

2024

Computer Animation and Game Development Program

Department Standards: FPPP reference guide to RTP and Evaluation (*rev. Fall 2023*)

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.



Table of Contents

- Section I: Overview3**
 - A. Introduction3
 - B. Program Mission3
 - C. Program Responsibilities3
 - D. Charge of the Personnel Committee3

- Section II: Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty 4**
 - A. Candidate Responsibilities 4
 - B. Evaluation Guidelines 4
 - C. Summary of FPPP Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion 5
 - D. Instruction Overview 5
 - a. Peer Teaching Observations 5
 - b. Instruction Levels of Evidence..... 5
 - c. Instruction Evaluation and Criteria 7
 - E. Professional Growth and Achievement Overview 8
 - a. Professional Growth and Achievement Levels of Evidence 8
 - b. Professional Growth and Achievement Evaluation and Criteria 9
 - c. Professional Growth and Achievement Evaluation and Criteria 9
 - F. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community Overview 11
 - a. Service Levels of Evidence 11
 - b. Service Evaluation Criteria 12

- Section III: Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty 14**
 - A. Introduction and Overview 14
 - B. RTP Committee Responsibilities 14
 - C. Evaluation Timeline 14
 - D. Lecturer Responsibilities and Dossier Preparation 14
 - a. Teaching Effectiveness 14
 - b. Other Work Assignments 14
 - c. Currency in the Field 14
 - d. Contributions to Strategic Plans and Goals..... 14

- Section IV: Lecturer Range Elevations 16**
 - A. Introduction and Overview 16
 - B. Evaluation 16
 - C. Eligibility and Criteria 16
 - D. Teaching Excellence..... 16
 - E. Maintaining Currency in the Field 16
 - F. Application Materials 16

- Section V: Glossary of Terms 18**

- Appendix A: Department RTP Committee and Candidate Meetings 19**

Section I: Overview

- A. **Introduction:** Decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and evaluation of lecturers, in the Computer Animation & Game Development (CAGD) Program are aligned with the program mission, as well as the mission and strategic priorities of California State University, Chico, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA- Unit 3), the CSU, Chico Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP), and this document.
- B. **Program Mission:** We prepare students for successful professional careers in the computer animation and game development fields through our innovative program based on the synergy of creativity and technology. Through applied-learning and collaborative environments embracing industry-standard technical and conceptual techniques, we provide the foundation for creative expression and life-long learning that leads our students to be successful and effective contributors, leaders and innovators capable of overcoming complex challenges.
- C. **Program Responsibilities:** All members of the Program will work to the best of their ability to assist tenure-track faculty through the RTP processes. New tenure-track faculty may also be assigned a peer mentor at the department or college level. In addition, new tenure-track faculty will meet twice each academic year with the Chair until they submit their application for tenure and promotion. Meetings should take place near the beginning of the fall semester and near the end of the spring semester. At the fall meetings, the Chair will review the FPPP and program guidelines for RTP with the faculty member. The tenure-track faculty member will establish goals for each area of review, determine a plan of action for the academic year, and share their plan with the Chair. Each spring, the tenure-track faculty member will report to the Chair the steps taken, and/or completed, to meet their goals during that academic year.
- D. **Charge of the Personnel Committee:** The CAGD Program has the responsibility of evaluating faculty candidates for RTP, and reviewing and evaluating lecturers. Faculty elected to serve on the Personnel Committee must:
- Maintain confidentiality about candidates, evidence, and deliberations.
 - Mentor candidates in presenting evidence in the dossier and ensuring the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) "accurately reflects the full performance record" (FPPP 8.1.1.b.1).
 - Critically evaluate the faculty member's performance based upon documented evidence (FPPP 8.1.3.e.4).
 - Meet with each tenure-track candidate individually following the submission of their dossier to discuss its contents and the candidate's work during the period of review (Appendix A).
 - Understand and apply specific criteria outlined in the CBA, FPPP, and this document to the evidence being evaluated.
 - Evaluate the candidate based on formative or developmental feedback reported in previous evaluations.
 - In the candidate's report, assign specific FPPP summary evaluation ratings (Exceeds Expectations; Meets Expectations; Does Not Meet Expectations) for each of the three areas of review (*i.e.*, Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community).
 - Justify evaluation ratings by referencing specific evidence and criteria in the candidate's report.
 - Submit a minority report when a committee member does not agree with the approved report.
 - Review and revise department standards as needed at a minimum frequency of every five years. This includes ensuring that the document language reflects current CSU and campus policies, offices, and initiatives.

