

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

Operating Procedures and Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP)

1. COMMITTEE FUNCTION, STRUCTURE, AND PROCEDURES

1.1 Function

1.1.1 The Department of Mathematics and Statistics Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee (“Committee”) is responsible for reviewing and evaluating tenured and tenure-track faculty for retention, tenure and promotion. The Committee shall be responsible for both Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews. This Committee shall also be responsible for maintaining this document and related materials.

1.1.2 The Committee shall not be responsible for the review of temporary faculty or for faculty appointments.

- The Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee shall be responsible for the review and evaluation of lecturer faculty members. A separate document addresses the operation of the Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee.
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments shall be the responsibility of the Department Hiring Committee(s). A separate document addresses the operation of the Department Hiring Committee(s).
- The Department Chair will normally make the determination about part-time temporary faculty appointments. The Chair may choose to consult with the Department Part-Time Evaluation Committee, if time permits. The periodic review of tenured faculty is addressed in the document titled, “GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY.”

1.2 Structure

1.2.1 The Department RTP Committee shall consist of at least three members (FPPP 4.1.4), depending on availability of eligible faculty and committee workload in a given year, elected from the list of eligible faculty as determined below in section 1.2.2. The Committee shall be elected after the selection of the department representative on the College Personnel Committee. The Department RTP Committee shall be elected by probationary and tenured members of the department. The election shall be in accordance with the department’s election guidelines.

1.2.2 Faculty eligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee shall consist of all full-time, tenured faculty members of the department, except for the following:

- The Department Chair when they are undergoing a performance review (see 1.2.3)
 - Faculty members who are serving on the College Personnel Committee
 - Faculty members on leave for all or any part of the academic year

- No tenured faculty member being considered for promotion may serve on a promotion or tenure review committee. (FPPP 4.1.6)
- Faculty members excluded by rank/classification considerations in section 1.2.4 below.
- Faculty members who have served at any level of review during both of the two preceding review cycles.

At the recommendation of a Department, the President (or designee) may allow eligible faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) to be elected to the Department RTP Committee (FPPP 4.1.4.a). A committee may not be composed solely of FERP faculty (FPPP 4.1.4.a.1). FERP faculty may be elected to a Department RTP Committee only if they will be employed during the entire portion of a faculty member's review cycle for which the committee is responsible (FPPP 4.1.4.b.2).

1.2.3 The department chair shall serve as a separate level of department review except during the periodic evaluation of faculty, when the department chair shall serve on the Department RTP Committee as a full voting member.

1.2.4 In promotion considerations, Department RTP Committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion (FPPP 4.1.5).

1.3 Committee Procedures

1.3.1 The Department RTP Committee shall organize and operate in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP), and this document. It follows that members of the Department RTP Committee must be knowledgeable of the guidelines and regulations in these documents. In the event of inconsistency between this document and either the CBA or the FPPP, the CBA or the FPPP shall take precedence over this document. The CBA takes precedence over the FPPP in the event of conflict between those two documents.

1.3.2 Before the end of the academic year, the current Department RTP Committee will review and update, if necessary, this document and related materials. This may take place in consultation with the department chair. The department must approve any significant changes.

1.3.3 Early in the academic year, after the Department RTP Committee has been elected, the Department RTP Committee and the Department Chair will meet with all candidates up for review to discuss the department's RTP Guidelines, their implementation, and the structure of the reports from the candidate, the Department RTP Committee, and the chair. At this meeting, the candidates will be given the current "Candidate's Instructions" letter (included as an appendix to these guidelines).

1.3.4 At least two Department RTP Committee members and the Department Chair shall make classroom visitations for each RTP candidate. A written report on each visit shall become part of the candidate's personnel file. The College Dean may also make classroom visits.

1.3.5 The Department RTP Committee's report must be based only on evidence in the

candidate's Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), including the Dossier. The report shall include a written evaluation of the evidence presented in the WPAF. The Department RTP Committee evaluation must address the evidence with respect to the requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion described in the section 10.4 of the FPPP, the definitions of evaluation ratings in section 10.3.3 of the FPPP, and the criteria of this document.

1.3.6 The Department RTP Committee shall always take into consideration the quality, as well as the quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's performance in each of the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community (FPPP 10.2.3)

1.3.7 Prior to finalizing its report and endorsing it by a vote of the Department RTP Committee, the Department RTP Committee shall consult with the department chair (if the chair is not participating as a member of the committee) to discuss and attempt to resolve, if necessary, any differences with their contemplated recommendations (FPPP 10.3.6).

1.4 Candidates' Responsibilities

1.4.1 It is the candidate's responsibility to be familiar with the procedures and criteria in this document as well as those in the CBA and FPPP.

1.4.2 Since the Department RTP Committee's report must be based entirely on evidence in the WPAF, the candidate must ensure that the WPAF includes all appropriate evidence presented in a format that facilitates review. Specifically, it is the candidate's responsibility to address the criteria in the department RTP Guidelines indicating, when appropriate, the activities or evidence, along with sufficient explanation of the significance of these activities or evidence, to justify why the candidate feels their performance meets the criteria or warrants a specific rating for an area of evaluation. More details can be found in the Candidate's Instruction letter (see appendix), which provides examples of how a candidate is expected to address specific rating criteria in these guidelines.

