

STANDARDS AND OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

DEPARTMENT OF EARTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Revised April 2022

I. STRUCTURE OF THE EARTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

- The Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences (Department) Personnel Committee (Committee) will be constituted according to all appropriate guidelines and regulations that include, but are not limited to, the CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement) and FPPP (Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures) documents, and will be responsible for reports and recommendations regarding the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) of faculty at the Department Committee level.
- The membership of the Committee will consist of three or five members. Eligibility for membership on the Committee will be determined in accordance with the FPPP. The Department Chair may elect to serve on the Committee or as a separate level of review.
- Faculty members who are serving on the College Personnel Committee may not serve on the Department Personnel Committee.
- If a committee member goes on leave during the academic year, the Department Chair may appoint a substitute Faculty Member. The substitute committee member must be able to participate in the entire portion of the faculty member's review cycle for which that committee is responsible.
- The Committee will be assisted by other members of the faculty in carrying out class visits, but the Committee will have the responsibility of drafting the final reports.

II. PROCEDURES

- The Committee will operate under, and be knowledgeable of, all appropriate guidelines and regulations that include, but are not limited to, the appropriate CBA articles and FPPP sections.
- The Committee will meet and select a Committee chair.
- A quorum consisting of a majority must be present in order for the Committee to conduct business.
- When the Committee meets to vote on the reports and recommendations, all members must vote, either in person or by proxy. Should a member abstain from voting, the member shall submit a written reason for the abstention.
- In RTP matters, the Committee will follow the procedures and the special criteria established by and approved for the Department. In the event of any inconsistency between this document and the FPPP or the CBA, the CBA followed by the FPPP will take precedence.
- At least one tenured colleague of equal or greater rank will make a classroom visit for each RTP candidate. The Department Chair may also visit if serving at an independent level of review. The College Dean may also make a classroom visit. A written report of each visit will become a part of the personnel file of the candidate. Because a ***Meets Expectations*** rating in the area of instruction is essential to promotion and tenure, the candidate may request additional mentoring class visits and will have the option of requesting a written visit report be placed in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).
- Periodic evaluations and performance reviews will cover the period since the faculty member's date of appointment. For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31st in the academic year preceding the appointment. Spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment. All faculty members' periodic evaluations and performance reviews will include work that is part of a service credit year or years. In consideration of tenure or promotion, the period of review shall be the entire probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if any). Consideration shall be given to the development and continuity of the candidate's total performance during the review period. Where prior credits have been granted, these credits plus performance rendered since being appointed to the faculty at Chico State shall, together, constitute the data base for the review. In consideration of promotion of tenured faculty, the period of review shall be the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank.
- All Committee members will examine the WPAF of each candidate. In accordance with the applicable article in the FPPP and the criteria and standards set forth in the Department RTP document, the committee's report will include a written evaluation of the evidence contained in the WPAF. **The Committee will evaluate candidates based upon the quality, quantity and continuity of their performance as a faculty member within the Department.**
- Because the Committee's report can only be based upon evidence contained within the WPAF, the Committee will assist the candidate (as per FPPP section 8.1.1.b) in making

certain that the WPAF accurately reflects the full performance record. To ensure all necessary materials are included in the WPAF, the Committee will meet with the candidate after reviewing the WPAF but before closing the candidate's WPAF and writing its report. In this report, the Department defines evidence to be all materials included in the WPAF.