Section II: Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- A. **Candidate Responsibilities:** Each candidate has the responsibility of creating a dossier. The dossier and Personnel Action File (PAF) make up the WPAF. The dossier and PAF provide evidence documenting the faculty member's contributions to Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that merit retention, tenure, or promotion.

The guidelines in FPPP 8.1.3 should be followed in construction of the dossier. Thus, the dossier should contain a copy of the department RTP standards, curriculum vitae (CV), narrative, and supporting materials. In particular, the narrative should provide context for the candidate's work that is aligned with department standards. Reflective statements on teaching and professional growth and achievement, and their interrelationship to one's arc of expertise should also be included. The candidate should also address the scope and quality of their performance with respect to all areas of evaluation and levels of evidence outlined in this document. The candidate must make the case that their performance has met or exceeded departmental and university expectations. Supporting materials may include, curricular matter (e.g., course syllabi, student work, rubrics, etc.), copies of scholarly work, and evidence or narrative of service. In addition, candidates are encouraged to cite relevant independent sources (e.g. book reviews, citations, etc.) to demonstrate the quality of their contributions. Letters of recommendation from friends and colleagues of the candidate are not considered independent sources of evidence.

The candidate's dossier and CV should be clearly organized with headings and subheadings consistent with department and university standards so that the nature of all contributions is documented. Additionally, candidates should provide a one-page "highlights" document in their dossier to emphasize work that has been completed during the period of review.

In addition to preparing a dossier, the candidate needs to ensure that peer evaluations of their teaching and a current CV are included. The college office will include all student and peer evaluations of teaching in the candidate's PAF.

- B. **Evaluation Guidelines:** The committee evaluation will be based on the evidence presented in the WPAF (i.e., the dossier and personnel action file). The evaluation should take into consideration the candidate's rank, workload, assigned time, and previous developmental feedback provided in periodic and performance evaluations. Other factors to be considered are the quality, quantity, originality, leadership roles, contribution of the faculty member (e.g., authorship, contributor, officer, etc.), rigor of external review, and prestige of the documented activities. To this end, a hierarchy of levels (with level 1 being the highest level of achievement) and examples have been provided to serve as a guideline. Candidates will be rated in each area of evaluation using the following language from the FPPP (FPPP 10.3.3):
- Exceeds Expectations: "...evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement..."
 - Meets Expectations: "... evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making continual, impressive, and valued contributions to the academic community..."
 - Does Not Meet Expectations: - "... evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions..."
 - Summary of FPPP Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

C. **Summary of FPPP Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

	Instruction	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Retention	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
Tenure	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor*	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Promotion to Associate Professor	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor*	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Promotion to Full Professor**	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

**For accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must achieve the Year-6 "Exceeds Expectations" criteria in each area of evaluation. For additional criteria for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 10.5.3. For accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must achieve "Exceeds Expectations" in each area of evaluation, and the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 11.1.3.*

***Evidence used in the evaluation of promotion will only include work completed in the period of review, which is the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. In addition to a rating of "Meets Expectations" in all three areas of evaluation, promotion to Professor requires substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University level {FPPP 11.1.2}.*

D. **Instruction Overview:** CAGD faculty will be evaluated on student-centered instruction, effective use of technology, reflective practices, and the provision of accessible and equitable learning opportunities for students. Candidates should present evidence that addresses each of these areas, and aligns with the levels of evidence outlined below. The candidate is responsible for providing appropriate verifiable documentation and for making the case to the RTP committee that their performance meets or exceeds expectations.