1.4.3 All department faculty members shall participate in the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) in all courses as required by the FPPP and/or the CBA. In the Dossier, the candidate shall assign each piece of evidence to exactly one category - Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, or Other Contributions to the University and Community. The Department is aware that some activities might reasonably be assigned to more than one category; in such cases the candidate is often best qualified to make the judgment about which category most closely matches a particular activity. In cases of ambiguity in the assignment of a category, the candidate is encouraged to explain the rationale for including the evidence in a particular category. Moreover, the Department encourages the candidate to point out the breadth of such activities and to consider whether a particular activity should be split and considered as two separate activities. For example, mentoring a student research project could be included under Instruction, and, if that mentorship leads to a publication with the student, the publication might be included under Professional Growth and Achievement. **Each individual item of evidence may only be recorded in a single category.**

1.4.4 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. This principle is that everything should be counted once, and nothing twice.

2. STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

2.1 Standards for Tenure Track/Tenured Faculty

The Department RTP Committee shall evaluate each candidate in each of the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community. In each area, the candidate will be assigned a summary evaluation or rating: Exceeds expectations (E), Meets expectations (M), or Does not meet expectations (D) (FPPP 10.3.3).

The defining criteria for these ratings are indicated in the specific sections for each area below: sections 3.2 & 3.3 for Instruction; section 4.2 for Professional Growth & Achievement, and section 5.2 for Other Contributions to the University and Community.

Note that for Professional Growth and Achievement, the criteria for the ratings as they apply for Promotion to Full Professor is separate from the criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

Since the benchmarks for a particular rating give criteria for tenure & promotion at the end of a promotional period, a new candidate most likely will merit lower ratings during the first few years of the review period. This should not necessarily be interpreted in a negative way. The RTP Department Committee should indicate in their report if they have found evidence that the candidate is making sufficient progress towards a particular rating with justification for this judgment. If the candidate is not progressing satisfactorily, the Department RTP Committee shall offer recommendations for rectifying the situation.

As a candidate progresses through the evaluation process, it is possible for a rating to devolve. For example, if a candidate is very active during the first year of review and then produces no scholarly work for the next 3 years, the lack of continuity of effort and achievement could reduce a rating. Similar breaks in continuity can apply in the areas of Instruction and Service and could affect previous ratings in these areas.

Therefore, candidates should note that reviews will be looking increasingly to continuity of performance as time of service increases.

Per the FPPP 10.1.4, “probationary faculty are subject to two different types of review. The first called periodic evaluations, focuses on providing the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The second type of evaluation is called the performance review, wherein a critical assessment of the faculty member’s performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal ratings of performance in each area of review are used and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member.” Per the FPPP 10.4.3.b, “retention shall be awarded only to those whose performance appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course.” Per the FPPP 10.1.5, “normally periodic evaluations are done in the faculty member’s first, third, and fifth years; performance reviews are conducted in the second, fourth, and sixth years. It is in the sixth year that the decision is made to offer tenure or to release the faculty member from employment.”

The following table illustrates the minimum ratings required for a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

		Teaching	PGA	Service
Using Rankings Defined for Tenure and Promotion to Associate	Tenure & Promotion to Assoc.	M	M	M
	Early (both)	E	E	E
Using Rankings Defined for Promotion to Full Professor	Promotion to Full	M	M	M
	Early	E	E	E

Note that in the areas of Instruction, PGA and Service, a minimum rating of Meets expectations is required for tenure or/and promotion.

The following table illustrates typical, minimum, ratings required for a positive recommendation for retention.

	Instruction	PG & A	Other Contributions
2 nd year retention	M	-	-
4 th year retention	M	-	M

Note that, for retention, probationary faculty are expected to demonstrate instruction at Meets expectations (FPPP 10.4.3.c). Therefore, a Department RTP Committee recommending retention for a faculty member whose evaluation in Instruction does not meet expectations must explicitly indicate in their report why they recommend retention in spite of this low evaluation and provide a concrete plan outlining how the candidate can improve his/her teaching to a level of meets expectations before the tenure decision.

It is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee to ensure that its report contains developmental feedback in addition to ratings. The Department RTP Committee report must give constructive guidance that will help the candidate improve performance in each area of review.

Standards specific to Accelerated Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor

Consideration of tenure before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year, including service credit, as specified in FPPP 10.5.2 shall be regarded as consideration of accelerated tenure.” Consideration of promotion to associate or full professor, which would occur earlier than provided for in FPPP 10.5.2 or FPPP 11.1.1, respectively, shall be regarded as consideration of “accelerated promotion.”

Accelerated tenure and promotion shall be initiated according to FPPP 10.5.4.

See the previous table for typical minimum ratings required for early tenure and early promotion. As indicated in this table, the department has coupled early tenure and promotion to associate professor, using the same criterion for both. Hence, normally, they will be granted together. As stated in the FPPP 10.5.3, to qualify for accelerated tenure and promotion the candidate must 1) have been rated Exceeds expectations in all three categories of evaluation; 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. As stated in the 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; 2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue; and 3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. A recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review (FPPP 11.1.3).

It should be noted that a pattern of commitment is essential to Instruction, Professional Growth & Achievement, and Service. Pattern of commitment implies that there is a sustained and consistent performance over a period of multiple years. This pattern of commitment is especially important for evaluating early tenure & promotion and we wish to emphasize that it is a difficult standard to meet. It would be a rare situation for someone to meet this pattern very early, such as, more than one year early.