- In the WPAF the candidate will assign each piece of evidence to **only** one of the three primary categories listed in the FPPP (Section 8.1.3.e.4): *Instruction*; *Professional Growth and Achievement*; and *Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University and Community (Service)*.
- The Department encourages faculty to engage in some activities that might reasonably be assigned to more than one category. However, in such instances it is the candidate's responsibility to make the assignment to only one category. In cases of ambiguity regarding the assignment of evidence to a particular category, the Department encourages the candidate to explain the rationale for the assignment. In such situations, the candidate is encouraged to discuss the breadth of such activities and consider the possibility of splitting and considering it as multiple activities. For example, mentoring a student research project could be included under *Instruction*, but a co-authored publication or conference presentation resulting from the project might be included under *Professional Growth and Achievement*.
- Written or electronic student questionnaire evaluations (Student Feedback on Teaching, SFOT) are required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).
- Evaluation of lecturer faculty will follow guidelines set forth in the CBA Article 15 and FPPP 9.0.
- Before the end of the academic year, the Committee will review and update, if necessary, this RTP document and related materials. The department, the Dean, the Office of Academic Personnel, and the Provost must approve any significant changes but this may be deferred to within the first 14 days of the next academic term.

III. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION AND RANGE ELEVATION

In each area of the performance review (*Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement [PG & A], and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community [Service]*), all reports conclude with a summary **rating** (FPPP section 8): ***Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations***. Therefore, it is helpful to candidates and reviewers to specify ratings typically required to produce a recommendation for retention, tenure or promotion and the minimum work necessary to achieve a given rating.

The remaining text of the RTP Criteria and Standards describes the work or activity that constitutes the minimum necessary to achieve a **Meets Expectations** rating and **Exceeds Expectations** rating. If the candidate does not obtain a **Meets Expectations** or **Exceeds Expectations** rating, then they will receive a **Does Not Meet Expectations** rating and the candidate will not be considered for tenure or promotion.

In the 2nd and 4th years, probationary tenure-track faculty undergo a performance review for retention. Retention shall be awarded only to those whose performance affords them a reasonable possibility of **Meeting Expectations** in all three areas toward obtaining tenure in due course (FPPP).

A committee recommendation of retention for a tenure-track faculty member whose evaluation is **Does Not Meet Expectations** must (i) include detailed information to explain why they recommend retention in spite of this evaluation and (ii) provide a concrete plan outlining how the candidate can improve their evaluation level to **Meets Expectations** before the tenure decision.

As stated in the FPPP, Section 10.5.1, “Tenure may be conferred earlier than the normal sixth year of employment.” The FPPP (Section 10.5) further clarifies that since ‘accelerated tenure or promotion’ is necessarily based on less evidence of performance than granted on a normal timeline, faculty are required to receive an **Exceeds Expectations** rating in all three categories. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, the FPPP (Section 10.5.3) further clarifies that the candidate must: (1) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; and (2) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment. The College of Natural Sciences defines full-time assignment as a year without new faculty release AWTU.

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.

Beyond simply rating the candidate and making the appropriate retention recommendation, it is particularly important that the Committee report give constructive guidance concerning the candidate’s progress toward tenure and promotion. In this same collegial spirit, the Department strongly recommends that at the conclusion of the entire review process the candidate requests to meet with the Committee and Department Chair to discuss and clarify issues regarding tenure and promotion. The Committee will inform each candidate of this recommendation at the scheduled candidate-committee meeting.

The Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences has quantified certain minima of activity in the three areas of activity: *Instruction; Professional Growth and Achievement; and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University, and Community*. The purpose of the minima stated below is not to restrict the candidate's range of work, but to aid both the candidate and the Committee by providing a list of achievements that would merit a positive recommendation for personnel action.

Criteria for Range Elevation

Upon request from a lecturer faculty member, the personnel committee will evaluate eligible lecturers for a Range Elevation. (Refer to the FPPP for eligibility, criteria, and procedures.) The information below within the "Criteria for RANGE Elevation" only applies to lecturers with full-time or part-time instructional work assignments on a 15-unit base. For elevation to the RANGE of Lecturer B or above, the individual must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last RANGE elevation, whichever is more recent. Professional growth and development for lecturer RANGE elevation eligibility is defined as teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field, unless the faculty member's work assignment includes duties in addition to teaching. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for RANGE elevation.

