



California State
University **Chico**

**School of Education
Approved May 2024**

Department Standards: FPPP reference guide to RTP and Evaluation

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

Table of Contents

1.0 SOE VISION.....	5
1.1 Vision.....	5
2.0 SOE COMMITTEES	6
2.1 Function of the Personnel Committee	6
2.2 Structure of the Personnel Committee	6
2.3 Personnel Committee - Membership by SOE Director (see section 4.1.10 FPPP)	6
2.4 Selection of the Personnel Committee	6
2.5 Operation of the Personnel Committee	7
2.5.1 SOE Search Committee Structure.....	7
2.6 SOE Search Processes	7
2.7 Lecturer Faculty Hiring Process (.50 or greater).....	9
2.8 SOE Personnel Committee for Post-Tenured and Lecturer Faculty Reviews	10
2.8.1 Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee	10
2.8.2 Post Tenure Performance Review Committee	10
2.8.3 Post Tenure Periodic Review Committee (5 Year Review)	10
3.0 REVISION PROCESS FOR THE SOE PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (SOEPPP)	10
4.0 DIVERSITY	11
5.0 APPOINTMENTS	11
6.0 ACCELERATED TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION	12
6.1 Accelerated Tenure or Promotion to Associate for Probationary Faculty	12
6.2 Accelerated Promotion for Tenured Faculty to Full Professor	12
7.0 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS.....	13
7.1 Procedures for Classroom Observations (for course instructors, face-to-face or online)	14
7.2 Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning.....	15
7.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision	15
7.4 Procedures for Post Tenure Periodic Review (5 Year Review)	15
8.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY	16
8.1 EVALUATION OF LECTURER FACULTY	16
8.2 Range Elevation	18
9.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY	18
9.1	18
9.2 SPC Procedures	18
10.0 EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY	19
10.1 Evaluation Categories and Standards.....	19
INSTRUCTION	20
Rubric for Category I. Instruction.....	23
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT	24
Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)	27
SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY	29
Rubric for Category III. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS	

AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)	32
11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	34
11.1	34
11.2	34
12.0 PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY	34
12.1	34
12.2	34
12.3	34
12.4	34
12.5	34
13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED	34
SOE PPP Appendices	35
Appendix A: Review of Supervisors	36
Appendix B: University Supervisor Evaluation	37
Appendix C: Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty.....	39
Appendix D: Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty	42
Appendix E: The Lecturer Faculty Supplemental File for Periodic Evaluation	43
Appendix F: Range Elevation	45
Appendix G: Sample Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process.....	46
Appendix H: Sample Interview Day Agenda	47
Appendix J: Example of Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Table.....	49



School of Education Personnel Policies and Procedures

Approved

May 2024

The School of Education (SOE) Vision address the collaborative nature of work in the school, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE Vision also guides the evaluation of faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community.

The SOE has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the anchor and guide for interpreting the rubric. These standards, some of which are based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPT), are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.¹ The candidate submits evidence to align with the elements under each standard (see table of suggested types of evidence). The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Expectations of performance are commensurate with years of service and professorial rank of the candidate. As a result, these varying expectations of development provide a context for utilizing the rubric in performance review and periodic evaluation. In all areas relating to hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure, the [Collective Bargaining Agreement \(CBA\)](#), Title 5 regulations and the [University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures \(FPPP\)](#) govern the SOE policies. The SOE Personnel Committee (SPC), the SOE Director, and candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and periodic evaluation must be familiar with these policies and procedures. This document sets the standards by which SOE faculty are appointed and evaluated.

1.0 SOE VISION

1.1 Vision

The School of Education prepares innovative educators to serve in classrooms, local communities, and across global contexts with a deep commitment to justice-oriented approaches that elevate educational experiences, opportunities, and life

¹ The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards <https://www.nbpts.org/certification/five-core-propositions/>

outcomes for all learners while collectively working toward liberation for oppressed peoples.

2.0 SOE COMMITTEES

2.1 Function of the Personnel Committee

The function of the SOE Personnel Committee (SPC) shall be to review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion. It is also the responsibility of the SPC to review and recommend policies and procedures related to these matters. Recommended policy and practice shall be consistent with approved personnel plans and University personnel documents.

The SPC will consult with the SOE Director on the development, implementation, and annual review of the SOE PPP.

2.2 Structure of the Personnel Committee

The SPC will consist of a minimum of five elected tenured faculty members (including academic year FERP faculty), at least three of whom are at the rank of Professor. The SPC will select a chair from among its membership. All members of the SPC must complete the unconscious bias training.

Service on the SPC shall be for two years. No faculty member shall be required to serve on the SPC more than two years within any three-year period. Elections will happen as needed to replace members in a staggered manner to maintain consistency. Faculty members who are on leave for any part of the academic year will be ineligible to serve on the SPC. Faculty members who are eligible for and elected to the SPC are required to serve and may not serve on any other college or university personnel committee.

2.3 Personnel Committee - Membership by SOE Director (see section 4.1.10 FPPP)

According to the FPPP, the Director of the SOE may participate as a member of the SPC when the committee is undertaking a periodic evaluation or a performance review. Such membership counts towards the committee's required size. If the SOE Director elects to serve as a member of the SPC, the Director must do so for all candidates either undergoing a periodic evaluation or performance review during that personnel cycle.

As per FPPP 4.1.10.c, if the Director serves on the SPC, the committee's report shall be considered an SOE report, and the Director will not be considered a subsequent separate level of review. Upon the Director's request, the SOE Personnel Committee may meet with the Director to discuss personnel matters that are not part of the normal evaluation schedule. The main purpose of these meetings is to provide counsel to the Director.

2.4 Selection of the Personnel Committee

General voting policy, including election of SPC members, will be consistent with the policy specified in the SOE Constitution. Committee elections will take place

in May for the following academic year, except as specified in this document. The following procedures will be used to elect the SPC:

1. The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee.
2. All probationary, tenured and FERP faculty members having at least a .50 appointment will receive a ballot and be eligible to vote.
3. Those nominees receiving the greatest number of votes will be elected.
4. If a tie vote occurs, a run-off election will be held.

2.5 Operation of the Personnel Committee

A quorum will consist of four (4) of the elected Committee members.

The SPC Chair calls and presides at meetings and carries out other appropriate duties. The secretary keeps minutes. These minutes indicate only time, place, date of meeting, members present, and any action taken.

2.5.1 SOE Search Committee Structure

The SOE Search Committee (SSC) will normally be constituted in the spring semester preceding the year of the search process. Members of the committee will serve from the time the committee is constituted through the end of the search.

The SSC will consist of: (1) the SOE Director and/or the Assistant Director, (2) the coordinator of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, (3) a member of the SPC appointed by the SPC, (4) one tenured or, with the prior approval of the Provost, one tenure-track faculty elected by the faculty of the department, (5) one faculty member from the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, and (6) optional: one faculty member from another department. The SOE Search Committee is encouraged to include at least one student from the program(s) in the open faculty search sessions. The student will be selected by the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve. In years when searches are to be conducted for more than one program, additional members representing programs of primary employment will be added to the Search Committee. The SSC will select a faculty member to chair the committee, who will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the School of Education.

2.6 SOE Search Processes

2.6.1

The SSC will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned as an early step in writing a proposal for recruitment.