3. AREA OF EVALUATION - Instruction

3.1 Overall Structure

Teaching is the primary mission of the Department and the University. Effective teaching is a minimum and necessary requirement for retention, tenure and promotion. As such, the university’s strategic priority, “to develop high quality learning environments in and outside the classroom,” lays the foundation for the department’s goal in instruction. Central to this priority is the ability of faculty to establish and maintain a high-quality, student-centered learning environment in the classroom, promote academically rigorous standards, and provide the support necessary for our diverse student body. There are, however, many facets to the instructional mission of the department and university, which may involve a variety of activities both inside

and outside of the classroom.

The evaluation of a candidate's performance in Instruction will be based on evidence that lies in two major areas.

Area 1: Establishing and maintaining a high-quality, academically rigorous, inclusive learning environment in the classroom

Area 2: Additional instructionally related activities

- a. Curriculum and program development
- b. Mentoring students outside of the classroom
- c. Scholarship of instruction
- d. Diversity, equity, and inclusion
- e. Other instructionally related activities

Area 1 is the department's central priority for instruction and is described below in section 3.2. The evaluation of a candidate's performance in this area shall be based on activities and evidence directly impacting instruction in the classroom. The department's rating criteria for this evidence is given in section 3.2 below.

The Department of Mathematics & Statistics expects the candidate to engage in teaching activities beyond Area 1. Area 2 represents additional activities that, at least indirectly, inform instruction. This area has been broken up into sub-areas intended to be suggestive, but not exhaustive, of those suitable for instruction. The RTP Department Committee shall evaluate the candidate's performance in this area based on the quality, as well as quantity and continuity of commitment, of activities using the criteria given in section 3.3.

3.2 Evidence for Area 1

The RTP Department Committee shall evaluate a candidate's performance in this area based on the following evidence.

- **Written peer evaluations of teaching** based upon classroom visitations by faculty, including at least one visitation each by two members of the Department RTP Committee and the Department Chair. Additional visits may be requested by the candidate to provide further evaluative feedback. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) and the candidate's thoughtful reflection on SFoTs. (All faculty members shall solicit SFoTs in all courses as required by the FPPP and/or the CBA.)
- Written course materials (syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc.) submitted by the candidate and the candidate's reflections on these materials. The candidate's reflections of the material are an important component of the review process.
- Other evidence provided by the candidate under review that is relevant to this area.

A baseline description of instructional expectations is given below:

The candidate carries out the basic duties of teaching assignments in a professional manner; is available to students outside of class meeting times; prepares and presents course materials consistent with the discipline, clearly conveys expectations to students, and assigns fair and

consistent grades based on these expectations.

Evidence (listed above) indicates the candidate's competence in performing basic teaching duties.

In addition to this general description, the RTP Department Committee may consider the criteria for effective teaching set forth by Chickering and Gamson (1987) in "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" in determining the degree to which the evidence demonstrates that the candidate:

- Encourages student-faculty contact.
- Encourages students to work together.
- Encourages active learning in the classroom or outside of it.
- Provides prompt feedback on assignments.
- Uses class time wisely.
- Sets high standards and communicates them to students.
- Recognizes and responds to the fact that different students learn differently.

The following items pertain specifically to how the RTP Department Committee is to weigh the required components of peer evaluations and SFoT.

SFoT shall count for approximately 25% of the rating in Area 1. SFoT's shall be weighted at approximately 25% with the other three items, peer evaluations, written course materials, and other relevant evidence, which provide the other approximately 75% of the weight in Area 1. The intent of this criterion is to provide more clarity for the candidate and the RTP Department Committee concerning the language in FPPP 10.2.5.a, "Student Evaluations of Faculty data ... will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation ..."

To be satisfactory, SFoTs should show evidence of student learning and engagement, and generally have a question score average of above 3.0. However, we emphasize that there is no "required" numerical score on SFoT questions as many factors can influence these scores. Candidates should address any low scoring questions as well as any patterns of negative student comments.

To be satisfactory, peer-evaluations should show evidence of student learning and engagement. Candidates are required to address any concerns raised with peer-evaluations and implement changes as necessary.

The following gives some examples of evidence that could result in a higher rating in Area 1. We emphasize that quality of evidence is the overriding measure and that these are just possible examples, but evidence of an equivalent performance value may be considered as evidence that could result in a higher rating in Area 1.

- Creation of course materials and the candidate's discussion of how these materials were intended to enhance student learning.
- Written student comments, or written peer evaluations indicating that the candidate consistently or regularly schedules additional study sessions, above and beyond expected office hours (e.g. evening help sessions before exams, regularly scheduled upper-level study sessions or other online support/office hours).
- Incorporating additional classroom assessment and evaluation in a manner that enhances

- learning.
- Reflects on student feedback and peer-evaluations.
- Expands beyond the traditional classroom, including inclusive pedagogy, modern technologies, techniques, modalities, and materials.
- Participates in workshops or conferences about pedagogy and implements changes in the classroom as a result.
- Observes teaching of peers and documents one's own attempts to improve student learning.
- For courses with significant written assignments, grading is done via a series of drafts.

A *typical* minimum level of performance for the rating of Meets Expectations is that the candidate has satisfactory peer and student evaluations and regularly incorporates at least five of the following into their teaching:

- Uses a variety of teaching methods
- Participates in faculty development programs related to teaching (can be workshops or conferences)
- Visits peers' classrooms and reflects on the teaching practices observed.
- Creates or curates classroom materials
- Uses technology in the classroom
- Evidence of an inclusive classroom where all students from our diverse student population are encouraged to participate
- Evidence of student to student interaction and student to teacher interaction
- Other items, with appropriate justification

If the candidate fails to meet any of the requirements described above under Meets Expectations, then the candidate will be given a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

To obtain a rating of Exceeds Expectations, the candidate needs to show a pattern of excellent peer and student evaluations with evidence of addressing any low scoring SFoT comments or ratings if applicable. A candidate must have developed or experimented with strategies to improve educational performance of underrepresented students and report the results of using those strategies. The candidate will also need one additional item from the list above, in addition to the required five.