- a. **Peer Teaching Observations:** Candidates will have a minimum of one peer teaching observation per academic year. Each academic year, the department RTP committee will assign its members, or members of the faculty at a rank above the faculty member being evaluated, to perform the peer teaching observation. Throughout the period of review, additional observations and evaluations from multiple peers are encouraged and may be requested by the candidate, including from those within their subdiscipline. All classroom visits should be scheduled in consultation with the faculty being evaluated. Teaching observations will be documented using the department classroom observation form.
- b. **Instruction Levels of Evidence:** The following levels of evidence will be used to evaluate the quality and quantity of the candidate's work, with level 1 being the highest level of achievement. The list presented for each level of evidence is not all-inclusive; the list is meant to provide examples of the quality and quantity of work expected for each level. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient verifiable documentation and information regarding the nature of their contributions to

each piece of evidence to justify the level presented. Specifically, the candidate is responsible for making the case to the RTP committee that their performance meets or exceeds the expectations.

Level 1: Pedagogical practices that are indicative of reflection, currency in the field, student-centered learning and teaching, and valuing equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI).

- **Peer teaching observation ratings are at the level of "meets expectations" or better, or the candidate has progressed to "meets expectations" or better during the period of review.**
- **Evidence of reflection and action, in response to SFOT results and/or peer evaluations with a subsequent associated improvement in feedback (as needed).**
- **Evidence that they create an accessible and equitable learning environment that embraces diversity and inclusion. Evidence of reflection and implementation of practices in response to equity gaps though this may not be evident in subsequent equity gap results (i.e., gaps may not improve despite the reflection and action).**
- Course materials are in an accessible format as evidenced by accessibility scores in the course learning management system. Specifically, ALLY Course Accessibility scores are greater than 90%.
- Gives students multiple modes of demonstrating their achievement of course learning objectives.
- Regularly revises and updates course content to enhance student learning.
- Evidence that CAGD Program student learning objectives are being addressed, assessed, and students are achieving the objectives.
- Evidence of course curriculum development or revision that occurs through department and college curriculum committee processes.
- Provides data or evidence to demonstrate students' learning improvement in a given course.
- Completes a Faculty Development (FDEV) learning community (semester or academic year in length) and demonstrates how this learning opportunity influences their pedagogical practices or enhances student learning in their course(s).
- Provides experiential or service-learning opportunities for students in the classroom or beyond.
- Serves as a chair of graduate student project, thesis, or professional paper.
- Earns University or external award for instruction.

Level 2: Materials generally demonstrate the use of effective learning and teaching strategies and value of EDI.

- **Majority of peer teaching observation ratings are at the level of "meets expectations", or the candidate has progressed to "meets expectations" during the period of review.**
- **Evidence of reflection, and action, in response to SFOT results, though this may not be evident in subsequent SFOT results (i.e., scores and comments may not improve despite the reflection and action).**
- **Evidence that they create an accessible and equitable learning environment that embraces diversity and inclusion.**
- Course content is reflective of current evidence in the field (e.g., evidence from peer observations, integration of scholarly activities in the classroom, current literature is used in course materials, etc.).
- Course materials are in an accessible format as evidenced by accessibility scores in the course learning management system. Specifically, ALLY Course Accessibility scores are greater than 80%.
- Provides evidence, in addition to information provided in course syllabi, that CAGD department student learning objectives are being addressed and assessed.

- Inclusive language is used throughout course syllabi and present in other course materials.
- Participates in FDEV trainings or workshops, or documents the use of available Faculty Development (or other) resources to improve pedagogical practices.
- Demonstrates opportunities for student engagement with peers and faculty in the classroom setting.
- Gives guest lecture or presentation in a university course in the department, elsewhere on campus, or in a course at another university.
- Serves as member of graduate student project, thesis, or professional paper committee. Contributes to planning, writing, and revising at the direction of the committee chair.

Level 3: Materials demonstrate efforts aimed at improving teaching and learning.