2.6.2

The proposal for recruitment will include selection criteria for the position that specify minimum qualifications and preferred qualifications. These selection criteria will become the basis for position advertisements and the paper screening of applicants.

2.6.3

Candidates for a probationary faculty position must meet SOE minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned doctorate in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

2.6.4

The proposal for recruitment shall be approved by the SOE faculty² before submission to the dean of the college and provost of the university. If recommendations for changes are made after approval by the faculty, the proposal shall be returned to the faculty and a consultation process will be conducted to arrive at an approvable search proposal.

2.6.5

Once approved, advertising for all positions will occur on a timeline that permits the SSC to review the files of applicants, interview final candidates, and make recommendations to the faculty so that an offer of employment can be approved and made prior to the end of the academic year.

2.6.6

The SSC will conduct a screening process. This screening process will be used to determine candidates to be interviewed by phone.³ Following phone interviews, reference checks will be conducted, and candidates will be selected and invited for on-campus interviews. At a minimum, there will be three reference checks for the finalist offered the position.

2.6.7

On-campus interviews will only be conducted at times when the SSC, candidates of the program, the faculty, the program coordinator, the SOE Director, and the dean or associate dean have the availability to interview candidates. SOE faculty and others will be invited to attend an instructional presentation by each faculty candidate related to the position of primary appointment and ask questions of each candidate.⁴

2.6.8

The SSC will recommend candidates for employment to the tenured and tenure track faculty. The tenured and tenure track faculty will recommend the individual faculty for hire to the dean of the college after that individual receives a majority vote.

² The SOE faculty, in this case, consists of the SOE tenured faculty.

³ See Appendix G for sample phone interview questions.

⁴ See Appendix H for a sample interview day agenda. Office of Academic Personnel site.

2.6.9

For issues not addressed in this document, the SPC will follow the university policies and procedures related to appointments.

2.7 Lecturer Faculty Hiring Process (.50 or greater)

2.7.1

Lecturer faculty hired for less than a .50 appointment for instruction are hired at the discretion of SOE Director, in consultation with the appropriate program coordinator and faculty. Lecturer faculty hired for any amount of supervision will be reviewed by the SOE Lecturer Faculty Search Committee. Lecturer faculty with a .50 appointment or greater will become voting members of the SOE, as per the SOE Constitution, Article IV.1.

2.7.2

Candidates for lecturer who teach courses must meet SOE minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned master's degree in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

Candidates for lecturers who supervise must meet SOE minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned baccalaureate or master's degree in education or a related field, (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking, and (3) hold an earned teaching credential from California or another state. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.

2.7.3

The Lecturer Faculty Search Committee will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned. The search committee will consist of the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director, the program coordinator(s), or a designee from the program that the lecturer faculty will be primarily assigned, and one tenured/tenure track faculty representing another program who is independent of the roles held by the Director, Assistant Director, and the Coordinator. Recommendations will be made to the SOE Director.

The Lecturer Faculty Search Committee is a standing committee appointed by the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director. The LFSC will review all documents for hire submitted by lecturers.

2.7.4

For Expectations of Lecturers in each Range, refer to FPPP 5.2.5: University Appointment Standards for Lecturer Ranges.

2.8 SOE Personnel Committee for Post-Tenured and Lecturer Faculty Reviews

In order to conduct university required faculty evaluations according to established timelines, the SPC will determine the need for committees at the beginning of the fall semester, as follows:

2.8.1 Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for collecting data for the periodic evaluation of lecturer faculty and reporting findings to the SPC (procedures for reviews are addressed in Section 7.0 of this document and Section 9.0 of the FPPP). All tenured SOE faculty members who are not serving on the SPC or College Personnel Committee shall be eligible to serve on the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee and, are required to serve, barring an approved University absence or leave. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve more than two years within any three-year period on the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee.

2.8.2 Post Tenure Performance Review Committee

The Post Tenure Performance Review Committee will conduct the performance reviews of tenured faculty seeking the rank of Full Professor (see Section 7.0 of this document and Section 11.1. of the FPPP). In the fall semester, the SPC will identify at least two members at the rank of Professor from the SPC committee, and the Department Chair (Director) who will conduct the performance review.

2.8.3 Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation Committee (5 Year Review)

The Post Tenure Periodic Review Committee will conduct the periodic evaluations of tenured faculty i.e., Full Professor or Associate Professor not seeking promotion (see Section 7.0 of this document and Section 11.2 of the FPPP). Tenured faculty members are evaluated at intervals no greater than five years. In the fall or spring semester, the SPC will identify at least two members at the rank of Professor from the SPC committee, and the Department Chair (Director) who will conduct the post tenure review. Faculty members assigned to conduct the periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member are eligible to concurrently serve on the SPC or College Personnel Committee.

3.0 REVISION PROCESS FOR THE SOE PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (SOEPPP)

At the beginning of each academic year, all members of the SPC shall read the current SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures (SOEPPP) document, University Faculty Personnel Policies Procedures (FPPP) document, and Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and suggest potential revisions to the SOE PPP. SPC introduces suggested revisions, and faculty shall then vote to approve an official SOE PPP and any appropriate evaluation forms. If approved at all university levels, all changes become effective the following academic year.

4.0 DIVERSITY

There will be a systematic effort to encourage recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates of members of underrepresented groups with the goal of obtaining an employee composition that reflects our diverse student body.

5.0 APPOINTMENTS

5.1

The normal appointment of a tenure-track faculty member will be to probationary status. For those seeking a position related to teaching instructional strategies, K-14 teaching experience is required. For other positions, K-14 teaching experience is desirable. Normally, no one with less than an educationally related M.A. degree or equivalent shall be hired to teach or supervise teacher candidates.

5.2

If any candidate for appointment is to be offered an initial rank higher than Assistant Professor, the SPC's review of this candidate must use the same rigorous procedure and standards for substantiation specified for on-campus promotions to the proposed rank.

5.3

The SOE will seek a sufficient number of probationary/tenure-track appointments to ensure continuity in program development, sustain the identity of the unit, and maintain a stable core of committed, qualified, and informed faculty. At the beginning of each academic year, the SOE Director and the SPC shall review, and update as necessary, the personnel portion of the SOE hiring practices, determining needs for new tenure track positions and the needed areas of expertise.

5.4

In an effort to ensure adequate faculty input into SOE hiring needs and plans, early in each fall semester, the SOE Director and program coordinators will consult with the SPC regarding utilization of current faculty positions and projected program faculty needs. A summary of this consultation will be provided to the SOE.

5.5

Should the annual consultation on faculty utilization (described in step 5.4, above) indicate a potential need for additional probationary faculty, the SPC will describe to the SOE in a general meeting the faculty needed and recommend that a request to hire probationary faculty be made. The decision to request hires will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty per SOE Constitution, Article IV.1. When the request is approved, the decision to constitute a Search Committee(s) will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty.

5.6

Advertising for all positions, probationary and temporary, will occur on a timeline that permits the Search Committee to review the files of applicants and interview final candidates prior to the end of the academic year.