3.3 Evidence for Area 2

This section is intended to convey departmental expectations beyond **Area 1** and give criteria and typical standards for activities in **Area 2**. It should be noted that classroom instruction and standard teaching duties belong in Area 1 of teaching. The following is a list of sample activities for the various sub-areas of **Area 2** for which a candidate may wish to provide evidence. The list is intended to be suggestive of some of the types of activities that are suitable for each sub-area, but not exhaustive. Activities are not restricted to just these areas (provided there is justification for including them in Instruction).

This list can provide a way for the candidate to organize and present their work as a teacher, but the candidate should present more than a list. The Department RTP Committee encourages the

candidate to develop and employ the reflective practices necessary to develop and document effective teaching. In addition to providing documentation of participation in teaching activities, the candidate must also provide a rationale for participating in such activities and their potential impact on student learning.

Area 2 a: Curriculum and Program Development and Support

(Note that some of these items could instead be included under PG&A provided the activity involves a significant professional development component.)

- Creating new Math or GE courses as needed by the department
- Program development
- Coordinating multi-section courses
- Developing or participating in team teaching

Area 2 b: Mentoring Students Outside of the Classroom

- Academic advising - Serving as a faculty advisor to the Chico State Math Club or other student organization
- Promoting and mentoring internship experiences for undergraduates
- Supervising of student teachers or tutors
- Mentoring student research experiences
- Serving on master's committees
- Providing statistical consulting for master's students

Area 2 c: Scholarship of Instruction

- Writing or developing a textbook
- Publications related to instruction
- Secure Grants related to instruction
- Engage in Presentations that inform instruction at professional meetings
- Participate in On-going research in mathematics education, education, or a related field
- Have a Leadership role in a faculty development workshop on teaching

Area 2 d: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

- Participate in faculty workshops to promote equity and inclusion in the classroom and implementing strategies learned at the workshop
- Attend conference presentations related to diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Develop curriculum or programs to support underrepresented groups

Area 2e: Other instructionally related activities

- Involvement with mathematics education at any grade level, or mathematics-related education
- Enhancement of student-centered learning (for example, presentations to University students at forums or colloquia)

Criteria specific to Area 2 The following criteria give definitions that shall apply for evaluating the candidate's additional activities in this area. The RTP Department Committee is to take into account the quality, as well as the quantity and continuity, of the candidate's performance in these activities, as based on the materials in the candidate's dossier and WPAF.

Also included are examples of *typical* minimum sets of activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other activities of equivalent performance value could be substituted. The purpose of these examples is not to restrict the candidate's range of work but to aid the candidate and the RTP Department Committee by providing an example set of achievements that would merit specific performance ratings. We emphasize that quality and continuity are the main criteria for evaluating performance - any quantification implied in these examples is relative to these overriding measures.

The department anticipates that a candidate's contributions in Area 2 will grow with time. Since the ratings emphasize a **pattern** of commitment, in general, the candidates will be measured relative to the length of their employment.

A *typical* minimum level of performance for the rating of Meets Expectations is that the candidate is involved in at least 2 activities. For example,

- The candidate 1) is involved with advising majors, e.g. reaching a normal load by the end of a probationary period, and 2) has revised, updated, or created new course materials, or
- Same advising as above and the candidate has been involved in mentoring projects, such as, serving on a masters committee.

Candidates going up for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have had the time to demonstrate a *pattern* of commitment in both time and quality to educational activities such as those listed in **Area 2**.

A *typical* minimum level of performance at this stage is that the candidate is involved in 2 or more activities with a significant level of commitment in time and quality. For example,

- The candidate routinely advises a normal or above normal load and has created a new (or essentially new) course needed by the department (as documented by, for example, a letter from the chair), or
- Same advising as above and the candidate is routinely (i.e. demonstrates a pattern of) involved in mentoring of students, such as, serving on a masters committee, conducting special topics or readings courses (beyond their normal load) or directing an undergraduate research project of significant scope and duration.

If the candidate fails to meet any of the requirements described above under Meets Expectations, then the candidate will be given a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

To obtain a rating of Exceeds Expectations, the candidate must demonstrate a *strong, consistent pattern* of commitment in both time and quality to educational activities such as those listed in **Area 2**.

A *typical* minimum level of performance for Exceeds Expectations is that the candidate is involved in significant activities as measured by a time commitment, e.g. 3 or more activities that have a year-long commitment (or a lesser number with multiple-year commitments).

Rating criteria for Instruction:

The following table illustrates the typical path toward obtaining a rating of Meets expectations or Exceeds expectations. Note that the Exceeds expectations column lists the items needed **in addition** to items listed in the Meets expectations column.

