

## **Guidelines and Procedures of the Department of Biological Sciences Personnel Committee 2022-2023**

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 make 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 personnel calendar.
- C. Membership of the DBSPC shall be a minimum of seven tenured members of the Department.
- D. The DBSPC may be composed 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 the committee will be three, as defined by section 5.0e of the FPPP.
- E. All eligible faculty will serve on the committee 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 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. Each committee 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 RTP subcommittee must be present. A quorum of the DBSPC consists of two-thirds of its members.
- I. Any discussion of personnel matters, exclusive of FPPP and the Guidelines and Procedures of the Department, with non-committee members is considered a breach of confidentiality (FPPP 1.3.1.b, as referred to in Section 4.2.3). Discussions with the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Vice

Provost for Human Resources, Provost, or Director of Affirmative Action 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, as early as possible in the review cycle.
- 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 and provided to the Provost (FPPP 10.2.7). The DBSPC 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.
- F. Members of personnel committees 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 campus executive orders.

2. Candidates follow the Model Outline for a Faculty Dossier (AAO 02-04). Materials other than those required in the dossier are included in a separate evidence binder.
3. In all retention, tenure, or promotion decisions, a minimum rating of meets expectations (ME) in teaching and related activities is required (FPPP 10.2.5.a)
4. In consideration of promotion, the review process shall only take into account the candidate's record of performance for all years since their letter of appointment or the last promotion, whichever is most recent.

## B. Areas Reviewed

Listed below are the activities, materials, and evidence examined by the DBSPC in the process of performance evaluation.

### 1. Teaching and related activities

Effective instruction is the first minimum and indispensable requirement for promotion. 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. Student evaluations
  - v. 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 will include course requirements, 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, and evaluation procedures. Samples of written comments on student work 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, or uses class time wisely.

Student evaluations of teaching will include SET 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
- iv. Use of instructional technology
- 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 student internships
- ii. Mentoring
- iii. Academic advising
- iv. Supervision of student projects
- v. Student Learning Fee applications
- vi. Integration of research into classroom activities
- vii. Pedagogical grants
- viii. Presentation of pedagogic research at professional meeting, and organization of a pedagogic 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.

a. Authorship (in general order of significance)

- i. Peer reviewed book
- ii. Peer reviewed manuscript in a professional publication
- 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 and contracts ( $\geq$ \$50,000)
  - ii. PI or Co-PI of minor grants (\$5,000-49,999)
  - iii. Submitted, but not funded major grant ( $>$ \$50,000)
  - iv. PI or Co-PI of mini grants ( $\leq$ \$4,999)
  - v. Co-operator on a grant or contract
  - vi. Submitted, but not funded, grants and/or contracts
- 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. National
  - ii. State and regional
  - iii. Local
  - iv. 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 professional activities 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, and professional growth and achievement, all faculty are expected to 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.

- 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
  - ii. Serve as member of a Department, College or University committee
  - iv. Serve as Chair of an Academic Senate subcommittee
  - v. Serve as member of an Academic Senate subcommittee
  - vi. 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 five 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

Meets Expectations (ME)— Manages teaching assignments, 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 advising as demonstrated by effectively participating in some or all of the activities listed in III.B.1.a, at least three in III.B.1.b above and at least three 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 four in III.B.1.b above and at least four 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**

Meets Expectations (ME)— Demonstrates recognition beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of four substantive contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, with at least one in III.B.2.a and one in III.B.2.b.

Exceeds Expectations (EE)— Same as ME plus demonstrated leadership within areas of assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of five or more substantive contributions from III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, and/or III.B.2.c, with at least two in III.B.2.a and one in III.B.2.b.

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”).**

Meets Expectations (ME)— The candidate serves on Department committees, and has served professionally in the community/profession or serves on at least one committee at the College or University level.

Exceeds Expectations (EE)— in addition to the ME criteria the candidate also serves on Department, College, University, and professional committees, and at times provides a leadership role.