6.0 ACCELERATED TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Consideration for accelerated tenure and/or promotion may be requested by any faculty member wishing to be so considered. The request must be made to the Dean of the College of Communication and Education and SOE Director by the fall semester census date (the closing date for the current Performance Review cycle: Refer to 10.5.4). Consideration of promotion which would occur earlier than provided for above may be initiated by written request of the would-be candidate or by action of the Department/Unit committee. To be promoted and/or tenured, such candidates must meet the criteria for an “exceptional record” (Refer to FPPP 10.5.2- and 10.5.8). Candidates for promotion without tenure must be similarly regarded as having an “exceptional record” (Refer to FPPP 10.5.7).

6.1 Accelerated Tenure or Promotion to Associate for Probationary Faculty

According to FPPP 10.5.3, “to qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) be rated *as exceeds expectations* (at year 6 of SOE PPP performance descriptors) in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the 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. The evidence to support such recognition must be provided by the applicant. The School of Education defines a typical full-time assignment as 12 units per semester, with a minimum of 6 units per semester dedicated to instruction. See also the details of evaluation in Section 7 of the SOE PPP.”

According to FPPP 10.5.2, “consideration of tenure before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of “accelerated tenure or promotion.” It should be noted that meeting the minimum requirements for tenure in a shorter timeline than the usual minimum (6 years) is not itself adequate for an award of accelerated tenure. A decision on tenure before the sixth year is necessarily based on less evidence of performance within rank than tenure granted on a normal timeline. For this reason, decisions for accelerated tenure will require that faculty meet a higher standard than they would for tenure granted on a normal timeline. This higher standard is defined in FPPP 10.5.3 and is the definition of an “exceptional record” for accelerated tenure.”

6.2 Accelerated Promotion for Tenured Faculty to Full Professor

According to FPPP 11.1.3, “to qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: (1) be ranked Exceeds Expectations 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 performance will continue, and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review.”

According to FPPP 11.1.4, “tenured faculty members wishing to apply for accelerated promotion to full professor must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. In the request, the candidate shall offer a brief description of how they meet the criteria (see above in 11.1.3) for eligibility for accelerated promotion. This request shall be included in the candidate’s Personnel Action File and in the candidate’s Dossier prior to closure of each.”

7.0 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS

The SPC shall be responsible for making a recommendation regarding each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. SPC members will review the data and evaluations. Unless expressly excluded in documents governing the RTP process, all responsibilities that comprise faculty workload are eligible for inclusion and consideration in the review process. This is not subject to change while faculty members are undergoing review.

After reviewing all available data, but before writing its final recommendation, the SPC shall meet individually in an interview with each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. The purpose of this meeting will be to answer unresolved questions related to the retention, tenure, or promotion process. The faculty member must be afforded an opportunity to respond to these questions and to receive answers to inquiries about the retention, tenure, or promotion process. The interview process will also be an opportunity for the SPC to discuss with the candidate future aspirations as a member of SOE and to suggest ways to meet personal/professional goals. The SOE Director, if not a member of the SPC, may be present at this meeting interview and may participate in the discussion. The secretary shall keep minutes. These minutes shall indicate time, place, and date of meetings; members present; and any action(s) taken. The report and recommendation relative to each candidate shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement.

In relation to recommendations on tenure and promotion, the committee will follow the guidelines of FPPP section 10.0. All performance reviews shall be written in an evaluative manner using the following ratings: “Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations.”

In order to earn tenure or promotion, a candidate must receive a rating of Meets Expectations and/or Exceeds Expectations in all three categories.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member’s capability to be a contributing scholar in education or a related field. SOE values collaborative professional achievement efforts (e.g., writing components of grant proposals or sections of publications), however, each individual contribution must be verified.

For promotion to Professor, as per FPPP Section 10.4.5.e. “Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation, and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly

demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.”

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion (probationary faculty), reappointment and range elevation (lecturer faculty) are reviewed and evaluated in accordance with policies, procedures, and criteria as described in the most current [FPPP](#). Probationary and tenured faculty should consult both the SOEPPP (especially Section 10) and the FPPP (especially FPPP 3.0, 10.0, and Appendix I) to obtain information on the documents included in their University personnel file, and to help determine the supporting materials they should provide in the dossier they are responsible for submitting.

The CME College office is the central collection point for all types of probationary faculty evaluation materials. Faculty shall organize and view/examine their personnel files in BOX. Procedures for collecting data shall ensure that only authorized personnel have access to faculty evaluations and files. (Authorized personnel are those identified in the FPPP or CBA.)

At the beginning of the semester for which they are scheduled for evaluation, Lecturer faculty will be provided a designated folder in BOX which includes two subfolders: their Personnel Action File (PAF) and their Supplemental Evidence File that they are responsible for submitting in the Lecturer Faculty Dossier. The Supplemental Evidence Folder includes a list of necessary documents located in BOX: 1) Resume/Curriculum Vita, 2) Narrative, 3) Teaching, 4) Currency in Teaching, 5) Non-Teaching Work if Applicable, and 6) Contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals. The SOE office will be the collection point for evaluation materials of lecturer faculty.

7.1 Procedures for Classroom Observations (for course instructors, face-to-face or online)

A classroom observation will be conducted for each review cycle. A SPC member, as assigned by the SPC chair, will make a formal observation. The SOE Director may also make an observation. Members of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Post Tenure Review Committee may make an observation as appropriate. Procedures for observations follow:

7.1.1

A time for the observation will be determined through consultation between the observer and the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and observer do not agree on a time, the chair of the SPC will determine the time and date for the observation. There will be a five-day notice, as per CBA 15.14. For online courses an interview between the faculty member and the observer with access to the online course during the interview will substitute for the classroom observation.

7.1.2

The faculty member should inform the observer of the objectives of the lesson and provide a course syllabus and other materials that will enable an informed

observation. The observer shall prepare a descriptive and evaluative commentary using the Classroom Observation of Faculty Form (see Appendix B). The observer should not solicit comments from students. The observer and faculty member should conduct a post-lesson conference, at which time the observer shares the observation report (Appendix B) and the candidate signs. A report of the observation, aligned with standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as set forth in SOEPPP 10.1, will be placed in the faculty member's University personnel action file. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a written rebuttal to this material per (FPPP 7.0.11).

7.1.3

The reviewing committee member and the SOE Director will typically not observe the faculty member at the same time. Exceptions will be made with approval of the faculty member. Subsequent to the review, additional classroom visitations may be conducted as needed.

7.2 Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning

All teaching faculty (tenure, tenure-track, and lecturer) will be given feedback by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 3.0 and 8.1.4. Results are filed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained by the Office of the Dean. The Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning⁵ section notes that all teaching faculty will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 3.0 and 8.1.4., which states, "Written or electronic student evaluations of teaching shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student evaluations. See CBA 15.15." (FPPP 8.1.4.a.2)

7.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision

Forms designed for assessing the quality of supervision will be distributed online by the SOE to credential candidates and to cooperating teachers in the fall and spring semesters. Forms completed after the closing date of a personnel cycle will be held out of the file until the next cycle. (See Appendix A) An interview shall be conducted for faculty members whose appointment is primarily supervision of candidates.