	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Area 1	<p>Two items required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satisfactory SFoTs and thoughtful written reflection on SFoTs 2. Satisfactory peer evaluations and written reflection on ways to implement suggested changes 	<p>Three items required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistently excellent SFoTs and peer evaluations 2. Evidence that previous low scoring SFoT comments or ratings have been addressed, if applicable 3. Developing or experimenting with strategies to improve educational performance of underrepresented students; reporting on/evaluating the results of using those strategies
	<p>At least 5 items from the list below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uses a variety of teaching methods 2. Participates in faculty development programs related to teaching (can be workshops or conferences) 3. Visits peers' classrooms and reflects on the teaching practices observed 4. Creates or curates classroom materials 5. Uses technology in the classroom 6. Evidence of an inclusive classroom where all students from our diverse student population are encouraged to participate 7. Evidence of student to student interaction and student to teacher interaction 	<p>At least one additional item from the items listed in "Meets expectations"</p>

	8. Other items, with appropriate justification	
Area 2	1. Engagement in multiple activities listed in Area 2a-2f 2. Engagement in at least 1 activity in Area 2 that has a significant commitment of time and quality. This will be judged by a candidate's length of employment. At time of promotion a candidate is expected to have completed at least 2 activities with a significant commitment of time and quality.	1. Completion of one or more additional Area 2 activities with significant commitment of time and quality

4. AREA OF EVALUATION - Professional Growth and Achievement

4.1 Evidence

All faculty must demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and achievement by engaging in scholarly activities that foster intellectual growth and professional development. Scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the missions of the Department, College and University. The Department RTP Committee shall consider the quality, along with the quantity, level of effort, and overall pattern of involvement of the candidate's scholarly activities. To the extent possible, quality is to be the overriding factor in measuring a candidate's performance. While scholarly activity has intrinsic merits, the candidate should strive to disseminate new ideas to the larger mathematics or statistics community. Activities with a peer-reviewed component will typically be considered more significant. It is the candidate's responsibility to help the RTP Department Committee judge performance value by documenting activities and explaining the significance of the activities with respect to the candidate's professional development. For any activity started before the hire date, the candidate should explain what proportion of work was performed prior to the hire date.

The following is a list of sample activities with professional growth and achievement merit (not in any order of performance value). The list is intended to be suggestive of the types of activities for which a candidate may wish to provide evidence, but is not exhaustive.

4.1.1 Authorship and Research

- a. Publications, both peer-reviewed and not
- b. Presentation at professional meetings
- c. On-going research in mathematics, applied mathematics, mathematics education, statistics, data science or a related field (documented by, for example, submitted papers or drafts of current work in progress)

4.1.2 Professional Achievements furthering the missions of the Department, College or University

- a. Involvement in renewal and development (e.g., substantial professional development or achievement during leave of absence, sabbatical, or assigned time; attendance at professional meetings, attendance at workshops for faculty development not covered above).
- b. Seeking internal or external funding for research, activities, or projects.
- c. Obtaining internal or external funding for research, activities, or projects.
- d. Collaboration with area schools and members of the K-14 mathematics education community (for example, providing professional development opportunities for teachers).

4.1.3 Other scholarly contributions to the profession

- a. Professional consulting in their discipline (documented by hours and a description of work done)
- b. Serving as a referee for a journal (documented by work done and hours)
- c. Serving as an editor (documented by work done and hours)
- d. Serving as a reviewer (documented by work done and hours)
- e. Participation in professional societies (e.g., holding office, organizing meetings, workshops, symposia, etc., documented by details of duties and time involved)

Evidence and measures of performance value of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer and administrative review of material submitted in the dossier
- Self-evaluation of material submitted in the dossier (to be included in the dossier)
- External reviews of work
- Citations of work
- External recognition of professional work (such as invitations to present)
- Extent, frequency, and quality of professional activity
- Awards or honors

4.2 Rating Criteria

The rating criteria for measuring a candidate's performance in professional growth and achievement shall be based on the following items. First, a brief description is given for Meeting Expectations and Exceeding Expectations. These are further defined by giving examples of *typical* minimum levels of achievement with sample activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other achievements of equivalent performance value may be substituted. The purpose of these examples is not to restrict the candidate's range of work but to aid the candidate and the RTP Department Committee by providing an example set of achievements that would merit specific performance ratings. Since evaluations are to be based, to the extent possible, on the quality of an achievement and since typical minimum benchmarks sometimes involve an accounting of significant achievements, some special notes on "quality" and "significance" are given below.

4.2.1 "Quality" and "significance"

As a comprehensive university, our department values scholarship in the area of Professional Growth and Achievement in the broadest sense. With the university's emphasis on our instructional mission and the heavy teaching loads in our department, the department recognizes

the inherent difficulty in staying professionally active - a perspective that influences our interpretation of quality or significance of activities, such as, publications or grants.

- Collaboration is highly valued and encouraged, whether it is presentations, publications, grants, or other collaborative work. A statement should be provided by the candidate describing his/her role and the significance of the contribution to any joint work.
- In terms of publications, it is not the department's intent to get into a journal rating game. The primary criterion for a quality publication is that it be peer-reviewed in a reputable journal.

It should be noted that "peer" in this context would typically require the editorial process to include reviewers with Ph.D.s but not necessarily restricted to mathematics or a mathematics related field. For example, since interdisciplinary collaboration is valued, other science areas or engineering would be acceptable. Also, the department recognizes the importance that the publisher be reputable and has a stringent review process.

The candidate is required to give details about the journal if the journal is not well known and established, or if the RTP Department Committee is unfamiliar with the journal. (See example 1 in the Appendix). The Candidate may be required to provide information on the review, such as, details of the review board, the review process, publication fees, or the publication acceptance rate, if available. If the Impact Factor is available, that number could help validate the quality of the journal. If the journal is reviewed by MathSciNet, the candidate could give the Math Citation Quotient (MCQ) value for the journal. The RTP Department Committee may request additional information at any time after the candidate's dossier has been submitted (or at the time of the interview).

The department wishes to take a broad perspective on the evaluation of grants. However, there is no single defining criterion as with publications.

