Department of Management

Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

Adopted by Department May 2022

Approved by Dean and Provost May 2022

Effective 2023-24 AY

Table of Contents

DEFINITIONS

CBA

Collective Bargaining Agreement, also known as MOU, Contract or Agreement. It is an agreement between the Trustees of the California State University and an exclusive representative of a unit of employees' union. Faculty are in Unit 3. The Office of Academic Personnel has the online version at: [Bargaining Agreement: Unit 3 | CSU (calstate.edu)](calstate.edu)

DOSSIER

The professional file kept by each faculty member. It contains data in the possession of the faculty member that provide evidence of professional activity, which are indexed and submitted to the working personnel action file (WPAF) in those cycles in which the member is being formally evaluated or reviewed. After the review period is complete, the index will be placed in the PAF with the evaluative reports, maintaining the link between the dossier and the personnel action file (or PAF).

EM

See "Executive Memorandum."

EQUIVALENCY

Attainment judged by the faculty of a discipline to be equivalent to possession of the terminal degree normally required for tenure and/or promotion in that discipline.

EVALUATION

Either a Periodic Evaluation or a Performance Review.

EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM

A memo issued by the campus President, which creates or updates formal campus policy. The memo is the policy document. Referred to as EM or EMs (plural) for short.

FPPP

The University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document. The FPPP is the primary policy relating to personnel actions affecting faculty. It is available from the Office of Academic Personnel web site.

INDEX

A list of those materials prepared by the faculty unit employee for periodic evaluation or performance review that is placed in the working personnel action file (WPAF). That index is permanently placed in the personnel action file (PAF) which results in materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty unit employee to be incorporated by reference to the personnel action file (the only official personnel file containing employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee).

LECTURER EMPLOYEE

The class to which lecturer faculty unit employee appointments are made, in contrast with the rank designations to which probationary and tenured faculty are appointed, such as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The Lecturer class is subdivided into ranges, and their appointments have a specified termination date, whether full-time or part-time.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The process of evaluating probationary faculty for retention, tenure, or promotion that leads to formal reports, recommendations, and notices of results.

PERIODIC EVALUATION

The process of evaluating faculty on the basis of temporary service, probationary service in a year when retention is not an issue, and service as a tenured faculty member. Periodic evaluations stress developmental issues and focus on plans for improving a faculty member's effectiveness. The written report does not contain formal recommendations regarding retention, tenure, or promotion.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Committee which makes recommendations on appointment, retention, tenure,

promotion, leaves of absence, or other actions which may result in a change of employment status for an individual faculty member.

PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (PAF)

The Personnel Action File shall be defined as the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. For each faculty unit employee, the President shall designate an office in which the Personnel Action File shall be maintained and shall designate a custodian for the Personnel Action File. It is the intent of the CSU to maintain accurate and relevant Personnel Action Files. There may be copies of materials contained in the official file in other working files for the convenience of the Employer. Only the official Personnel File may be used as the basis of personnel actions. The Dean is the custodian of the PAFs of faculty in their College and the PAFs are maintained in the office of the College Dean. (See also WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE.)

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

A technical term employed to describe any activity or participation that contributes to an instructor's development of currency in the subject matter taught and in instructional technology appropriate to the assignment of a temporary faculty member as defined by academic department standards and criteria. It is to be distinguished from "professional growth and achievement," which must also encompass research and scholarship that contributes to the knowledge base of the instructor's discipline or to the effective operation of professional organizations of scholars.

RANGE

The term used to designate subdivisions of the lecturer unit employees that denote placement of lecturer faculty unit employees on the salary schedule. Ranges correspond to the academic ranks of probationary and tenured faculty as follows:

> A Range (also designated as 2) corresponds to Instructor Rank
> B Range (also designated as 3) corresponds to Assistant Professor
> C Range (also designated as 4) corresponds to Associate Professor Rank
> D Range (also designated as 5) corresponds to Professor Rank

RATING

The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all levels of evaluation in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement,

and Other Contributions to the University. Recognized ratings are "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," and "Does not meet expectations". The use of hyphenated ratings is NOT permissible.