7.4 Procedures for Post Tenure Periodic Review (5 Year Review)

The evaluatee will provide a highlights page that summarizes the three sections along with supporting evidence. As per FPPP 11.2.3.a & b, faculty will provide course syllabi, course examinations, peer and student evaluations of instruction for courses representative of the evaluatee's responsibilities during the evaluation cycle, copies or abstracts of publications, evidence of participation in scholarly meetings, copies of papers presented at scholarly meetings, letters of commendation, evidence of committee service, and such additional information as they may wish to have considered. The evaluatee shall also provide a copy of their most current vita.

⁵ See Appendix I for SOE Items on the Student Feedback of Teaching and Learning

Per FPPP 11.2.4.a, after assessing the data, but before writing its final report, the Committee shall meet with the evaluatee to provide an opportunity to clarify any unresolved questions. The Committee's report shall include any recommendations it may make. Note that the focus of this review should be on providing developmental feedback and encouragement to maintain a positive level of performance. Where appropriate, the review provides an opportunity for those colleagues to express their appreciation to the faculty member for their continued positive contributions to the University. It is recognized that, where necessary, the review will include corrective feedback.

8.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY

8.0.1

Definition of a Lecturer faculty as noted in the FPPP (Definitions section). The procedures for recruitment and appointment of lecturer faculty with a time base of .50 or greater shall conform to Section 2.6 of this document and CBA Article 12.

8.0.2

The SPC and the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee are responsible for evaluation of lecturer faculty. The primary criterion for the evaluation of lecturer faculty is teaching effectiveness⁶ as described in SPPP Section 10.1 and FPPP 9.0.

8.1 EVALUATION OF LECTURER FACULTY

8.1.1

SOE supports the criteria for evaluation of lecturer faculty as specified in the FPPP and outlined below:

According to FPPP 9.1.4.a, "Each lecturer faculty member neither eligible for nor currently holding a three-year appointment will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles of their appointment, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. This requirement may be waived for lecturer faculty who are in their first semester of employment as described in CBA Article 15.25. At the discretion of the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, or upon the candidate's petition, a review may be scheduled in a year succeeding an annual or biennial review. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's work performance since the individual's initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent."

According to FPPP 9.1.4.b, "lecturer faculty members eligible for an initial three-year appointment pursuant to CBA Article 12.12 shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire six or more years of consecutive service on the

⁶ FPPP Section 8.2.b.

same campus that make up the qualifying period for the initial three-year appointment.”

According to FPPP, 9.1.4.c, “when the Appropriate Administrator determines, based on the personnel action file, that an eligible lecturer faculty member has performed in a satisfactory manner, and absent documented serious conduct problems, an initial three-year appointment shall be offered. Otherwise, an initial three-year appointment shall not be offered and the reasons for this determination shall be reduced to writing by the Appropriate Administrator and placed in the personnel action file.”

According to FPPP 9.1.4.d, “all lecturer faculty members holding three-year appointments and eligible for subsequent reappointment pursuant to CBA Articles 12.13, 15.26 and 15.29 shall be evaluated in the third year of their appointment and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of either the employee or the President (or designee). The evaluation shall consider the faculty member’s cumulative work performance during the entire preceding three-year period.”

According to FPPP 9.1.4.e, “when the Appropriate Administrator determines, based on the personnel action file, that a lecturer faculty member already holding a three-year appointment has performed in a satisfactory manner, and absent documented serious conduct problems, a subsequent three-year appointment shall be offered as long as there is sufficient work. Otherwise, a subsequent three-year appointment shall not be offered and the reasons for this determination shall be reduced to writing by the Appropriate Administrator and placed in the personnel action file.”

8.1.2

By the end of the first week of each fall and spring semester, the SOE administrative support coordinator shall provide the SPC with a list of lecturer faculty scheduled for review that semester.

8.1.3

The SPC will provide each lecturer faculty member scheduled for evaluation with information about the evaluation criteria, procedures, and documentation (see Appendices C & D). Lecturer faculty members are responsible for reviewing materials in their personnel action files (in Box) and providing supplementary materials for their evaluations in the supplemental evidence folder. The supplemental evidence must be submitted in BOX by the designated fall or spring date as determined by the RTP Deadline Calendar (FPPP, Section Appendix 3)

8.1.4

The chair of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will assign a committee member to conduct the classroom observation or supervision interview and draft the initial report of findings. Each member of the Lecturer Faculty

Evaluation Committee shall read the personnel file and dossier of each faculty member being evaluated.

8.1.5

The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet to finalize reports of findings for each lecturer faculty member evaluated. (See Appendices C & D for procedures and materials for evaluation of lecturer faculty.)

8.1.6

The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward reports of findings and classroom observation reports, if applicable, to the chair of the SPC prior to the deadline listed in the RTP Deadline Calendar. These time frames will change based on new RTP timelines.

8.1.7

Results of the evaluation, including a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation report, if applicable, will be shared with the lecturer faculty member by the SPC chair.

8.1.8

Results will be reported to the SOE Director for review. The SOE Director will forward a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation to the Office of the Dean for review and inclusion in the PAF.

8.2 Range Elevation

Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (See FPPP Section 12.0 – CBA Article 12.16-20)

9.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

9.1

Faculty members will have opportunities to update personnel files and submit other materials for review as specified in the FPPP and according to the University RTP calendar. (See FPPP Sections 8.0 and 10.0)

9.2 SPC Procedures

The SPC shall follow these procedures in conducting reviews:

9.2.1

The chair of the SPC will assign a member of the SPC to draft the initial periodic evaluation or performance review report. Each member of the SPC shall read the PAF and dossier of the faculty member under review. After reviewing all available data, the SPC shall interview the faculty member.

9.2.2

At the time of the interview, the following statement of purpose and procedure will be shared with the faculty member being interviewed.

“The purpose of the personnel interview is to answer any unresolved questions by committee members about the evidence in the record or by the candidate about the review process or the committee’s understanding of the evidence. For Periodic reviews, the purpose of the interview is also to provide the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The SOE Director may be present at the interview but may not act as a member of the committee.”

9.2.3

The report and recommendation relative to each faculty member shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement. Endorsement is arrived at by majority vote of the SPC. If a member abstains from voting, that member shall submit a written reason for the abstention. Written abstention reasons shall be attached to the report.

10.0 EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The SOE Vision addresses the collaborative nature of work in the SOE, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE Vision affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community (See FPPP 10.1.2).

10.1 Evaluation Categories and Standards

The SOE has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the foundation and context for interpreting the rubric. These standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.¹⁴ The elements under each standard are examples of how each standard can be demonstrated in teaching practice. The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Within each of the three categories of Instruction, Professional Growth, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community, the candidate submits a narrative illustrating how the evidence aligns with each *standard*, but not necessarily each *element* (see table of suggested types of evidence). Included in this narrative is an instructional growth plan (a description of your plan for growth in each area, including goals, action steps and a timeline that responds to evidence from multiple sources).

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

INSTRUCTION

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty. The area of Instruction seeks evidence of the faculty member's professionalism and skill as an educator with respect to methodology, materials, learning activities and SOE standards. Models of effective teaching are complex and diversified. While the following areas related to instruction may not be exhaustive, it suggests the complexity of teaching roles. All activities that are a part of a candidate's instructional assignment must be considered in the evaluation process. The format below includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation drawn from the [National Board for Professional Teaching Standards](#).

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.

