Experience or CURE)
- iv. Serving as an advisor to student clubs and organizations
- v. Academic advising
- vi. Supervision of off-campus student internships (i.e., Biol 389, 489)
- vii. Student Learning Fee applications
- viii. Pedagogical grants
- ix. Presentation of pedagogical research at professional meeting or organization of a pedagogical meeting, workshop, or symposium.

Examples of the above may include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- Support of student projects in the classroom, lab, or field (e.g., thesis or undergraduate research), especially those leading to presentation or publication
- Evidence of effective academic and career advising (e.g., student, alumni, employer testimonials)
- Support of student projects (e.g., theses) on a one-to-one basis
- Service on thesis committees
- Development and supervision of student internships
- Advisor to student organizations
- Contribution to the development of student leadership

d. Other

The DBSPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other related instructional

and activities not included above.

2. Professional growth and achievement (a-f are listed in general order of significance)

Professional and scholarly activities are viewed as essential for retention and promotion. All faculty are expected to engage in activities that foster intellectual growth and professional development and which contribute to the professional disciplines encompassed by the biological sciences. The DBSPC will consider the candidate's self-evaluation of professional growth and achievement to establish the context for its deliberations. It is the responsibility of the candidate to communicate their level of contribution to the achievements. For its deliberations, the Committee will review the following:

- a. Authorship (in general order of significance)
 - i. Peer reviewed book
 - ii. Peer reviewed manuscript in a professional journal
 - iii. Peer reviewed book chapter
 - iv. Non-printed medium or computer software
 - v. Development of a new technology or patent
 - vi. Non-refereed book
 - vii. Non-refereed manuscript in a professional publication
 - viii. Non-refereed book chapter
 - ix. Consultancy reports and funded research reports
- b. Research and grants (in general order of significance)
 - i. PI or Co-PI of major grants or contracts (\geq \$50,000)
 - ii. PI or Co-PI of minor grants or contracts (\$10,000-49,999)
 - iii. Submitted, but not funded, major grant or contract ($>$ \$50,000)
 - iv. PI or Co-PI of mini grants or contracts (\leq \$9,999)
 - v. Collaborator on a grant or contract
 - vi. Submitted, but not funded, grants and/or contracts (\$10,000-49,999)
- c. Scholarly activities within one's profession (in general order of significance)
 - i. Presentation of research at a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
 - ii. Organization of a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
 - iii. Editor of a professional publication
 - iv. Reviewer/referee of a professional publication
 - v. Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, or symposia
- d. Professional awards and honors
 - i. International
 - ii. National
 - iii. State and regional
 - iv. Local
 - v. Honorary appointment (e.g., visiting, or adjunct professor)
- e. Consultancy
 - i. Professional consultant dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's

- areas of expertise.
- ii. Expert witness dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's areas of expertise.
- iii. Service as a non-paid consultant or member of an advisory board or council, dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's area of expertise.

f. Other

The DBSPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other types of Professional Growth and Achievement not included above.

3. Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (also referred to as "Service")

In addition to teaching and related activities (1), and professional growth and achievement (2), all faculty are expected to perform service that contribute towards the mission of the University and the goals and objectives of the Department of Biological Sciences and the College of Natural Sciences. Activities that contribute to increasing the number of majors through recruitment or retention, improve the image of the Department or College, improve internal communication and teamwork, or help to increase private support of our programs are encouraged. It is the responsibility of the candidate to communicate their level of contribution to the achievements. For its deliberations, the Committee will review the following:

- a. Service to professional organizations (in general order of significance)
 - i. Service as an elected/appointed official of a professional organization
 - ii. Service as a committee member of a professional organization
 - iii. Membership in a professional organization
- b. Service to the Department, College, and University (in general order of significance)
 - i. Serve as Chair of a Department, College, or University committee, or Academic Senate subcommittee
 - ii. Serve as member of a Department, College, or University committee
 - iii. Serve as member of an Academic Senate standing committee
 - iv. Serve as member of the Academic Senate
- c. Perform outreach/recruiting/extension activities
- d. Guest lectures and other public presentations
 - i. Presentations at public forums, meetings, field days/tours, and other events where specific knowledge possessed by the candidate is shared with the campus community and/or general public
 - ii. Off-campus lectures in person or through electronic delivery systems
 - iii. Guest lectures in courses on campus
- e. Contributions to K-14 and other community service related to one's professional competency (in general order of significance)
 - i. In-service training for K-14 teachers