To be considered for a RANGE elevation, candidates must have demonstrated teaching excellence for the last three years as defined by the department's Instruction guidelines for Instructional Area 1. In addition, a RANGE elevation will be recommended for candidates who demonstrate they have maintained currency in the field as defined below.

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

- i. Advising student organizations or discipline related clubs.
- ii. Academic advising in a specific professionally related area.
- iii. Curriculum and course development.
- iv. Service on department, college level or university level committees.
- v. Professional service related to the field of geology or environmental sciences.
- vi. Community service related to the Department of Earth and Environmental Science, or the university.
- vii. Publication in a peer reviewed journal.
- viii. Presentation at a regional or national meeting.
- ix. Grant submission to a regional, state, or federal agency.
- x. Conducting funded research.
- xi. Recognition of teaching excellence by the department, college or university.
- xii. Mentoring student research.
- xiii. Addressing equity gaps in courses taught.

xiv. Participation in EDI (Equity, Diversity, Inclusion) activities that promote cultural competence and/or increase opportunities for historically underserved (e.g., Black, Indigenous and people of color [BIPOC], first generation, foster youth, low-income, Dream) students.

1. Instruction:

*The department values faculty who demonstrate commitment to student learning by the energy, time and care that they devote to the creation and support of innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environments. This commitment may be demonstrated in any or all of the three groups of courses: general education, service courses and Earth and Environmental Sciences degree programs. Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in the following **Instructional Areas**:*

1. Established and maintained academically rigorous and effective classroom instruction.
2. Actively and continually participated in assessment of courses and programs.
3. Achieved success in significant additional instruction-related activities.

Because Instruction is central to the Department's mission, *all* faculty members under review must demonstrate a **Meets Expectations** rating at minimum in *Instruction* to be recommended for tenure or promotion. A rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations** will include specific guidance for improving *Instruction*.

For Instructional Area 1, the Committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for rigor and effectiveness in classroom instruction:

- Self-evaluation narrative;
- Syllabi, assignments, exams and other course materials created by the instructor;
- Student Feedback on Teaching (SFOT);
- Reports of class visits;
- Other evidence provided by the candidate such as samples of student work or written comments not included in the SFOTs.

To achieve a rating of **Meets Expectations** in *Instruction* in Area 1 (there is no rating for **Exceeds Expectations** in Area 1), the evidence should indicate that the candidate:

1. Maintains subject matter currency;
2. Designs courses in harmony with established research findings on the effectiveness of various teaching practices and inclusive pedagogy;
3. Sets high standards and communicates them to students;
4. Maintains a classroom environment conducive to diverse ways of learning;
5. Interacts with students in a respectful, helpful manner;
6. Facilitates active learning in the classroom or outside of it;

7. Provides prompt feedback on assignments;
8. Encourages students to work together.

For Instructional Area 2, the Committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for continued participation in assessment:

- Written responses to SFOT results and reports of class visits as well as evidence of improvements made to courses;
- Summaries of data collected and analyzed for course or program assessment purposes; this includes departmental and university-wide (e.g., general education) assessment efforts but can also include unofficial assessments initiated by the instructor;

To achieve an overall rating of ***Meets Expectations*** in *Instruction* in Area 2 (there is no rating for ***Exceeds Expectations*** in Area 2), the evidence should indicate that the candidate:

1. Takes action to address concerns that arise from SFOT results and reports of class visits;
2. Establishes and regularly assesses student learning goals for courses, analyzes the results, and implements improvements as warranted;
3. Contributes to program or general education assessment efforts.

For Instructional Area 3, the Committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for showing success in additional instruction-related activities:

- List of activities that clearly delineate dates and duties performed;
- List of supervised students;
- Evidence of improving courses such as syllabi, exercises, or exams;
- Other evidence provided by the candidate such as samples of student work or letters of support.