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

- a. Treat students equitably.
- b. Recognize individual differences.
- c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
- d. Develop students' cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
- e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

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

- a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
- b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
- c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
- d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
- e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
- f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
- g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
- h. Create multiple paths for learning.
- i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

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

- a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.
- b. Make effective use of time.

- c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
- d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
- e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
- f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.
- g. Employ multiple methods for assessing and evaluating student growth and performance.

Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.

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

- a. Model the professional dispositions and to inspire these dispositions in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
- b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).
- c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.
- d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence (See Table 1). The faculty member’s narrative provides a thorough justification through analysis and reflection of their teaching practice, based upon their submitted required and additional evidence. The candidate’s narrative should explicitly reference and align with the following documents: FPPP, SOE PPP, the SOE vision/purpose, and the University Strategic Plan, and provide evidence for consideration of retention, tenure, and/or promotion. It is recommended that a candidate also review and reference previous RTP reports as appropriate. All required evidence elements must be included. Elements listed as Additional Evidence are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion.

Narrative includes, but is not limited to, a reflection and analysis of the following:

- Peer observations
- Prior RTP reports
- SFOTs and/or Supervisor Evaluations
- Course material provided in required evidence.

Table 1

Required Evidence
Course Syllabi and Materials are a representative selection of course syllabi and additional materials used by the instructor to facilitate their teaching. This is where faculty provide evidence of effective pedagogy, high expectations for students, and knowledge of the discipline.

Evidence of curriculum development, including creating new courses, course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement, or program cohesion.
<p>Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning</p> <p>Provide a table of the SFOT results that includes: using statistical summaries for each course (item means and course means), provide number of course enrollments, and the number of respondents. Additionally, provide a narrative that describes the results of the qualitative analysis of student written comments. (Please see Appendix J for an example of the table.)</p>
Evaluations of supervision when part of your teaching load.
Teaching Assignments are a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review. The list shall include the Department name, the course name and number, the number of students enrolled, and the unit value.

Additional Evidence
Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules.
Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback.
Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement and inclusion of diverse experiences
Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g., team teaching or guest presentations).
Reflections on invited peer observations (conducted by either university colleagues or K-12 personnel)
Evidence of using data to inform instructional practices (e.g., student outcome data).
Evidence of student growth in response to faculty feedback on an assignment.
Letters from students (unsolicited) and/or public-school personnel (for supervisors of credential candidates) that address strengths not otherwise addressed in the evidence
Short audio or video footage of instruction, with reflective commentary

*Student evaluations of faculty data shall be used but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness and shall not be used when determining a candidate's knowledge of the field. The candidate should provide a summary of data from the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning surveys that includes calculation of averages.⁷

⁷ FPPP Section 9.1.2.c.1

Rubric for Category I. Instruction

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

Does not meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>The narrative and evidence (see Table 1) demonstrates that the faculty member has not met all four standards and expectations. Some or all the <i>required</i> evidence is missing.</p> <p>Per FPPP 10.3.3, The evidence does not demonstrate the expected level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.</p> <p><i>The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the department's criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction.</i></p>	<p>The narrative and evidence (see Table 1) demonstrates that the faculty member has performed at a level that met all four standards and expectations. All required evidence is present in the dossier.</p> <p>Per FPPP 10.3.3, The evidence demonstrates the expected professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.</p> <p><i>An evaluation of "meets expectations" performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.</i></p>	<p>The narrative and evidence demonstrate analysis and reflection of the faculty member's teaching practice (see Table 1). The analysis and reflection of the evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has performed at a level that exceeds all four standards and expectations. All required evidence is present in the dossier.</p> <p>Per FPPP 10.3.3, The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department/Unit standards, other sections of this document (FPPP), and the CBA.</p>

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

The area of Professional Growth and Achievement seeks evidence of the faculty member's professional development through scholarly activity, including independent scholarship and scholarship undertaken in collaboration with professional colleagues and students, related to professional contributions to students, the discipline of education and the professional community, in accordance with the SOE Vision. Research agendas that benefit from collaborative and interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and recognized accordingly in the evaluation process.

For the duration of the appointment, Professional Growth and Achievement will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The items in Area A and C list specific examples of achievement in each category (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), not necessarily in order of importance. Some of the examples represent a range of significance to the field. In those cases, the examples in Area A are considered to have a greater weight than in Area C. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to write a narrative explaining the impact of Areas A and C. For areas A and C, multiple accomplishments of the same item are acceptable.

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

Area A: High Quality/Impact Evidence (Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable).

- Author or co-author of a published book in a peer-review press (make the case of a significant contribution to material).
- Author or co-author of a published article in a refereed journal (make the case of a significant contribution to material).
- Author or co-author of a published book chapter (make the case of a significant contribution to the material).
- Edited or co-edited a book or special issue of a journal.
- Secured a substantial external grant (approximately \$50,000 or more).
- Invited presentations at a conference, campus event, symposium, workshop, or community event (not guest lectures in a class- see Area C).
- Juried exhibits, installations, or creative works at community, regional, national/international conferences, or other venues.
- Evidence of significant impact of previously published work/scholarly activity/juried exhibits, installations, or creative works.
- This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

Area B: Research Agenda Narrative

- Evidence of an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress. Narrative describes scholarship goals and research trajectory. In multiple authored work, the faculty describes the scope of their contribution. The narrative includes the following evidence:
 - Purpose and audience of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative work in general (suggestion: listed as objectives).
 - Scholarship objectives and related accomplishments toward objectives met and unmet.
 - Potential funding sources, if applicable, contextualized to content area/discipline.
 - Likely/target venues for publications and presentations (including but not limited to conferences, workshops, and professional development venues).
 - Likely timeline for the aforementioned outcomes.

Area C: Other PG & A Evidence (Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable).

- Scholarship and collaboration that results in presentation(s)/workshop(s) at peer-reviewed national or international conferences.
- Acceptance or publication of at least 5 education-related articles/op-eds in a newspaper or magazine.
- Disseminated education-related research results/new ideas in a peer-review electronic venue.
- Acceptance or publication of an encyclopedia or reference book entry of 2+ pages, or at least 3 shorter entries.
- Acceptance or publication of a research report.
- Acceptance or publication in an education-review anthology, journal, or other peer-review (inter)national method of dissemination.
- Acceptance of education-related art into a juried exhibition outside of the university.
- Acceptance or publication in a peer-reviewed journal (above the required) or as minor contributing author.
- Acceptance or publication of a chapter in a book (above the required) or as minor contributing author.
- Acceptance or publication of computer software/manual/workbook
- Scholarly collaboration with students such as joint research and publications/presentations.
- Participation at state, national or international levels of accreditation.
- Serve on a MA/PhD/Ed committee for a student outside of Chico State.
- Submission of work for consideration in one of the above-listed categories (only one submission may count toward the required number of instances).
- Work in progress: manuscripts or ongoing data collection (for article or book-length peer-review publication) (only one work in progress may count toward the required number of instances).
- Accepted or presented a peer-reviewed paper at a national or international conference.
- Accepted or presented two papers at a local/regional conference or meeting.
- Accepted or presented at two poster sessions.