- Peer teaching observation ratings are on a trajectory of improvement towards the "meets expectations" rating during the period of review.
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) ratings are on a trajectory for the overall quality of teaching ratings being "adequate" or better.
- Course learning objectives align with department student learning outcomes, and this is evident in course syllabi.
- Course materials are in an accessible format as evidenced by accessibility scores in the course learning management system. Specifically, ALLY Course Accessibility scores are greater than 70%.
- Inclusive language is used throughout course syllabi.
- Serves as a comprehensive exam committee member. With direction from the committee chair, contributes to student preparation, exam writing, and exam assessment.

c. **Instruction Evaluation and Criteria:** Information in the table that follows is based on FPPP descriptors and previously described levels of evidence for instruction.

	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2 nd Year Retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 2 ● A minimum of 1 additional piece of evidence from any level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● A minimum of 2 additional pieces of evidence from any level
4 th Year Retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 2 ● An additional 3 pieces of evidence, with a minimum of 2 of these pieces from level 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● An additional 5 pieces of evidence, with a minimum of 2 of these pieces from level 1
6 th Year – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● An additional 5 pieces of evidence, with a minimum of 3 of these pieces from level 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● An additional 5 pieces of level 1 evidence ● An additional 3 pieces of level 2 evidence
Promotion to Full Professor**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● An additional 5 pieces of evidence, with a minimum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meets all bold criteria in level 1 ● An additional 5 pieces of level 1 evidence

	of 3 of these pieces from level 1	● An additional 3 pieces of level 2 evidence
--	-----------------------------------	--

**For accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must achieve the 6th year "Exceeds Expectations" criteria. For additional criteria for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 10.5.3. For accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must achieve "Exceeds Expectations" in each area of evaluation, and the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 11.1.3.*

***Evidence used in the evaluation of promotion will only include work completed in the period of review, which is the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. (FPPP 11.1.2).*

E. **Professional Growth and Achievement Overview:** Computer Animation and Game Development faculty value a holistic vision of scholarly contributions (Boyer, 1990), where scholarly contributions share the characteristics of originality, peer-review, and formal communication. It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the quality of scholarship and discuss it within the context of their subdiscipline. The candidate should present evidence of professional growth and achievement according to the levels of evidence described herein; this evidence will be evaluated by the committee based on the products and impact of the candidate's work. Candidates and evaluators should be mindful of the diversity among subdisciplines of Computer Animation and Game Development and the related differences in the subsequent products of professional growth and achievement. With this in mind the levels of evidence presented herein have been developed with the intent of recognizing the many forms of scholarship that may emerge from the respective subdisciplines of Computer Animation and Game Development. Regardless of the subdiscipline, for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer-reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member's capability of being a contributing scholar in Computer Animation and Game Development. Additionally, candidates must demonstrate continuous contributions in the area of professional growth and achievement in pursuit of becoming a recognized expert in their field.

- a. **Professional Growth and Achievement Levels of Evidence:** The following levels of evidence will be used to evaluate the quality and quantity of candidate work, with level 1 being the highest level of achievement. No work completed should be double-counted (e.g., a conference abstract and poster or podium presentation is the equivalent of one piece of evidence.)

Level 1: Note: Candidate must document significant contribution to all co-authored material. In support of the department mission, collaborative work with students is always valued and encouraged.

- First author, significant co-author, or co-author with Computer Animation and Game Development student, of published peer reviewed journal article
- First author, significant co-author, or co-author with Computer Animation and Game Development student of published peer reviewed proceedings {Note: this does not refer to abstracts published as part of conference proceedings}
- Published book (e.g., a non-self-published textbook, anthology, scholarly book, etc.)
- Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work (e.g., interactive media, game, animation, film, software, etc.)
- Editor of scholarly book or textbook
- Chapter in edited scholarly book or textbook
- Principal or co-principal investigator on internal grant award greater than \$5,000 or the competitiveness of the grant award is well-documented
- Principal or co-principal investigator on external grant award greater than \$10,000 or the competitiveness of the grant is well-documented