To achieve an overall rating of ***Meets Expectations*** in *Instruction* in Area 3, the evidence should indicate that the candidate achieved success in ALL of the following four categories (for Periodic Evaluations, the candidate should show a trajectory towards meeting the goals in all four categories):

1. Chairing or serving on Masters committees OR mentoring student research projects (3 examples);
2. Developing new courses or substantially improving existing courses; OR developing and improving course materials for courses taught by multiple faculty; OR teaching general education courses in particularly engaging ways (2 examples);
3. Implement new strategies to support equity (diversity, anti-racism & inclusive practices) in their courses (2 examples);

4. Other activity presented by the candidate that contributes to the area of instruction (2 examples).

To achieve an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in *Instruction*, the candidate must receive a **Meets Expectations** rating in all three areas. In addition, the evidence must support that the candidate has exceeded the requirements for **Meets Expectations** in Area 3 by satisfying at least two of following four criteria: at least six (6) examples of Category 1, at least four (4) examples of Category 2, at least three (4) example of Category 3, and at least four (4) examples of Category 4.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Range Elevation for Temporary Faculty

Achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or range elevation for temporary faculty requires, at a minimum, an overall rating of **Meets Expectations** in Instruction. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or range elevation for temporary faculty must have demonstrated consistent commitment to quality instruction over their entire period of review.

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

In order to promote to Professor, a candidate must show continued improvement since the time of the last dossier submission for promotion. At this career level, it is expected that the candidate has contributed significantly at the program level in all instructional areas 1-3 and must receive at least a **Meets Expectations** rating as defined above for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to Professor in the CSU requires the candidate to demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2). Therefore, letters are recommended as evidence for such impact of your instruction. (See FPPP 10.1.9 for guidance on incorporating external letters.)

2. Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A):

*The department values faculty who are committed to expanding the body of scientific knowledge. This commitment can be expressed by a consistent pattern of high-quality research that involves students, making and sharing scientific discoveries, synthesizing and explaining scientific knowledge in new ways, applying existing scientific knowledge, and developing and testing novel ways to teach science to diverse populations. These activities are especially valued when they involve students and are aligned with one or more of the University's Strategic Priorities (i.e., Equity, Diversity & Inclusion; Resilient & Sustainable Systems; Civic & Global Engagement). A commitment to expanding the body of scientific knowledge can be demonstrated by **continual activity** in a variety of types of accomplishments.*

To achieve an overall rating of **Meets Expectations** in *PG&A*, the evidence should indicate that the candidate achieved success in ALL of the following four *PG&A* areas:

1. Author one (1) article in a peer-reviewed publication; OR author one (1) chapter in a textbook; OR author one (1) major report for a governmental agency or equivalent with justification;
2. Apply for one (1) externally funded grant;
3. Publish at least two (2) abstracts at the meeting of a regional, national, or international professional society;
4. Demonstrate at least two (2) examples of the following items:
 - a. author a field trip guide;
 - b. develop significant intellectual property with justification and role; examples could include a patent, copyright;
 - c. present an invited lecture to a scientific audience;
 - d. author an article in a publication that is not peer-reviewed;
 - e. chair a session at a scientific conference;
 - f. organize a K-16 teachers workshop/institute/talk;
 - g. post teaching materials online that are downloaded and used by instructors at other institutions;
 - h. obtain internal research funding;
 - i. some other example of *PG&A* that the candidate must justify as noteworthy.

For all of the above types of accomplishments, the candidate must provide evidence that a significant portion of the effort took place within the period of review as specified by the FPPP. For publications with multiple authors, the candidate must provide evidence for their role in the research and writing effort. Finally, the candidate must provide evidence of continual progress across the period of review.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must at least receive a rating of **Meets Expectations** in *PG&A*. To receive a rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in *PG&A*, the candidate must satisfy the following in the four *PG&A* areas: have at least two (2) examples of Area 1; receive external funding (Area 2); have at least four (4) examples of Area 3; have at least four (4) examples of Area 4.