- Submitted an external grant proposal (unfunded).
- Secured an external grant (above the required).
- Reviewed 2 articles or books for a publisher or journal (if not listed under service).
- Member of a journal editorial board (if not listed under service).
- Member of an editorial board for an academic or literary press (if not listed under service).
- Secured an internal grant (other than travel grants).
- Developed a film or other non-print media that is peer-reviewed or nationally recognized.
- Grant writing for an education-related organization related to an area of professional interest.
- At least 5 education-related lectures to campus/community groups.
- Year-long participation and/or leadership in active coalitions or substantive collaborative work with other faculty, focusing on education-related issues.
- Grassroots organizing with underserved communities, such as co-organizing a campaign with community leaders.
- Organizing and coordinating advocacy coalition activities.
- Holding an appointment or being an officer in an education-related organization outside of the university.
- Extraordinary support of retention of underserved students (not counting in the service area), such as establishing and administering a new and effective program.
- Published curriculum materials (peer-reviewed lesson plans, units, course design).
- This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)

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

Performance Review	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>2nd Year Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Areas A, B and C has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations.</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations is insufficient for the renewal of the contract.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area C.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND evidence in Area A in progress toward publication.</p>
<p>4th Year Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B has not met the level of expectations AND/OR the evidence in Area A in not progress toward publication.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND evidence in Area A in progress toward publication.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p>
<p>6th Year Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>The evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B has not met the level of expectations AND/OR is missing at least 1 Area A as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet</i></p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 2 in Area A (1 as a lead author on a publication) AND at least 5 in Area C.</p>

	<i>Expectations is insufficient for granting tenure and promotion.</i>		
Promotion to Full Professor Review (5 Years - during the review period)	The evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B has not met the level of expectations AND/OR is missing at least 1 Area A as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C. <i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations is insufficient for promotion.</i>	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A as a lead author on a publication AND at least 3 in Area C.	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 2 in Area A (1 as a lead author on a publication) AND at least 5 in Area C. Additionally, the evidence clearly demonstrates substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.

SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY

The area of Service evaluates the faculty member's service to the department, college, university, and community, especially in regard to active participation as a team member in the department (which may include mentoring of incoming faculty), and service in governance on department, college and university committees. The SOE encourages civic engagement and values mutually beneficial partnerships that align the teaching and research agenda of the university and the self-identified interests of the communities of its region. In each written performance review report, the evaluator(s) shall state whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to conform to University, College, and Department/Unit plans, and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College's, and Department's/Unit's abilities to meet their standards and strategic goals

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

Standard 1. The faculty member engages collaboratively, creatively, and productively in the work of the department, college, and university that contributes to the [University Strategic Plan](#) and the [SOE Vision, Vision and Conceptual Framework](#). Reviewers will assess the quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's contributions in two or more of the following areas:

- a. Provide service through substantial contributions or leadership to the institution through a variety of committee work that may include standing, positional, elected, and/or ad hoc committees.
- b. Provide service through substantial contributions or leadership to the institution through advising.
- c. Provide service through substantial contributions or leadership to the institution through department, college, or university leadership.
- d. Provide service through substantial contributions or leadership to the institution through active participation in institutional, state, and national accreditation and program reviews.

Standard 2. The faculty member contributes to the learning community and/or area of professional expertise through outreach and services that contribute to the [University Strategic Plan](#) and the [SOE Vision, Purpose and Conceptual Framework](#). Reviewers will assess the quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's contributions in one or more of the following areas:

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

For the duration of the appointment, other contributions to the university and community will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence (not listed in order of importance or weight). Elements are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion:

Suggested Types of Evidence
Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on department, college, and university committees. The narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Vision, Purpose, and Conceptual Framework.
Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on community-based committees or boards. The narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Vision, Purpose, and Conceptual Framework.
Other leadership roles could include but not limited to intellectual, organizational, policy, community based, cultural, social justice, and ecological justice leadership roles supported by a letter or documentation.
Documentation of participation in the teamwork of SOE programs and projects, especially as they relate to the University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Vision, Purpose, and Conceptual Framework (e.g., accreditation review, program revisions, data driven improvement), significant SOE event planning (e.g., Recognition Ceremony, Partners in Education, CORE Rubric Training), and published articles in the SOE Newsletter and other University publications.
Letter of support from program coordinator, committee chair, or other supervisor-type person with written comments of participation and contribution on committees, programs, and projects.
Advising of candidates as a program, pathway, degree, or certificate coordinator with a description of your role.
Informal advising of students, particularly those from under-represented populations.
Chairing MA thesis or project . Provide a list and title of projects.
Advising of Master’s students. e.g., Provide a list of MA candidates and a description of

your role.
Documentation of teaching, collaboration, and service in and outside the SOE.
Participation in activities with K-12 schools and the community at large, including work that promotes democratic education principles and practices.
Preparation of accreditation materials for national and state reviews.

Rubric for Category III. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)

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

Performance Review	Does not meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>2nd Year Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>No or minimal evidence of listed criteria.</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations is insufficient for the renewal of the contract.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of active participation in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>
<p>4th Year Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress in developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of service in standard 1 AND evidence of service in standard 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership.</p>
<p>6th Year Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Review</p> <p>For summer or fall appointments, the period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).</p>	<p>The evidence of service has not met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND/OR does not have evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations is insufficient for</i></p>	<p>The evidence of service has met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard.</p>	<p>The evidence of service has exceeded the level of expectation demonstrating active participation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of leadership and/or substantive responsibility in the area(s) under both standards.</p>

	<i>granting tenure and promotion.</i>		
<p>Promotion to Full Professor Review</p> <p>(5 Years - during the review period)</p>	<p>The evidence of service has not met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND/OR does not have evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard.</p> <p><i>A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations is insufficient for promotion.</i></p>	<p>The evidence of service has met the level of expectation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of substantial contributions or leadership in one of the areas under each standard.</p>	<p>The evidence of service has exceeded the level of expectation demonstrating active and <i>sustained</i> participation in standards 1 and 2 AND evidence of <i>sustained</i> leadership and/or substantive responsibility in the area(s) under both standards. Additionally, the evidence clearly demonstrates substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.</p>

11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

11.1

As per FPPP Section 10.2.5.a. "Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty." In the area of Instruction, "an evaluation of "Meets Expectations" is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion."

11.2

As per FPPP Section 10.4.5.e, Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements, which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.

12.0 PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

12.1

The Post Tenure Review Committee contacts each faculty member to be evaluated in writing during the fall semester with procedures for the evaluation, a list of materials requested by the committee, and the assignment of a committee member to make a classroom observation.

12.2

Faculty members submit, to the chair of their review committee, a brief summary of academic activities aligned with evaluation areas in Section 10 of this document, a current professional vita, syllabi of current courses, and descriptions of student assignments and assessments.

12.3

A member of the Post Tenure Review Committee makes a classroom observation of the faculty member following procedures in Section 7 of this document.

12.4

The Post Tenure Review Committee examines materials submitted by the faculty member and the Working Personnel Action File, meets with the faculty member, and writes a report as described in FPPP Section 11.2 The committee report is forwarded to the college dean.

12.5

For policies and procedures regarding a faculty member's right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response to any level of review, see FPPP 10.2.8.

13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED

For policies and procedures not addressed in this document the SOE will apply policies and procedures in the FPPP.