- Invited, selected, or peer-reviewed oral or poster presentation at international or national conference {Note: candidate or their student must be the presenter}
- Principal or co- principal investigator on an internal or external grant not awarded (Note: Grant proposal must be greater than \$50,000)

Level 2:

- International, national, or state award for academic technology creation
- Co-author of published peer-reviewed journal article
- Co-author of published peer-reviewed proceedings
- Substantial contributor to professional studio published creative work (e.g., interactive media, game, animation, film, software, etc.)
- Principal or co-principal investigator on internal grant awarded less than \$5,000
- Principal or co-principal investigator on external grant awarded less than \$10,000
- Invited, selected, or peer-reviewed oral or poster presentation at regional or state conference
- Published abstract from conference proceedings of international or national conference
- Published activity booklet or manual (non-self-published)
- Lead a significant degree program curriculum revision or proposal (see CSU, Chico Academic Department Manual for definition) at program or state level
- Internal or external grant not awarded {Note: Grant proposal should be greater than \$25,000.}

Level 3:

- Local presentation at professional conference, workshop, or community organization (e.g., campus events, local associations, school boards, etc.)
- Contributor to professional studio published creative work (e.g., interactive media, game, animation, film, software, etc.)
- Non-peer-reviewed publications (e.g., magazine, newsletter, newspaper, blog, website, etc.)
- Academic technology creation (e.g., video, software, website, etc.)
- Internal grant, external grant, student-faculty collaborative awards, or research contract awarded (Note: Grant proposals less than \$1,000 unless competitiveness of grant is otherwise argued)
- Professional conference attendance (Note: includes regional, national, or international - in-person attendance is encouraged)
- Principal or co-principal investigator on internal grant not awarded less than \$5,000
- Principal or co-principal investigator on external grant not awarded less than \$10,000
- Trainings, certifications, or continuing education related to professional growth and achievement

b. **Professional Growth and Achievement Evaluation and Criteria:** Information in the table that follows is based on FPPP descriptors and previously described levels of evidence for professional growth and achievement.

	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2 nd Year Retention	A minimum of 2 pieces of evidence including the following:	A minimum of 3 pieces of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of level 1 work in progress where the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 2: Minimum of 2 ● For 1 piece of level 1 evidence the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work.
4 th Year Retention	<p>A minimum of 4 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 1 ● Level 2: Minimum of 2 level 2 or greater ● Evidence of 1 level 1 publication in progress where the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work. 	<p>A minimum of 5 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 2 ● Level 2: Minimum of 2 level 2 or greater ● Evidence of 1 level 1 publication in progress where the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work.
6 th Year – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor*	<p>A minimum of 6 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 2 ● Level 2: Minimum of 3 level 2 or greater. ● Evidence of 1 level 1 publication in progress where the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work. 	<p>A minimum of 8 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 4 ● Level 2: Minimum of 3 level 2 or greater. ● Evidence must include 2 level 1 publications for which the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work.
Promotion to Full Professor**	<p>A minimum of 6 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 2 ● Level 2: Minimum of 3 level 2 or greater. 	<p>A minimum of 8 pieces of evidence including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: Minimum of 4 ● Level 2: Minimum of 3 level 2 or greater.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of 1 level 1 publication in progress where the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence must include 2 level 1 publications for which the candidate is first-author, significant co-author, or the work is co-authored with a CAGD student(s) or Lead producer, lead developer or lead designer of professional studio published creative work.
--	---	--

**For accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must achieve the 6th year "Exceeds Expectations" criteria. For additional criteria for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 10.5.3. For accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must achieve "Exceeds Expectations" in each area of evaluation, and the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 11.1.3.*

***Evidence used in the evaluation of promotion to full professor will only include work completed in the period of review, which is the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. (FPPP 11.1.2).*

F. **Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community Overview:** CAGD faculty must provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, university, discipline, profession, and community beyond the university. All service contributions should be well-documented, including a narrative of the nature, quantity, and years of service associated with each piece of service work.

a. **Service Levels of Achievement:** The following levels of evidence will be used to evaluate the quality and quantity of candidate work, with level 1 being the highest level of achievement. For committee work, candidates should describe the nature and extent of the commitment, and their contribution to each committee. The list presented for each level of evidence is not all-inclusive; the list is meant to provide examples of the quality and quantity of work expected for each level. The candidate is responsible for making the case that their performance meets or exceeds expectations.