- ii. Involvement with area teachers in curriculum development
 - iii. Science fair judge
 - iv. Class visits to K-14 classrooms or field activity
 - v. Other professional community service
- f. Volunteer for or accept and complete assignments which further one or more of the goals of the College or University (see the University Strategic Priorities)
 - g. Volunteer for or accept and complete assignments that contribute towards the realization of the objectives specified in the Department Five Year Review Implementation Plan.
 - h. Other
The DBSPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other types of service not included above.

C. Performance Standards

1. Teaching and related activities

As part of the evaluation process, the DBSPC will carefully assess the candidate's performance record, taking account of the quality, as well as quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's achievements. The DBSPC recognizes the following standards:

Meets Expectations (ME)— Manages teaching assignments and office hours; course materials consistent with the state of the discipline; and teaches courses in a manner appropriate to the material. The candidate's record provides evidence of continual, impressive, and valued contributions to high quality teaching and mentoring. ME is defined in the following ways:

Retention. The candidate has participated in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least three separate activities in III.B.1.b above, and at least three separate activities in III.B.1.c above.

Tenure. The candidate has significant contributions, in terms of quality and quantity, in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least four in III.B.1.b above, and at least four in III.B.1.c above.

Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate has significant contributions, in terms of quality and quantity, in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least four in III.B.1.b above, and at least four in III.B.1.c above.

Promotion to Professor. The candidate has significant contributions, in terms of quality and quantity, in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least five in III.B.1.b above, and at least five in III.B.1.c above.

Exceeds Expectations (EE)— Same as ME plus a record of outstanding accomplishment recognized by peer and student evaluations; a consistent demonstration of commitment to excellence and innovation in teaching and advising as demonstrated by substantive accomplishments; and participating in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least six in III.B.1.b above, and at least six in III.B.1.c above.

Does Not Meet Expectations (DN)— The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the area of teaching and related activities.

2. Professional growth and achievement

As part of the evaluation process, the DBSPC will carefully assess the candidate's performance record, taking account of the quality, as well as quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's achievements. The DBSPC recognizes the following standards:

Meets Expectations (ME)— Demonstrates recognition beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline. ME is defined in the following ways:

Retention. The candidate shows evidence of working towards a peer-reviewed publication and working towards applying for a grant or contract.

Tenure. The candidate demonstrates recognition beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of four contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, III.B.2.d, III.B.2.e, with at least one substantive contribution in III.B.2.a or one substantive contribution in III.B.2.b. For Authorship, III.B.2.a, a substantive contribution is defined as a peer-reviewed publication. For Research and Grants, III.B.2.b, a substantive contribution is defined as being the PI or co-PI on an awarded grant or contract > \$10,000.

Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate demonstrates recognition beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of five contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, III.B.2.d, III.B.2.e, with at least one substantive contribution in III.B.2.a and one substantive contribution in III.B.2.b. For Authorship, III.B.2.a, a substantive contribution is defined as a peer-reviewed publication. For Research and Grants, III.B.2.b, a substantive contribution is defined as being the PI or co-PI on an awarded grant or contract > \$10,000.

Promotion to Professor. The candidate demonstrates recognition beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of seven contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, III.B.2.d, III.B.2.e, with at least one substantive contributions in III.B.2.a and one substantive contribution in III.B.2.b. For Authorship, III.B.2.a, a substantive contribution is defined as a peer-reviewed publication. For Research and Grants, III.B.2.b, a substantive contribution is defined as being the PI or co-PI on an awarded grant or contract > \$10,000.

Exceeds Expectations (EE)— Same as ME plus demonstrated leadership within areas of assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of ten contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, III.B.2.d, III.B.2.e, with at least two substantive contributions in III.B.2.a and two substantive contributions in III.B.2.b. For Authorship, III.B.2.a, a substantive contribution is defined as a peer-reviewed publication. For Research and Grants, III.B.2.b, a substantive contribution is defined as being the PI or co-PI on an awarded grant or contract > \$10,000.