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 ~~with~~ 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

Successful candidates must achieve ratings of at least ME in teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service (see table below).

	Teaching	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Tenure	ME	ME	ME

## 3 Promotion

### *Associate Professor*

Successful candidates must-achieve a rating of EE in one of the categories, and ratings of ME in the other two remaining categories (see table below for examples).

	Teaching	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Prom. to Associate	EE	ME	ME
	ME	EE	ME
	ME	ME	EE

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

- a. Consideration of tenure/promotion before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of “early tenure/promotion.”
- 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.
- c. Inasmuch as consideration of early tenure/promotion is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for early tenure/promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional case that warrants special consideration. To be considered for early tenure/promotion a candidate should have been rated EE in

all three rated categories (or have the reasonable expectation of EE ratings in all three categories based on past reviews) and significantly exceed the minimum qualifications for the rating of EE in one of them. A candidate could be considered for early tenure/promotion if they were rated ME in either the teaching or service categories but significantly exceeded the minimum requirement for EE in the other two categories.

*Professor*

Successful candidates must achieve an EE rating in two of the rated categories and a rating of at least ME in the third rated category (see table below). 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).

	Teaching	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Prom. to Full	EE	EE	ME
	EE	ME	EE
	ME	EE	EE

**Early Promotion to Full Professor may be conferred one year earlier than the normal fifth year of employment at the Associate Professor level.**

- a. Consideration of promotion before the beginning of the fifth consecutive year at the level of Associate Professor shall be regarded as consideration of “early promotion.”
- 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.
- c. Inasmuch as consideration of early promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for early promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional case that warrants special consideration. To be considered for early promotion, a candidate must have completed a minimum of three years at the level of Associate Professor and must be rated EE in all three rated categories and significantly exceed the minimum qualifications for the rating of EE in one category. A candidate could be considered

for early promotion if they were rated ME in either the teaching or service categories, but significantly exceeded the minimum requirement for EE in the other two categories.

#### **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 at the rank of Professor. 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 that are pertinent to the evaluation of the quality of instructional performance, professional currency, and service and include these in their personnel file. These data 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 data collected 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, level of professional currency, and service. If the candidate's evaluation includes a rating of DN, the report should provide suggestions guiding the candidate to achievement of higher rating by year 6 of the tenure and promotion timeline.
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.
4. The faculty member may respond in writing to the report's findings within seven days. 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.
5. Upon completion of the evaluation process all data that are not normally kept in the College personnel file will be returned to the faculty member.

#### **Part V. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty**

The DBSPC will evaluate all temporary faculty for teaching effectiveness annually for the initial two personnel cycles. These will be followed by biennial evaluations unless the individual's course assignment changes, in which case the evaluation process returns to the initial two-year review cycle. All temporary faculty will participate in the student evaluation

of faculty process each semester in which they teach. Personnel files will be updated annually. All temporary faculty on three year contracts will be evaluated in the spring semester of their third year.

The DBSPC will submit a report of its findings to the faculty member, the Chair of the Department, and the College personnel file.

#### A. Data for Evaluation

Data used by the DBSPC are described in Part III, B, 1, 2, and 3. Although the criteria and standards of the Department review of temporary faculty will focus predominantly on instruction, professional activities and service related to their teaching appointment or other positive assistance to the Department will be considered. (FPPP 10.1.3) 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.

**PART VI. Range Elevation for Lecturers.** Upon request from a temporary faculty member, the DBSPC will evaluate eligible lecturers for a Range Elevation. (Refer to FPPP 12.1.1-12.1.2.d for eligibility, criteria, and procedures)

TEMPORARY FACULTY (excluding coaches) who (1) are not eligible for more SSIs in their current RANGE and (2) have been employed in their current RANGE for at least five years are eligible for RANGE Elevation [CBA 12.17; FPPP 12.1.1].

The information below within the “Criteria for RANGE Elevation” only applies to lecturers with the following work assignments:

- Full-time or part-time instructional work assignments on a 15-unit base
- Full-time or part-time non-instructional work assignments
- Hybrid work assignments that include instructional and non-instructional elements.