If the candidate does not meet the **Meets Expectations** or **Exceeds Expectations** requirements for *PG&A*, then the candidate will receive a **Does Not Meet Expectations** rating and will not be considered for tenure or promotion. A rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations** will include specific guidance for improving *PG&A*.

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must at least receive a rating of **Meets Expectations** in PG&A as defined for promotion to Associate Professor level. To receive a rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in PG&A, the candidate must satisfy the following in the four PG&A areas: have at least two (2) examples of Area 1; receive external funding in Area 2; have at least four (4) examples of Area 3; have at least four (4) examples of Area 4.

In consideration of promotion to Professor, the period of review shall be the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Promotion to Professor in the CSU requires the candidate to demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2). Therefore, letters from scientists who are not CSU Chico faculty are recommended as evidence for such impact. (See FPPP 10.1.9 for guidance on incorporating external letters.)

3. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans of the Department/Unit, College, University, and Community (Service):

The department values faculty who work together and demonstrate a commitment to serving the department, college, university, and larger communities. Part of this commitment is advising students to advance their educational and personal growth. This commonly occurs outside of classroom instruction. Academic advising is expected of all faculty. Additional service may include advising of the Department student organization and facilitating internships.

It is in the candidate's interest to document workload on committees and/or document special responsibilities assumed. Evidence to demonstrate Service contributions include, but are not limited to:

- Lists of committee assignments, dates, and responsibilities
- Letters or emails acknowledging the candidate's service
- Programs or notices from events noting the participation of the candidate
- A record of the number of student advisees

To achieve a rating of **Meets Expectations**, evidence of this commitment to *Service* is demonstrated by activities that lie in ALL of the following five (5) *Service* areas:

1. At least four (4) semesters of: participation in committees at the departmental, OR college, OR university level;
2. At least two (2) examples of non-committee departmental, OR college, OR university service;
3. At least two (2) examples of: participation in EDI (Equity, Diversity, Inclusion) activities that promote cultural competence and/or increase opportunities for historically underserved (e.g., Black, Indigenous and people of color [BIPOC], first generation, foster youth, low-income, Dream) students; OR contributions aligned

with Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), Accessible Technology or Basic Needs Initiative related priorities;

4. At least three (3) examples of: participation in professional activities (societies), OR community service organizations, OR K-12 outreach, OR reviewing scientific journal articles, OR other community service;
5. Advising your assigned majors.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must at least receive a rating of ***Meets Expectations*** in *Service*. To receive a rating of ***Exceeds Expectations*** in *Service*, the candidate must satisfy the following in the five (5) *Service* areas: at least eight (8) semesters of examples for Area 1 AND must chair at least one (1) of those committees; at least four (4) examples of Area 2; at least four (4) examples of Area 3; at least six (6) examples of Area 4; advising your assigned majors in Area 5.

If the candidate does not meet the ***Meets Expectations*** or ***Exceeds Expectations*** requirements for *Service*, then the candidate will receive a ***Does Not Meet Expectations*** rating and will not be considered for tenure or promotion.

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must at least receive a rating of ***Meets Expectations*** in *Service as defined for promotion to Associate Professor*. To receive a rating of ***Exceeds Expectations*** in *Service*, the candidate must satisfy the following in the five (5) *Service* areas: at least eight (8) semesters of examples for Area 1 AND must chair at least one (1) of those committees; at least four (4) examples of Area 2; at least four (4) examples of Area 3; at least six (6) examples of Area 4; advise the assigned students at in Area 5.

In consideration of promotion to Professor, the period of review shall be the period since closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Promotion to Professor in the CSU requires the candidate to demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2). Therefore, letters from individuals who are not affiliated with CSU Chico are recommended as evidence for such impact on service to the community. See FPPP 10.1.9 for guidance on incorporating external letters.



Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

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

Chair/Director Approval: Todd Greene Date: May 19, 2023

Dean Review: David M. Hassenzahl Date: May 20, 2023

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

Provost Approval:  Date: May 25, 2023