RECOMMENDATION

The expression of the wish of a reviewer of any level as to the action being considered; an explicit indication of an action said to be justified on the basis of relevant criteria and evidence.

REPORT

A written discussion of evidence submitted as a basis for a personnel action, including description and judgmental conclusions arising from such evidence.

RETENTION

The decision or action to retain a probationary faculty unit employee, normally for one or two years during their probationary period following a performance review.

REVIEW CYCLE

The sequence of events involved in an evaluation or review conducted within a particular academic year. (See RTP Deadline Calendar.)

RTP

The retention, tenure, and promotion process, including Periodic Evaluations for temporary and probationary faculty, and Performance Reviews for tenure line faculty.

RTP DEADLINE CALENDAR

A calendar of deadlines for the submission of reports and recommendations from each Personnel Committee, Department Chair, and College Dean. It is provided by the Provost (or designee) by the beginning of each Fall semester.

WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF)

The personnel action file (PAF) and dossier are combined during the time of evaluation to create the WPAF. The Working Personnel Action File is the file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. It includes all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the employee (dossier) being evaluated, and information provided by faculty unit employees, students, and academic administrators. It also includes all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. Because the WPAF is part of the PAF, all regulations regarding the PAF also pertain to the WPAF.

1.0 Statement of Compliance

This document is intended to comply with provisions of the CBA and the FPPP, and to provide elaboration in those areas where these documents allow for standards to be established by each Department/Unit or College. The reader is urged to consult these essential documents. If there should be any conflict between the provisions contained within this document and federal or state law, California State University policy, the CBA, and/or the FPPP, the higher-level laws, regulations, or policies shall apply. For current information regarding documents and policies that may have personnel decision implications, contact the Office of Academic Personnel.

2.0 Personnel Committee Structure and Eligibility

Personnel Committee size and membership shall be established by discussion, nomination, and election at either the first meeting of the Department of Management at the beginning of each academic year or at the last Department meeting held the prior academic year. An eligible nominee may not decline the nomination to serve. A quorum consists of at least fifty percent of the total committee membership.

3.0 Responsibilities and Rights of Membership

Members of the Department of Management will retain the ability to formulate, recommend, review, and revise all academic, personnel, and professional policies of the Department of Management, including curriculum and fiscal policies related thereto broadly and liberally defined. In order to properly carry out this charge, the DOM decision making committees need to inform the body and its members. It is the responsibility of the members to become informed regarding these issues. Relevant Department of Management committee or the Department Chair will initiate and supervise voting of its members in relation to the above items.

4.0 General Responsibilities of Faculty Undergoing Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review

3.1 It is the responsibility of all faculty members to understand the provisions of the FPPP and those contained within this document. Faculty members undergoing Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review should periodically consult with (and seek guidance from) the Department Chair and/or the Personnel Committee with respect to questions about the personnel process generally, or about specific expectations or requirements pertaining to the individual faculty member. Senior faculty members have the responsibility to provide guidance in this area.

3.2   The Department of Management cannot overstate the importance of maintaining a dossier containing a cumulative record of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments (see the FPPP and directives from the Dean's Office for additional requirements, guidance, and restrictions related to the dossier). Although unmanageable quantities of material should be avoided, capabilities, performance, accomplishments, and effectiveness must be documented affirmatively. That is, should insufficient evidence exist regarding any evaluation criterion, the reviewer(s) may not find that satisfactory performance has been achieved. Each faculty member should be familiar with the contents of their PAF (and WPAF), and note that materials can be included in the WPAF via indexing in the dossier.