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.

#### **Criteria for RANGE Elevation**

A. To be considered for a range elevation in the DBS, candidates must have had superior teaching evaluations for two out of the last three years and at least effective in the third as defined by the DBSPC. Range elevation will be recommended for candidates demonstrating teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field as defined below.

B. The DBS defines teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field as several (more than two) significant contributions or activities apart and distinct from the instructional assignments made by the DBS Chair. Such contributions or activities may include but are not limited to:

- i. Advising student organizations or discipline related clubs.
- ii. Academic advising in a specific professionally related area.
- iii. Curriculum and course development.
- iv. Service on department, college level or university level committees.
- v. Professional service related to the field of biology.
- vi. Community service related to biology or the university.
- vii. Publication in a peer reviewed journal.
- viii. Presentation at a regional or national meeting.

- ix. Grant submission to a regional, state, or federal agency.
- x. Conduct extramurally funded research.
- xi. Recognition of teaching excellence by the DBS, college or university.
- xii. Mentoring student research.

### **Application Information**

The application 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.

### **Procedures**

Pursuant to CBA 12.18, lecturers who meet the FPPP 12.1.1 criteria above will be notified thirty (30) days prior to the commencement of the annual campus RANGE elevation process. In that notification, the campus shall inform the lecturers that receipt of a previous FMI may affect their eligibility for RANGE elevation. [CBA 12.18].

Eligible individuals must apply for RANGE elevation prior to March 1.

Applications are submitted to the department chair with a copy to the College DEAN. The chair shall obtain a RECOMMENDATION from the Department Personnel Committee; add his/her own Recommendation, and forward the application and both Recommendations to the Dean no later than April 1.

The College DEAN shall make a decision and notify the applicant no later than April 15.

RANGE elevation applications that are denied may be appealed pursuant to Article 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Appeals shall be submitted to the Office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Appeals will be reviewed by a peer panel (see CBA Article 10), and the panel's decision is final. The peer panel shall notify the appellant of its decision within fourteen days of receiving the appeal from the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs [CBA 12.20].

Pursuant to CBA 12.16, range elevation increases shall be effective at the beginning of the next academic year following the decision granting RANGE elevation.

RANGE elevation for lecturers shall be accompanied by advancement of at least five percent (5%) on the salary schedule [CBA 31.6].

Revision: 12/14/21. FPPP and CBA references were accurate at date of revision.



## Department Standards Approval Sheet

---

Process:

- a) Department votes, if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review and approval;
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean approved Word document to OAPL via email for review;
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the dean, then forwards OAPL approved document to Provost for approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns approved document to OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footnote to page 1 of the document:
  - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Standard 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.

---

**Approvals:**

Chair/Director:	<u><i>Kristopher Blee</i></u> <small>Kristopher Blee (Aug 31, 2022 17:01 PDT)</small>	Date:	<u>Aug 31, 2022</u>
Dean:	<u><i>David M. Hassenzahl</i></u>	Date:	<u>Aug 31, 2022</u>
OAPL:	<u><i>Mahalley D. Allen</i></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost:	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>



---

# MEMORANDUM

---

DATE: August 30, 2022

TO: Kristopher Blee, Department Chair

CC: David Hassenzahl, Dean

FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of BIOL Department RTP Standards

---

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

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 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:

- Resolve the comments on DBSPC
- Resolve the period of review question in III.A.4.
- Address comments in C.1. – define the word “some” and spell out the criteria for does not meet.
- Define the does not meet criteria in C.2 and C.3.
- Complete section D.1.
- D.3 Requires one exceeds expectations – out of compliance with FPPP
- Criteria and information for accelerated tenure and/or promotion for associate and for full are out of compliance with the FPPP
- Additional comments to improve parts D.IV and D.VI.
- Correct/update language in part D.VI to be consistent with CBA and FPPP.

Based on our review of recently submitted 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 Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 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.