It is the candidates' responsibility to provide sufficient verifiable documentation and information regarding the nature of their contributions for each piece of evidence to justify the level presented.

Level 1: Service at this level should be for a minimum of one academic year and require discipline specific expertise. Work from the same bullet point may be "counted" more than once (e.g., serving as the editor of a peer-reviewed journal for 4 years would count as 4 pieces of evidence).

- Editor of peer-reviewed journal
- University, College, or Department committee chair (e.g., curriculum, EDI, scholarship, tenure-track search, etc.)
- Serving as a member of Academic Senate, Senate Standing or sub-Committee or other university committee with equivalent workload
- Department personnel (RTP) committee member
- Program leads, coordinator, associate chair, etc.
- Internal or external award for service or advising
- Faculty Development learning community leader
- Faculty Development new faculty mentor

- Officer, board member, or significant participation in professional organization at the international, national, regional, or state level

Level 2: Service at this level should be for a minimum of one academic year. Work from the same bullet point may be "counted" more than once.

- University, college, or department committee member (e.g., curriculum, technologies, graduate, EDI, scholarship, tenure-track search, etc.)
- Faculty Development learning community guest speaker or presenter
- Journal editorial board member
- Organizer, manager, or director of campus, college, or department sponsored events that engage Computer Animation and Game Development students (e.g., jams, etc.)

Level 3: Service at this level may be less than one academic year, a one-time commitment, or not require significant contributions outside of scheduled activities. The service should provide an opportunity for the faculty member to contribute to the CAGD Program, campus, or community in a meaningful way. Work from the same bullet point may be "counted" more than once.

- Ad-Hoc manuscript reviewer
- Departmental Ad-Hoc committee member (e.g. curriculum, technologies, etc.)
- Participation in campus, college, or department sponsored events (e.g., Design Expos, promotional fairs, etc.)
- Student recruitment event participation (e.g., lab tours, field trips for local schools, Wildcat Preview Day, Choose Chico Day, etc.)
- Fundraising events (e.g., Chico Giving Day Ambassador)
- Participation in local community events as a representative of CSU, Chico and the Computer Animation and Game Development Department
- CSU, Chico student club advisor
- Member of community committee or board (e.g., Chico Children's Museum, Community Foundation Sub-Committee, etc.)

b. **Service Evaluation and Criteria:** Information in the table that follows is based on FPPP descriptors and previously described levels of evidence for service.

	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2 nd Year Retention	A minimum of 3 pieces of evidence from any level.	A minimum of 6 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum of 1 piece of level 1 or 2 evidence.
4 th Year Retention	A minimum of 6 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum of 1 piece of level 1 or 2 evidence. 	A minimum of 9 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum of 3 pieces of level 1 or 2 evidence.
6 th Year – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor*	A minimum of 9 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum of 3 pieces of level 1 or 2 evidence. 	A minimum of 9 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum of 5 pieces of level 1 or 2 evidence.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 additional level 1 piece of evidence.
Promotion to Full Professor**	A minimum of 9 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minimum of 3 pieces of level 1 evidence. ● 3 additional pieces of level 1 or level 2 evidence. 	A minimum of 12 pieces of evidence including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minimum of 5 pieces of level 1 evidence ● 4 additional pieces of level 1 or level 2 evidence.