3.3   Probationary faculty undergoing Periodic Evaluations or Performance Reviews can choose to be evaluated under the most recent Department of Management (DOM) standards approved by the Provost, or they can choose to be evaluated under the DOM standards in place in the fall semester of the faculty member's start date. Associate Professors with tenure must use the DOM standards in place at the time of going up for Promotion. The current FPPP is always used for the yearly RTP process.

3.4   A faculty member need not excel in all areas of review in order to be retained, tenured or promoted. The more relevant question is whether the faculty member overall provides a valuable contribution to the Department, College and University. When evaluating a faculty member's contributions, the quality, as well as the quantity, of performance shall be considered.

4.0   Evidence - Instruction

4.1   Candidates must include evidence of teaching effectiveness in the dossier which may include but is not limited to the following. Candidates should ensure that the evidence provided will allow reviewers to assess their performance on the criteria for Instruction below.
   a.   Items in the PAF that need not be duplicated in the dossier:
      i   Classroom visitation(s) by members of the Personnel Committee, and/or the Department Chair, and/or the Department Chair's designee
      ii   Student feedback on teaching (SFOTs; required by FPPP)

   b.   Items Required by the FPPP (Section 8.1.3.e.)
      i.   A copy of the Department Standards that the faculty member is being evaluated against
      ii.   Current Curriculum Vita of the faculty member
      iii.   A Narrative to provide context for reviewers to understand and

evaluate the faculty member's performance (FPPP 8.1.3.e.3)

c. Items Required by the Department

    i Course syllabi and examples of assessment and instructional materials at least for the most recent semester of each course taught, with additional materials available upon request

    ii A clear listing of all courses taught during the review period

d. Optional Elements

    i. A summary and interpretation of SFOT data over the duration of the review period

    ii. Course grade distributions and GPA by section

    iii. Teaching portfolios, including examples of student performance and achievement, and examples of the faculty member's feedback to students

    iv. Video of teaching sessions

    v. Written reports of colleagues based on team-teaching experiences

    vi. Written reports of guest appearances in an evaluator's class

    vii. Written student evaluations of teaching that are not already part of the WPAF

    viii. Peer evaluations of significant independent study or research by students

    ix. Special student projects, informal seminars, or internships overseen by the faculty member

    x. Honors, awards, or special recognition received for accomplishments in the classroom

    xi. Results of standardized measures or examinations across multiple-section, multiple- faculty courses

    xii. Creative measures of appropriate student outcomes assessment

    xiii. Evidence of pedagogical innovations and/or effective use of instructional technologies

    xiv. Evidence of Professional Growth and Achievements activities making impact in teaching

    xv. Attendance at pedagogical conferences or workshops leading to improvements or innovations in pedagogy

    xvi. Evidence of the candidate's role in course, curriculum, and program development

    xvii. Letters from students or colleagues

    xviii. Evidence of the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments. Evidence may include: efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps in the candidate's courses, the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning, the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors, the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, the creation of class assignments and activities that

    implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment, and/or
    the completion of training and professional development
    opportunities that center around equity, diversity, and inclusion.

  xix. Evidence of Backward Design for Learning and/or an explanation
    of how the course design links course material and activities to
    learning outcomes for both the course and the program

4.2 Many faculty activities naturally reflect on multiple areas of achievement.
Reviewers should include consideration of material presented regarding
professional growth and achievement that contributes to the evaluation of the
faculty member's instructional effectiveness and currency in the field. In
evaluating a faculty member's instructional effectiveness, reviewers also should
consider their role in course, curriculum, and

4.3   program development; and special forms of contact with students, such as individual student advising and involvement with student organizations. The unique challenges and contributions associated with team teaching shall be duly weighed. In all cases, evidence of the quality of such activities must be presented.

4.4   **Classroom Visits**

a. University policy (the FPPP) and the contract (CBA) require that there be some form of consultation between the faculty member(s) who is to do the classroom visit and the faculty member who is to be observed. This consultation may consist of communication from the observer(s) to the person to be observed as follows:

- Offering to meet ahead of the visit to discuss the nature of such observations and answer questions posed by the person to be observed.