- The evaluation of significance of grants should be based on a combination of things, like, the candidate's role on the grant (e.g. PI or co-PI), scope and reputation of the funding agency, level of competition and review, scope of the outcomes proposed, and, to a lesser degree, dollar amount. The candidate must describe their role in detail (what percentage of the grant they wrote, what outcomes they are responsible for, when those outcomes will be achieved).

In the evaluation of presentations, the department singles out presentations given at professional conferences, and places a higher value on those given at conferences with a national or international scope. However, it is possible that other presentations could rise to this level of significance, such as an invited seminar talk at a research-university.

4.2.2 Descriptions and Typical Minimum Levels – for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Meets Expectations: To meet expectations for tenure and promotion the candidate must

demonstrate a *pattern* of commitment to professional growth and achievement as evidenced by engagement in scholarly activities, such as those listed in section 4.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- One achievement of similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two are necessary for conferences if those conferences are of a local/regional scope) and
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

If the candidate fails to meet any of the requirements described above under Meets Expectations, then the candidate will be given a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

Exceeds Expectations: To exceed expectations for tenure and promotion the candidate must demonstrate *strong, consistent pattern* of commitment to professional growth and achievement as evidenced by engagement in scholarly activities, such as those listed in section 4.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of a similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences, at least one of which, is a major conference of national scope (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope).
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

4.2.3 Descriptions and Typical Minimum Levels – for Promotion to Full Professor

The basic descriptions stay the same but each rating (Meets expectations and Exceeds expectations) now requires an additional significant achievement of similar performance value as a peer-reviewed publication (as described below in section 4.2.4). Specifically, the typical benchmarks change as follows.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for Meeting Expectations for promotion:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope) and
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and

those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

If the candidate fails to meet any of the requirements described above under Meets Expectations, then the candidate will be given a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for Exceeding Expectations for promotion is:

- Two peer reviewed publications related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of a similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences, at least one of which, is a major conference of national scope (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope).
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

4.2.4 “Similar performance value”

The benchmarks above refer to achievements of similar performance value as compared to a publication that meets the department’s standard for quality (as described in section 4.2.1). This section is intended to give some clarification of what Similar Performance Value means. The department recognizes there may be activities or accomplishments that constitute professional growth & achievement but do not necessarily result in publications. These less-common activities may be of similar performance value depending on the documented level of achievement. The most common example is with grants that meet the department’s standard for significance as described at the beginning of this section. The overriding issues for evaluating the performance value are the same type of measures as applied to publications and grants, namely, documentation of peer review and documented academic achievement. The candidate must describe his/her role in the activity and the competitive nature of the activity if it applies. Other than grants, which are already covered in terms of measuring quality and significance, it is the candidate’s responsibility to promote an activity or achievement as being of similar performance value and provide the evidence and documentation to justify this position.

5. AREA OF EVALUATION – Other Contributions to the University and Community

In addition to teaching and related activities and professional growth and achievement, all faculty are expected to contribute and support the missions of the Department, College and University, and to serve our profession externally to the University, through activities not covered in the previous sections. The purpose of this area of evaluation is not to encourage candidates to accumulate a list of accomplishments; rather, it is to recognize that it takes work to make a Department, College, University or Profession run smoothly and, to acknowledge the contributions of individuals for sharing the workload. Candidates should describe the breadth and impact of their service. Service is an ongoing commitment, and all ratings will be based on a continuous pattern of contributions. Activities such as, but not restricted to those listed below, have value in this area of evaluation:

5.1 Evidence

5.1.1 Service to the Department, College, University, and Profession

- a. Service on committees at the Department, College, or University level
- b. Service on regional, state, or federal boards or committees
- c. Service as a program, department, or university administrator
- d. Outreach and service to the K-14 mathematics education community (for example, service on local, state, or national committees, commissions, or boards)
- e. Mentoring of master's students
- f. Advising non-majors
- g. Service to the mathematics community not covered above (such as service on local, state, or national committees, commissions, or boards)
- h. Work with advisory boards, or corporations.
- i. Outreach to students, potential students, and alumni (for example, work on the Department newsletter or webpage)
- j. Participation in fundraising or development activities.
- k. Participation in recruiting-related activities
- l. Organizing or participating in events that promote public awareness of the discipline.
- m. In general, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues (including colleagues from other institutions)
- n. Supporting student success outside of office hours; for example, meeting with non-majors about their honor's thesis
- o. Organizing a workshop or conference

5.1.2 Service towards Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Chico State has made equity, diversity, and inclusion the University's top priority. The department is committed to this goal and we especially value service contributions in this area. Activities listed below (not an exhaustive list) have value in this area of evaluation.

- a. Contributing to the University's programs to enhance equal opportunity or cultural diversity
- b. Serving on a task force or committee to address social issues facing the campus community
- c. Presenting in seminars on problems, issues, or concerns with regards to equity, diversity, and inclusion
- d. Recruitment of underrepresented minorities students to the discipline
- e. Volunteering for university special events related to equity, diversity, and inclusion
- f. Writing grant proposals that involve improving equity, diversity, and inclusion
- g. Providing advice, mentoring, or guidance to underrepresented minorities
- h. Giving talks or presentations to enhance understanding of equity, diversity and inclusion issues

Service contributions can be documented by, but not limited to:

- Including in the dossier peer and/or administrative review of service
- Self-evaluation submitted to the dossier
- Letters from committee or Department Chair describing extent, frequency, or quality of committee and other service (to be included in the dossier)

- Statements in the dossier describing leadership roles in committee work or other service
- Written opinions of faculty and staff colleagues, or community collaborators and the public regarding the Candidate's service (to be included in the dossier)
- Evidence of awards or honors

5.2 Rating Criteria

Service at the department level is particularly vital to maintain a healthy and functional department. All faculty should demonstrate a willingness and ability to cooperate and work effectively with other faculty and staff on issues of governance and service at the Department, College, and University levels. The RTP Department Committee shall consider the quality, continuity, and level of effort associated with any service activity, with the main criteria for evaluating performance being *quality of service*. Any quantification implied in the examples is relative to this overriding measure. The following descriptions and typical minimum levels of expectation shall apply.