**For accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must achieve the 6th year "Exceeds Expectations" criteria. For additional criteria for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 10.5.3. For accelerated promotion to full professor, the candidate must achieve "Exceeds Expectations" in each area of evaluation, and the candidate must meet the criteria in FPPP 11.1.3.*

***Evidence used in the evaluation of promotion will only include work completed in the period of review, which is the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank. (FPPP 11.1.2).*

Section III: Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty

- **Introduction and Overview:** Periodic evaluations of lecturers will be completed following the guidelines provided in the FPPP (FPPP 9.0), College Handbook, and this document. Faculty are encouraged to consult with the Department Chair, the Department RTP Committee, and reference each of the listed documents to ensure they understand the evaluation process and their responsibilities as they relate to the process. Lecturer faculty will be evaluated on their teaching effectiveness, performance related to any other work assignments, activities supporting currency in the field consistent with the lecturer's range classification and responsibilities, and activities that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Computer Animation and Game Development Program, College, and University (FPPP 9.1.2.c). Lecturers are responsible for providing evidence in their dossier for evaluation by the Department RTP committee. The evaluation process will include a classroom observation and a review of the faculty member's personnel action file and dossier. The process will conclude with copies of the evaluation report written by the Department RTP Committee being shared with the faculty member, and the Dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file following the deadlines provided in the FPPP.
- **RTP Committee Responsibilities:** As part of the evaluation process, a classroom observation of the faculty member will be conducted by the Department Chair or a tenured faculty member assigned by the Department Chair. The completed classroom observation report will be added to the personnel action file of the faculty member. All RTP committee members will read the personnel action file and dossier of the faculty member being evaluated. The RTP committee will draft an evaluation report for the faculty member and work together to finalize the report before it is added to the personnel action file of the faculty member. The report will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty member in their work assignments, indicate if the performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, describe how the faculty member has maintained currency in the field, and acknowledge activities of the faculty member that are not part of their work assignment that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community. The report may also include constructive suggestions to contribute to the development of the faculty member in their work assignment. If the Department Chair is not serving as a member of the Department RTP Committee, they will review the report prior to it being shared with the Dean and offer comments as needed and indicate that they concur or do not concur with the Department RTP Committee report.
- **Evaluation Timeline:** Lecturer faculty evaluations will occur in either the fall or spring semester. Lecturers undergoing a review will be notified in the beginning of the fall or spring semester by the College Office. Information regarding when lecturer faculty evaluations will occur, based on the lecturer's appointment, are outlined in the FPPP (9.1.4).
- **Lecturer Responsibilities and Dossier Preparation:** It is the responsibility of the faculty member to annually update their personnel action file and supporting materials regardless of whether they are scheduled for an evaluation (FPPP 9.1.2.d). The faculty member's personnel action file and supporting materials (i.e., dossier) will be used in the evaluation process completed by the Department RTP Committee. The faculty member's dossier should include a current CV, supporting evidence, and a narrative of this evidence as outlined below. Faculty members are encouraged to reference the College Handbook for additional information on preparing the dossier.
 - a. **Teaching Effectiveness.** Faculty will be evaluated on student-centered instruction, effective use of technology, reflective practices, and the provision of accessible and equitable learning opportunities for students. Faculty should present evidence that addresses each of these areas, and consider the levels of evidence outlined in Section II.D.b Level 1 and Level 2. The list presented for each level of evidence is not all-inclusive; the list is meant to provide examples of the quality and quantity of work expected for each level. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient verifiable documentation and information regarding the nature of their contributions to each piece of evidence to justify the level presented. Student Feedback on Teaching (SFOT) and classroom observations will

be used in the evaluation process. The faculty member should summarize their SFOTs, provide additional evidence of teaching effectiveness and include a narrative summary of this evidence. Specifically, the candidate is responsible for making the case to the RTP committee that their performance meets or exceeds the expectations.

- b. **Other Work Assignments.** If the faculty member has work assignments other than teaching (e.g., advising, research, service, etc.) for which they receive AWTU or other workload, this will be evaluated and verifiable documentation presented in the dossier.
- c. **Currency in the Field.** The candidate should describe activities that support currency in the field that is appropriate to their appointment. Currency can be supported with activities such as continued education, research, scholarship, and professional activities (e.g., journal reviewing, attending professional conferences, etc.). Examples of such contributions or activities may include but are not limited to those found in Section II.E.a Level 1 and Level 2.
- d. **Contributions to Strategic Plans and Goals.** Any other voluntary activities (i.e., work not required by contract) or achievements that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community should also be documented by the faculty member. Candidates may share activities related to: equity, diversity, and inclusion; sustainability, service learning opportunities; and engagement with the community.