- Offering to meet after the visit to provide informal feedback.

- Asking if there are any areas about which the person to be observed would like detailed feedback.

The above list is not intended to be exhaustive, and communication between the two faculty members can cover multiple purposes.

b. While the FPPP establishes a minimum of a 5-day notice be given to the faculty member being evaluated, there is no requirement to specify the exact day of the evaluation. However, in addition to providing notice of the upcoming visit, it is necessary to obtain additional information about the course schedule to make sure that the visit does not occur on a day where instruction is not the focal point (e.g., solely student presentations, an exam, technical coverage of how to do a simulation, etc.).

5.0   Evidence – Professional Growth and Achievement

5.1   Department of Management faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship and creative professional activities for purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion. In evaluating professional growth and achievement, all forms of scholarship–basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integration/application scholarship, and teaching and learning scholarship–will be considered. Faculty members must provide evidence of active and on-going scholarly inquiry and a record of intellectual contributions and other academic engagement activities, with an emphasis on both the number of contributions as well as on the quality

of the contributions over the duration of the review period. In line with AACSB Standard 8, intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business. Further, intellectual contributions may have the potential to address issues of importance to broader society. The contributions are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted academic research principles and are disseminated to appropriate audiences.

The department values cross-disciplinary research relevant to contemporary business scholarship. In these circumstances, a candidate's scholarly work may be published in a journal from a discipline other than their primary discipline. In this case, credit should be given as long as the standards for publication in that journal are comparable to the standards for journals in the candidate's primary discipline. This determination, as well as a rating for the journal article should be made according to the procedures in Appendix 5 of the COB Policy Manual for departments to add acceptable outlets to their journal list.

5.2   All published scholarship listed must be presented in a bibliographical format that clearly identifies the authorship as it appears or will appear in the published work. The judgment of the candidate's overall scholarship record should be based not only on the quantity of publications, but also on the quality of those publications and the consistency of their performance over time.

5.3   Standard evidence that may be used to establish performance on the standards related to Professional Growth and Achievement include (but need not be limited to) the following:

a. Required items.
  • Peer-reviewed articles published (or accepted for publication) in journals recognized as reputable and of high quality (i.e., journals in the ABDC list plus Department-approved journals based on College of Business Policy and Procedures Manual, Appendix 5). See Section 8.3 below.

b. Optional items.
  • Paper presentations at professional conferences including abstracts and papers published in proceedings.
  • Books, book chapters, or manuscripts published or accepted for publication that are reviewed by professional and/or academic reviewers.
  • Published cases with instructional materials.
  • Invited papers presented at professional meetings.
  • Research monographs.
  • Authoring a significant part of a major public policy analysis conducted through or on behalf of the University.
  • Conducting a significant part of a funded research project, including a major contribution to a final written report or product.

- Technical reports related to funded research projects.
- Published computer software.
- Published news briefs or updates that provide an overview on current trends, new findings, or recent occurrences relevant to the candidate's discipline.
- Published book reviews or other published reviews on technical or professional tools offering a comprehensive content overview and recommendations to readers.
- Other published pieces that do not meet the College of Business definition of quality under Appendix 5 of the College of Business Policy and Procedures Manual but are not proven to be predatory outlets.

5.4   Faculty members should note that outside reviews may be helpful in assessing their work, as would reviewers' and/or editors' comments on work that has been submitted for publication or presentation consideration. Faculty members should provide reviewers with any relevant evidence regarding works in progress.