Meets Expectations:

Candidates are advised to look at the examples in the Appendix: Candidate's Instruction Letter.

To meet Expectations for tenure and promotion a candidate must serve on 2 or 3 departmental committees each academic year (the minimum number of committees that all faculty are requested to serve on may vary from year to year based on eligible faculty and committee needs, e.g. due to hiring committees, etc.) The work load also varies from committee to committee, and can vary from year to year. The candidate should briefly indicate his/her role on the committee (member, chair) and the level of workload during the period of service (low, average, high) A letter from the committee Chair or Department Chair should document unusual workload, or special responsibilities, especially for activities or committees that may not be familiar to an RTP Department Committee. Advising is an important activity and candidates are expected to share the advising workload. Attendance at department meetings and participation in graduation ceremonies is also expected.

A candidate must also demonstrate a commitment to service beyond minimal service on departmental committees, as evidenced by engagement in activities such as those listed in section 5.1.

A *typical* minimal way to meet expectations is for the candidate to serve on department committees as described above and, in addition, the candidate has at least two of the following (note that faculty can do one of the activities more than once to achieve at least two):

- Served outside the Department at least once if candidate is untenured, and at least twice if candidate is tenured (for example, on minor College or University level committees, or on a community advisory board)
- Taken on a leadership role in service (e.g. chaired a committee with a significant workload at any level, or had a leadership role in a service activity other than committee service)

- Taken on a substantial advising load as documented by a time sheet or by a letter from the Chair.
- Devoted a significant amount of time to the activities listed in Section 5.1.2 (Service towards Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion).

If the candidate fails to meet any of the requirements described above under Meets Expectations, then the candidate will be given a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

Exceeds Expectations: The candidate demonstrates a strong and consistent commitment to other contributions, beyond service on departmental committees, as evidenced by engagement in activities such as those listed in section 5.1.

A *typical* way for a candidate’s service to “exceed expectations” is to meet the level given above and, in addition, the candidate

- Regularly assumes a leadership role in service both in and outside the Department
- Makes contributions in service to the Department, College, University, or Community other than standard committee service.
- Regularly does activities described in Section 5.1.2

We emphasize these are *typical* minimum levels of achievement with sample activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other achievements of equivalent performance value may be substituted. For example, the department recognizes that a candidate may make significant service contributions to the department, college, or university that are outside of a committee setting, e.g. work with advisory boards or other service on a non-campus regional, state, or national board, faculty senate, or participation in recruitment activities. Depending on the documented level of effort or achievement, the RTP Department Committee (whether requested by the candidate or not) may substitute these activities for an appropriate level of committee work.

The candidate is encouraged to document heavy workload committees and/or special responsibilities assumed, especially for activities or committees that are not well known.

Appendix: Candidate’s Instruction Letter

Notes about Instruction

Documentation similar to the examples given below for Professional Growth and Achievement also apply to Instruction. It is the candidate’s responsibility to focus the review on any significant teaching related activities, with sufficient explanation to justify their significance and justify a specific rating in the area.

For example, a candidate may reflect in narrative form on his/her SFoT’s for Area 1 in Instruction.

In particular, candidates are encouraged to document Area 2 activities with explanations, time sheets or letters of support.

For example, the guidelines for Instruction mention the value of developing course materials. Rather than simply listing materials, the candidate is encouraged to reflect on these materials and give guidance as to which materials are new or original. If the candidate has developed a “new course needed by the department,” the candidate should document how this course is needed (e.g., by including a letter of support from colleagues or the chair).

Notes about PG&A

As indicated in section 1.4.2 of the Department of Mathematics & Statistics RTP guidelines, the candidate should include a document in their WPAF that specifically addresses the criteria in the guidelines. For each criterion, where it is appropriate, the candidate should indicate the achievements or activities that they wish to promote as meeting a specific rating for that criterion. In some cases, additional information or explanation may be needed to justify the stated accomplishments as being “significant” or of “quality” (see the comments at the beginning of section 4.2 in the RTP guidelines).

The purpose of having it be the candidate’s responsibility to address the criteria in the guidelines is because he/she knows best how to match accomplishments, activities, and other evidence with the criteria and how to make the case for their significance. For many typical achievements, little, if any, additional information or justification may be needed. But, the candidate should be especially alert to achievements that might be perceived as marginally meeting the department’s standard for quality or significance.

Given below are a couple of examples of how the candidate might address specific criteria and ratings.

Example 1

The department’s RTP guidelines in the area for PG&A lists the following items in a typical minimum benchmark for a rating of Meets Expectations: (1) one peer-reviewed publication, (2) one achievement of similar performance value, (3) two presentations at professional conferences, and

(4) multiple activities indicating an on-going professional commitment. I have successfully met this benchmark with the following:

- (1) Candidate, A. (2005). Math Article Title. *Respected Math Journal*, vol. 1 (no. 2), 30-40.