Section IV: Lecturer Range Elevations

- A. **Introduction and Overview:** Decisions on RANGE elevations for lecturers in the Department of Computer Animation and Game Development are based on the department mission, as well as the mission and strategic plan of California State University, Chico, the CBA, the FPPP, the College handbook, and this document. Individuals eligible for a RANGE elevation will be notified early Spring by the College Office. The Computer Animation and Game Development Department Personnel Committee is responsible for reviewing application materials provided by the eligible individual and sharing their recommendation with the Department Chair. The Department Chair may add their own recommendation before forwarding the application and recommendations to the Dean for review. The Dean will share the final decision with the eligible individual.
- B. **Evaluation:** The department RTP committee, Department Chair, and Dean evaluations will be based on evidence in the application materials provided by the eligible individual and documents in their university personnel action file. Significant achievement beyond typical responsibilities is required for a RANGE elevation. Eligible applicants should ensure their application materials make a case for exceptional performance and demonstration of maintaining currency in the field worthy of a RANGE elevation and associated salary increase.
- C. **Eligibility and Criteria:** The following criteria are based on information provided in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 12.16-12.18, FPPP, Article 12, the College Handbook, and the CFA:
- Criteria for RANGE elevation for temporary faculty shall be appropriate to lecturer work assignments (CBA 12.19).
 - 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 (FPPP 12.0).
 - 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. In addition to other evidence of teaching, lecturer faculty may be evaluated on performance related to any other work assignment(s), besides teaching, as applicable, as specified in the appointment letter along with clear expectations for satisfactory performance of these assignments.
- D. **Teaching Excellence:** To make a case for exceptional performance worthy of RANGE elevation applicants must demonstrate teaching excellence. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not sufficient to demonstrate "teaching excellence." Examples of how applicants might demonstrate teaching excellence should follow Section II.D.b Level 1 evidence.
- E. **Maintaining Currency in the Field:** To make a case for exceptional performance worthy of a RANGE elevation applicants must demonstrate how they have maintained currency in the field. Applicants should illustrate how they have maintained their currency in multiple ways. Service alone is not enough to demonstrate currency. Examples of such contributions or activities may include but are not limited to those found in Section II.E.a Level 1 and Level 2.
- F. **Application Materials:** The application must include a written letter clearly stating the applicant's request, a complete and current vita, and a narrative documenting teaching excellence and currency in the field since the initial appointment or last RANGE elevation, whichever is more recent. The applicant should also include evidence of teaching excellence and currency in the field. Evidence might include items such as course materials, student work, publications, presentations, etc. Applicants are encouraged to use recommendations in the College Handbook for developing a CV and dossier as they work to prepare their

materials. Application materials should be shared electronically in the manner indicated by the College Office.

Section V: Glossary of Terms

- CBA: Collective Bargaining Agreement
- CV: Curriculum Vitae
- EDI: Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- FPPP: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures
- CAGD: Computer Animation & Game Development
- PAF: Personnel Action File
- RTP: Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
- SFOT: Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning
- WPAF: Working Personnel Action File

Appendix A: Department RTP Committee and Candidate Meetings

Overview: After submitting their dossier and prior to the writing of the report, tenure-track and tenured candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion will meet with Computer Animation and Game Development Department RTP Committee Members to discuss the logistics of the RTP process. During the meeting, the candidate will be provided an opportunity to ask questions about the RTP and review processes, and the committee will address these questions and offer clarification on the processes as needed. The candidate will be asked to share highlights of their work in the areas of instruction, professional growth and achievement, and service since their last review. The meeting will take approximately 45 minutes and will be scheduled in consultation with the candidate.

Additional Notes:

1. The committee may have specific questions regarding the contents of the dossier.
2. The committee may ask the candidate to add additional materials to their dossier to better highlight or emphasize the candidate's work or evidence.
3. The candidate will be asked to share goals for each area of review.