Does Not Meet Expectations (DN)— The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory

levels of performance in the area of professional growth and achievement.

3. Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (also referred to as “Service”).

As part of the evaluation process, the DBSPC will carefully assess the candidate’s performance record, taking account of the quality, as well as quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's achievements. The DBSPC recognizes the following standards:

Meets Expectations (ME)— Within the University, Service is conducted through Departmental, College, and University level committees. In addition, contributions to Service come from outreach, extension, and community service activities; contributions to K-14 education; assignments which further the goals of the College or University; and assignments that contribute towards the realization of the objectives specified in the Department Five Year Review Implementation Plan-

ME is defined in the following ways:

Retention. The candidate serves on at least one Department committee and has served professionally in the community/profession or serves on at least one committee at the College or University level.

Tenure. The candidate serves on multiple Department committees; serves on at least one committee at the College or University level; has demonstrated service to a professional organization (any of III.B.3.a); and has performed other service (III.B.3.b-h).

Promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate serves on multiple Department committees; serves on at least one committee at the College or University level; has demonstrated service to a professional organization (any of III.B.3.a); and has performed other service (III.B.3.b-h).

Promotion to Professor. Demonstrated service to a professional organization (III.B.3.a); serves on multiple Department committees (III.B.3.b); serves on at least one committee at the College or University level; provides leadership in service to the Department, College, or University (III.B.3.b.i); and has performed other service (III.B.3.b-h).

Exceeds Expectations (EE)— in addition to the ME criteria, the candidate also serves on Department, College, University, and professional committees, provides a leadership role on multiple committees, and has made contributions to III.B.3.a-h.

Does Not Meet Expectations (DN)— the candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the area of service to university, profession, and community.

D. Specific Requirements

1. Retention

Successful candidates must have achieved a rating of ME in teaching. Candidates may have ratings of DN in professional growth and achievement and in service after performance reviews, as long as evidence from the candidate's record demonstrates progress towards a future rating of ME in professional growth and achievement and in service to meet the timeline with tenure and promotion.

2. Tenure and Promotion

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, successful candidates must achieve ratings of at least ME in teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service associated with their particular level of advancement.

For Promotion to Professor, successful candidates must achieve ratings of at least ME in teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service. Also, the evidence must demonstrate contributions to the strategic plan of the Department, College, and University. Candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2).

3. Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor may be conferred earlier than the normal sixth year of employment.

- a. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, 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.
- b. Any faculty member wishing consideration of early tenure/promotion must request it in writing to the Chair of the DBSPC. They should only do so if they believe their record of accomplishment is exceptional and warrants special consideration. The DBSPC may initiate early tenure/promotion consideration at the Department level if, after careful examination of the candidate's file, it determines that the candidate's record is exceptional and warrants special consideration.

4. Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor may be conferred earlier than the normal fifth year of employment at the Associate Professor level.

- a. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to full professor, 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 their exceptional level of performance will continue; and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.

- b. Any faculty member at the Associate Professor level wishing consideration of early promotion to Full Professor must request it in writing. Early promotion will only be granted to those who have a record of accomplishment that is exceptional and warrants special consideration. The DBSPC may initiate early promotion consideration at the Department level if, after careful examination of the candidate's file, it determines that the candidate's record is exceptional and warrants special consideration.

Part IV. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

The DBSPC, or a subcommittee thereof, will serve as the evaluation committee, which in this case shall consist of tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the person being evaluated. The committee shall consist of at least three members, one of whom is the Chair of the Department. Members of the committee who are undergoing a fifth-year evaluation cannot participate in their own evaluation.

A. Data for Evaluation

The candidate shall collect all data and materials that are pertinent to the evaluation of the quality of instructional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service and include these in their dossier. The dossier shall be representative of the faculty member's responsibilities and activities during the five-year period immediately prior to the evaluation. Data shall include those described under Part III, B 1, 2, and 3.