SOE PPP Appendices

- Appendix A:** Review of University Supervisors Letter
- Appendix B:** University Supervisor Evaluation Form
- Appendix C:** Classroom Observations of SOE Faculty
- Appendix D:** Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty
- Appendix E:** The Lecturer Faculty Dossier for Periodic Evaluation
- Appendix F:** Range Elevation
- Appendix G:** Sample Phone Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process
- Appendix H:** Sample Interview Day Agenda
- Appendix I:** Students Evaluation of Teaching: School of Education
- Appendix J:** Example of Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Table

Appendix A: Review of Supervisors

School of Education
California State University, Chico
Chico, CA 95929-0222
530-898-6421

DATE:

TO: Credential Candidate
Cooperating Teachers/Mentor Teachers/Local Support Provider

FROM: Personnel Committee School of Education

SUBJECT: Evaluation of University Supervisor

The CSU, Chico supervisor(s) assigned to your school this semester is evaluated periodically as part of our personnel process, which includes decisions relative to tenure, retention, promotions, and awards. A personnel file is maintained for each SOE faculty member to accumulate material until that individual is scheduled for a performance review.

Your participation in the evaluation process is important in assessing the supervisor's effectiveness in the supervisory role. An evaluation form is on the reverse for your response, or you may respond by letter or memo if you prefer.

Please mail your response in the enclosed envelope. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Comments (from reverse side):

Appendix B: University Supervisor Evaluation

The CSU, Chico supervisor(s) assigned to your school this semester is evaluated periodically as part of our personnel process, which includes decisions relative to tenure, retention, promotions, and awards. A personnel file is maintained for each School of Education faculty member to accumulate material until that individual is scheduled for a performance review.

Your participation in the evaluation process is important in assessing the supervisor's effectiveness in the supervisory role. Please complete and submit this survey within the next week. The information we obtain from this survey is anonymous. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the School of Education Assessment Coordinator. Thank you.

1. You are responding to this survey as a:
Cooperating Teacher/ Mentor Teacher Credential Candidate
2. Please select the program you are currently in if you are a credential candidate or the program your credential candidate is in if you are a Cooperating Teacher or Mentor Teacher:
Provide drop-down menu of pathways
3. Name of the University Supervisor with whom you worked:
Drop Down of supervisor names
We are interested in your feedback, whether it is positive or negative. Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following questions. We also welcome your comments and suggestions, and really appreciate your feedback.
4. The University Supervisor communicates expectations of the candidate's placement requirements.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
5. The University Supervisor evaluates candidate's classroom practice using the Core Rubric, Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and/or Education Specialist Standards.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
6. The University Supervisor provides specific feedback focused on growth in teaching skills.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
7. The University Supervisor conducts conferences (e.g., initial meeting, mid-way, final 3-way) according to program guidelines.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:

8. The University Supervisor communicates effectively (e.g., clear, prompt).
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
9. The University Supervisor exhibits knowledge of current practices in teaching.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
10. The University Supervisor assists the candidate in meeting the needs of all students.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
11. The University Supervisor supports the candidate's development of the School of Education professional dispositions.
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
12. The University Supervisor supports cooperating teacher in mentoring the candidate (e.g., setting goals, developing improvement plans, etc.).
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree n/a
Comment:
13. The University Supervisor demonstrates professionalism (e.g., organization, dependability, and promptness)
Strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
14. Use this space for additional comments

Appendix C: Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty

Faculty Name:

Observer Name:

Required Observation

OR Elective Observation

Course:

Room:

Time:

Date:

Overview of lesson:

Describe examples of any of the elements of each standard that were demonstrated in this teaching episode. (See end of Appendix B for a complete list of SOE standards and elements in the area of Instruction.)

Standard 1. The candidate is committed to students and their learning.

Standard 2. The candidate knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

Standard 3. The candidate is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

Standard 4: The candidate thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience. (Observer: Include any examples of elements from this standard that were demonstrated during the post-observation conference with the faculty member.)

Summary of the Observation:

Observer's Signature:

Date:

I have debriefed the observation with the observer, and I have received a copy of this report.

Observed faculty member's (or instructor's) signature:

Date:

Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty (Continued)

These are the standards and elements as they are listed in the SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures.⁸

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.

- a. Treat students equitably.
- b. Recognize individual differences.
- c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
- d. Develop students' cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
- e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

- a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
- b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
- c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
- d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
- e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
- f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
- g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
- h. Create multiple paths for learning.
- i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

- a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.
- b. Make effective use of time.
- c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
- d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
- e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
- f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.
- g. Employ multiple methods for assessing and evaluating student growth and performance.

⁸ The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards <https://www.nbpts.org/standards-five-core-propositions/>

Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.

- a. Model the professional dispositions and to inspire these dispositions in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
- b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).
- c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.
- d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

Appendix D: Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty

DATE:

TO: Lecturer Faculty Review Committee:

FROM: School of Education Personnel Committee:

SUBJECT: Review of Lecturer Faculty

The Lecturer Faculty Review Committee will use the procedures that follow for the review of lecturer faculty in this annual cycle.

1. Use the evaluation criteria in Article 9 of the FPPP.
2. Review the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in Box. All members of the committee must review the PAF and sign it.
3. Review the dossier provided by the faculty member. (FPPP Section 8.1.3) The preparation of the dossier is the first step of the periodic evaluation process. (FPPP Section 9.0).
4. The reviewees may be an instructor and/or supervisor.
 - a. If an instructor, conduct a classroom observation by one member of the committee. We recommend a one-hour period for the observation and a follow-up debriefing.
 - b. If a supervisor, review materials that provide evidence of effectiveness.
5. Draft an individual report (not to exceed two pages) using a template that will be provided for each faculty member under review based on the observation and other documents. The report should contain a statement commenting on the faculty member's teaching effectiveness and other areas of evaluation if appropriate. As a guide for the observation and report use the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, underlined sections.
6. Meet as a committee to finalize reports.
7. Submit reports to the School Personnel Committee and the Director in accordance with the current RTP schedule established by the Provost and Office of Academic Personnel.
8. The department chair will transmit the report to the faculty member and to the dean for review and placement in the PAF (see FPPP 9.1.3.a).

Lecturer faculty under review are responsible for checking their personnel action file (in Box) for accuracy and providing the following to the SOE office: Copies of syllabi for course taught (instructors only),

- Current assessment system(s) including associated rubrics or scoring criteria,
- Additional materials that provide evidence of teaching and/or supervision effectiveness and student assessment, and
- Evidence documenting, *Developing as a Professional Educator*. (Standard 6)

Appendix E: The Lecturer Faculty Supplemental File for Periodic Evaluation

Lecturer faculty have a responsibility to review materials in their personnel action files (in Box) and provide supplementary materials for their evaluations in the Lecturer Faculty Supplemental File. The supplemental file must be uploaded to Box by the designated fall or spring census date, as defined by the [RTP Calendar](#), FPPP, Appendix III.

The Lecturer Faculty Supplemental File must contain:

- A current faculty curriculum vita/resume,
- A statement of the faculty member's philosophy of teaching (approximately 1-2 page),
- Analysis of and reflection on results from Student Feedback of Teaching and Learning and/or University Supervisor Evaluation results (lecturers who teach see table in Appendix J)(approximately 1-2 page),
- Copies of current syllabi for courses taught (instructors only) and descriptions of student assignments and assessments,
- Provide currency in the field through a description of professional development activities, readings, etc. (approximately 1-2 page), and
- Brief summary of other activities that show support for the vision and goals of the department and contributions to the university. (These may include activities related to evaluation categories in SPPP Section 10.)(approximately 1-2 page)

Procedures for conducting classroom observations can be found in SPPP Section 7.1. Information about Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning is in SPPP Section 7.2; information about the Evaluation of Supervision is in SPPP Section 7.3.