This is a well-known refereed journal requiring no additional justification for meeting the department’s standard for quality. The acceptance letter and full article can be found in _____.

- (2) Candidate, A. (Co-PI). Grant Title. *National Funding Agency*, \$75,000 (2005)

The acceptance letter and the full proposal can be found in _____. (As an external grant from a reputable national funding agency and of a high dollar amount, it is likely this is an example that would not require further justification of its significance. The candidate should document his/her level of involvement in writing and conducting the grant, and describe outcomes of the grant. The example below illustrates a case where additional

information may be needed.)

(3) I gave presentations at the following meetings.

- Conference Title (Date). This was a 15-minute contributed talk. An acceptance letter and paper this was based on can be found in_____.
- Conference Title (Date). I was a co-presenter for this 30-minute invited presentation. An acceptance letter and PowerPoint slides can be found in_____.

(4) The following activities, in addition to the achievements listed above, clearly illustrates a continuous pattern of performance: an additional presentation at a national professional meeting (Date), 3 presentations at colloquia or regional conferences (Dates), one internal grant (e.g. a CELT award for □ \$2K in (Date)), and one student talk each year for the past 4 years.

Example 2

(This example is intended only to illustrate a variation to item (2) in the benchmark used for Example 1 above.)

(2) Candidate, A. (Co-PI). Grant Title. “*CSU System-wide Program*, \$30,000 (2005)

While this is not external to the CSU system and not of national scope, it is a very competitive program. Last year only 9 awards were made out of 56 submissions, an acceptance rate which indicates a level of competitiveness at least equal to typical national funding agencies. In addition, the scope of this proposal is significant ... (very briefly summarize the time period and proposed outcomes).

Example 3

(This example is intended to illustrate an activity of equivalent performance value to a “presentation at a professional conference”)

(3A) I gave a presentation at the following meeting.

- Conference Title (Date). This was a 15-minute contributed talk. An acceptance letter and paper this was based on can be found in_____.

(3B) I supported the research of faculty in the Department of Biology with statistical consulting. This is documented by the following.

- Bio Faculty, A. and Bio Faculty, B. (2005) Bio Paper Title, *Respected Bio Journal*, (vol. 1) (no.2), 30-40. This paper includes an acknowledgement of my contribution and can be found in_____.
- A time sheet showing five hours of consulting related to this project can be found in_____.

Notes about Service

Both the Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations ratings in the department RTP guidelines for service require a “leadership” role on a “significant” committee. If this is satisfied by the candidate serving as the chair of a committee, the candidate should obtain evidence of this by requesting a letter from the Chair of the Department and, if necessary, indicating why this committee qualifies as being significant; if the candidate performs particularly significant service in a leadership capacity on a committee, then the candidate should request a letter from the chair of the committee detailing the contributions made by the candidate. If the candidate wishes to argue that he/she has taken on a significant advising load, this should also be documented with time sheets or letters of support from colleagues or advisees.

6. Range Elevation for Lecturers

To be considered for range elevation, a lecturer must show professional growth and development appropriate to the lecturer’s work assignment and the mission of the University during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the current request. This is the only review period in which a candidate's professional achievements shall be evaluated. The evaluation report will be sent to the Chair of the Department.

For elevation to the range of Lecturer B or above, the candidate must have, since the initial appointment or last range elevation demonstrated teaching excellence and demonstrated participation in activities that promote professional growth and achievement. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered sufficient for appointment at a higher level. (FPPP 12.1.2.d.1.).

Per FPPP 12.1.2.c, 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. 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 besides instruction (FPPP 12.1.2d).

The candidate must demonstrate satisfactory professional growth and achievement by documenting commitment to high-quality professional development. Examples of appropriate activities include (in no particular order):

Tier 2 Activities

- Engage with student organizations or math-related clubs.
- Participate in Faculty Learning Communities, formal or informal.
- Participate in instructionally-related workshops (including workshops about DEI topics).
- Mentor students.
- Observe colleagues teaching, and reflect on the teaching practices observed.
- Serve as a course coordinator for multi-section classes.
- Serve on Department, College, or University committees.

Tier 1 Activities

- Create substantial curricular materials, including open educational resources.

- Publish work in discipline-related journals.
- Attend and/or present at regional or national conferences.
- Engage in discipline-related or national conferences.
- Work on grant-funded activities or submit grant proposals.
- Participate in discipline-related professional organizations.

This list is intended to be suggestive of the types of activities upon which a range elevation may be based, but other significant professional development activities may also qualify.

Candidates should not just list their activities, but must also provide evidence of their professional activities in the form of documents, manuscripts, conference programs, emails, letters, etc.

The progression from Lecturer A to Lecturer B will typically have a lower bar for advancement than progression to higher levels.

A typical collection of professional activities required for advancing from Lecturer A to Lecturer B must include at least three Tier 2 activities, or one Tier 1 activity.

A typical progression from Lecturer B to Lecturer C must include at least two Tier 2 activities, and at least two Tier 1 activities.

A typical progression from Lecturer C to Lecturer D must include at least two Tier 2 activities and at least three Tier 1 activities.

	Tier 2 Activities	Tier 1 Activities
Lecturer A to Lecturer B	3 or	1
Lecturer B to Lecturer C	2 and	2
Lecturer C to Lecturer D	2 and	3



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: 
 Kevin McGown (May 16, 2024 17:52 PDT)

Date: May 16, 2024

Dean Review: 

Date: May 17, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: 

Date: May 17, 2024