B. Evaluation Process

1. The evaluation committee shall analyze the WPAF and prepare a report of its findings. Before writing the report, the committee shall meet with the faculty member to provide an opportunity to clarify any unresolved questions.
2. The evaluation report will address in detail the committee's findings on the quality and effectiveness of instructional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service. The focus of the review shall be on providing development feedback and encouragement to maintain a positive level of performance. Where appropriate, the review provides an opportunity to provide corrective feedback.
3. The report will be submitted to the College Dean who will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report's findings. If areas for improvement are identified in the report, the Dean shall discuss these and advise the faculty member of assistance available within the College or University. The Dean shall either concur with the Committee's report or shall submit an independent report which shall include any recommendations they may make.
4. The faculty member may respond in writing to the report's findings within the rebuttal period outlined in the CBA. The evaluation report, the faculty member's response, if any, and any suggested means of assistance will be placed in the candidate's personnel file following appropriate notification to the candidate.

Part V. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty

The DBSPC will evaluate all lecturer faculty for teaching effectiveness annually for the initial two personnel cycles. These will be followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. All lecturer faculty will participate in the student feedback on teaching and learning process each semester in which they teach. All lecturer faculty on three-year contracts will be evaluated in the third year of their appointment. All lecturer faculty eligible for an initial three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment. The DBSPC will evaluate whether the lecturer faculty member has performed in a satisfactory manner and will submit a report of its findings to the faculty member, the Chair of the Department, and the personnel action file. 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 DBSPC and the Chair of the Department.

A. Data for Evaluation and Range Elevation

The following shall provide the basis for evaluating lecturer faculty, as documented by evidence in the dossier and personnel action file. Teaching effectiveness (criteria 1) will be the basis for judgement for Satisfactory performance during Periodic Evaluations. Currency in the field (criteria 2) and contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University as well as the Community (criteria 3) also may be used to support Satisfactory performance during Periodic Evaluations but are secondary criteria. Range elevation decisions are based upon all three criteria.

1. Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for appointment, reappointment, and range elevation of lecturer faculty who teach (FPPP 9.1.2.a). This will be evaluated by reviewing the following:
 - a. A self-evaluation of teaching activities and reflection on student and peer evaluations
 - b. 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 (FPPP 9.1.2.c.1)
 - c. Peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year (FPPP 9.1.2.c.2).
 - d. Evidence of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the classroom, such as:
 - o Evidence of efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance. This may include, but is not limited to: 1) include a variety of learning materials in various formats, 2) encourage interaction and community-building among students, 3) provide assignment options, 4) relating course content to real world examples of inequity and disparity, 5) provide a space for students to ask anonymous questions, 6) help students connect science to their personal experience, 7) make accommodations/alternative assignments when appropriate based on student cultures and belief systems
 - o Data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or a lack of grade equity gaps in the candidate's courses.

- e. Course syllabi and materials if the instructor has the responsibility for producing these materials. This review includes assessing the course learning management page (i.e., Canvas)
2. Evaluation of evidence of any activities by the faculty member that support currency appropriate to the individual's appointment. 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. Expectations for activities supporting currency must be consistent with the candidate's range classification and responsibilities (FPPP 9.1.2.c.4).
3. Evaluation of evidence of any other activities or achievements related to the individual's work assignment(s) that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University as well as the Community. Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, civic engagement, and service to the North State (FPPP 9.1.2.c.5).

Part VI. Range Elevation for Lecturers.

Upon application from an eligible lecturer faculty member, the DBSPC will evaluate eligible lecturers for a Range Elevation. (Refer to the CBA and FPPP 12.1.1-12.1.2.d for eligibility, criteria, and procedures)

Criteria for Range Elevation

For elevation to the Range of Lecturer B or above, the individual must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last Range elevation, whichever is more recent.

Professional growth and development for lecturer Range elevation eligibility is defined as teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field, unless the faculty member's work assignment includes duties in addition to teaching. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for Range elevation.

The criteria for review are outlined in Parts V.A.1 - V.A.3, above.

Range Elevation Application Information

The application for a range elevation shall consist of a written letter or memorandum clearly stating the applicant's request, a complete up to date vita, and documentation of teaching excellence and currency in the field since the initial appointment or last Range elevation, whichever is more recent. Although not required, the documentation may include a description of other activities or accomplishments that contribute to the instructional mission of the University.



Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved Date* footer to the document and:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
 - b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

Chair/Director Approval: *Kristopher Blee*

Date: Sep 5, 2024

Dean Review: *David M. Hassenzahl*

Date: Sep 5, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: *Mahalley D. Allen*

Date: Sep 5, 2024