University Supervisor Interview Sample Questions

1. Describe your process for preparing candidates for an observation.
2. What observation strategies do you use during the lesson?
3. How do you structure the post observation conference?
4. How do you support struggling candidates? Please share an example of a time when you were successful in supporting a struggling candidate and a time in which you may have felt challenged.
5. How do you learn about the strengths and needs of your supervisees? How do you use this information to assist your students outside the formal observation process?

6. How do you develop a working professional relationship with cooperating teachers?
7. How do you remain current in your practice?
8. How does the SOE's Vision, Purpose and conceptual framework inform your supervision practices?

Appendix F: Range Elevation

Criteria for RANGE elevation for lecturer faculty (excluding coaches) 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). Please see Lecturer Range Elevations for more information <https://www.csuchico.edu/faaf/faculty-processes/lecturer-range-elevations.shtml>.

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.

Teaching Excellence – Teaching excellence is indicated in the standards under Instruction in SOEPPP 10.1. Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:

- SET/SFOT scores table and narrative analysis and reflection*,
- peer observations reflection*,
- number of courses taught,
- syllabi*,
- number of courses designed/revised,
- teaching awards,
- demonstrated ability to teach in multiple modalities, etc.

*These items must be included in the file.

Currency in the Field – Suggested evidence for maintaining currency in the field may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, nor prescribed by, the following list:

- Increased mastery of the discipline evidenced by additional relevant education or an additional degree
- Effectively using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field
- Contributing to and planning professional development activities on campus
- Presenting original work at professional meetings and conferences
- Collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the community
- Publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- Research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- Editing professional publications
- External fundraising and resource development related to the vision of the University
- Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to further the vision of the University

Appendix G: Sample Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process

The following descriptive interview sample questions are designed to allow candidates to provide pertinent information about their qualifications for the position, based on actual experiences. The SOE Director should introduce the members of the search committee and briefly describe the position under consideration before asking the first question. The candidate should always be asked if there is other job-related information to add that the committee did not cover.

1. Why did you apply to CSU, Chico for this position? What attracted you to this position and place?
2. One of the requirements for this position is that you have at least three years of K-12 teaching-related experience. Briefly describe one of your K-12/SPED experiences that you believe uniquely qualifies you for this position and explain why.
3. What knowledge or experiences have you had that will contribute to our need to prepare educators for successful work with learners from diverse populations including English learners?
4. Please briefly describe the range of your supervision experiences and the ways you go about supervising teacher candidates.
5. Provide an example of a grant development, research project and/or teaching experience in which you have worked collaboratively with others to accomplish a professional goal.
6. Please describe your scholarship agenda and your plans for scholarly work in the future.
7. Given the following scenario, describe the methods and approach you might use to provide effective instruction for this content [Committee provides position specific examples of content addressed in a course.]
8. Other position-specific question(s) added by the search committee.
9. Do you have questions for us?

Appendix H: Sample Interview Day Agenda



School of Education
On-Campus Interview, *Date*

Applicant for Position
Candidate Name *University*
Degree
Date

- 8:30 – 9:00 Breakfast with Search Committee Host
- 9:00 – 9:30 Visit – Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Office, Kendall Hall 118
- 9:30 – 10:30 Teaching Demonstration, Tehama 105
- 10:30 – 11:00 Meet with Search and Hiring Committee, Tehama 105
- 11:15 – 11:45 Meet with SOE Director
- 11:45 – 1:00 Lunch with faculty and any invited teacher candidates
- 1:00 – 2:00 Research Presentation, Tehama 105
- 2:15 – 2:45 Meet with Dean, Tehama 203
- 3:30 – 4:00 Visit –Chico State Enterprises, 25 Main, Room 103
- 4:00 – 4:30 Faculty / Staff Reception, Tehama 105
- 4:30 Leave for hotel or opportunity to explore the university/community

Appendix I: Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning, School of Education

General Information

1. You are a: (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate)
2. Is this course: (Required, Elective)
3. Expected Grade: (A, A or B, B, B or C, C, C or D, D or F, F)

This evaluation form will be used by the instructor of this class to help improve teaching effectiveness and by the University in retention and promotion decisions. You are asked to evaluate the instructor of this class on teaching ability, not on the course content. There will be a section for you to add comments at the end of the survey.

Part A

1. How well are you keeping up with the assignments and readings for this course? Give a percentage estimate. (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%).

Part B

Response Code:

(SD) Strongly Disagree, (D) Disagree, (N) Neither Disagree or Agree, (A) Agree, (SD) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor presents the material in an understandable way.
2. The instructor communicates high expectations.
3. The instructor has command of the course content.
4. The instructor is prepared for each class session.
5. The instructor provides appropriate feedback.
6. The instructor is helpful and responsive to students.
7. The instructor is willing to listen to student questions and opinions.
8. The instructor actively encourages equitable participation of students.
9. The overall instruction in this course contributes to learning.
10. The syllabus explains the course requirements.
11. The assignments contribute to learning.
12. The instructor prepares students to work with diverse populations.
13. What did your instructor do to make this class a good learning experience for you? (Text Box)
14. What could your instructor do in the future to make this a better class? (Text Box)
15. How do you rate the overall quality of teaching in this class? (Superior, Very Good, Minimally Acceptable, Unacceptable)
16. Important: Please give at least one reason to justify your rating. (Text Box)

Appendix J: Example of Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Table
(for the period of review)

	Semester*	Spring 2X	
SFOT Item	Course	EDTE XXX	Question Average
	For mat	F-F	
	N	7	
	Class Size	22	
	%	31.8%	
1. The instructor presents the material in an understandable way.	4.6	4.6	4.6
2. The instructor communicates high expectations.	4.1	4.5	4.3
3. The instructor has command of the course content.	4.3	4.1	4.2
4. The instructor is prepared for each class session	4.3	4.0	4.2
5. The instructor provides appropriate feedback.	4.3	4.8	4.6
6. The instructor is helpful and responsive to students.	4.3	4.3	4.3
7. The instructor is willing to listen to student questions and opinions.	4.5	4.9	4.7
8. The instructor actively encourages equitable participation of students.	4.1	4.3	4.2
9. The overall instruction in this course contributes to learning.	4.1	4.5	4.3
10. The syllabus explains the course requirements.	4.1	4.4	4.3
11. The assignments contribute to learning.	4.0	4.2	4.1
12. The instructor prepares students to work with diverse populations	4.3	4.6	4.5
Overall Class Means	4.3	4.4	4.3

Format: Face to Face (F-F); Online Asynch (OA); Online Synchronous (OS); Hyflex (H)

N = survey respondents

Class Size = number of students enrolled in course

Percentage represent survey responses

*Please put courses in chronological order. Starting with the Oldest course under the review time period



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: Alfred R. A.

Date: Sep 6, 2024

Dean Review: Angela Trothewey

Date: Sep 9, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: Mahalley D. Allen

Date: Sep 10, 2024