5.5. Weighted Values of Publications. The college uses the Australian Business Dean's Council (ABDC) list as a guideline to assign ratings of quality for journals containing faculty publications. For journals not appearing on the list, the department journal review committee determines whether the journal is of acceptable quality, and assigns a rating level (A, B, C or unacceptable) to the journal as appropriate, following procedures in COB Manual Appendix 5 adopted 10-25-21. Works in law reviews published by an ABA-accredited law school or ranked on the Washington and Lee list meet the quality criteria but will need to be rated. For candidates who include journal articles in their dossier that are not on the ABDC list and have not been approved by the department journal review committee prior to the candidate entering the RTP process, the department RTP committee will make this determination. In working towards the peer-reviewed journal publication requirements for the ratings below, "C" level publications will count as 1.0 research-related works, "B" level publications will count as 1.5 research-related works, "A" level publications will count as 2.0 research-related works and "A*" level publications will count as 2.5 research-related works.

5.6. Uniqueness of Research.   Faculty are encouraged to disseminate their research to have an impact in a variety of ways – indeed, taking research results to different audiences ensures the work will have a greater impact than a more limited distribution. In a typical publication process, manuscripts can undergo significant changes, potentially making different publication works unique. Nevertheless, these works must be sufficiently unique from each other to count separately for tenure and promotion. Candidates should provide descriptions of all research-related works, as well as the works themselves so that reviewers can clearly see their uniqueness.

6.0   Evidence – Service to the Department, College, University, and Community

6.1   There are many ways by which a faculty member can contribute to the success of the Department, College, University, or the surrounding community. Faculty members should include appropriate documentation of any such contributions. While the Department of Management does not particularly value any one form of contribution over another, reviewers should consider the impact and quality of these efforts/outcomes as they relate to facilitating the achievement of University/College/Department strategic plans and goals.

6.2   Each faculty member must provide evidence regarding their service on committees, task forces, and other service-related activities. For each committee, task force, or other group activity, the faculty member should identify: (1) the service group's name, (2) the faculty member's role (e.g., Chair, member), (3) the duration of service, (4) a contact person for verification of the faculty member's contributions, and (5) the ways in which the faculty member effectively contributed to the group's tasks and outcomes. In all cases, evidence of the quality of such activities should be presented. An example of sufficient documentation is a brief statement from the chair of the committee on which one served.

6.3   Standard evidence that could be used to establish performance in Service may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Maintain an active involvement and/or provide leadership in Department, College, and/or University-wide committees and important internal projects.
- Maintain an active involvement within the faculty member's discipline (such as serving as a session chair, officer, or committee member in international, national, regional, or local academic or professional organizations and/or conferences).
- Serve as an editor, associate editor, serve on the editorial board, or serve as a manuscript reviewer for journals and/or conferences
- Other substantial service in the community with meaningful impact.

6.4   "Working collaboratively and productively with colleagues" is defined by the CBA as a professional responsibility of faculty, and this activity should be included in the evaluation of "Other Contributions." It is the responsibility of the faculty member to include evidence that s/he works well with others (i.e., is considered to be a "good colleague"). For example, such evidence might include written confirmation by others in the discipline that the faculty member works collaboratively and productively with their colleagues. Team-developed courses, co-taught classes, and co-authored articles may also demonstrate the effectiveness of a faculty member's ability to work harmoniously with their co-workers. Evidence presented under the sections of "Instruction" and

"Professional Growth and Achievement" may also demonstrate the effectiveness of the faculty member's ability to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues. The Narrative contained within one's dossier provides an important opportunity to describe these contributions.

8.0   Evaluation (Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)

8.0.1   General Ratings and Definitions for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Ratings: The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all levels of evaluation in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community. Recognized ratings are "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," and "Does not meet expectations." A tenure-track faculty member rated as "Does not meet expectations" in any one (but only one) of the three areas may be recommended for retention at the two-year Performance Review. A tenure-track faculty member rated as "Does not meet expectations" in any one of the three areas will not be recommended for retention at the year four Performance Review, or for tenure or promotion.

Definitions: In each written performance review report, the reviews of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community will each conclude with a summary rating. These evaluations are defined in the remainder of this section and supersede discipline-specific nomenclature as outlined in the Unit's department standards. Here, expectations are defined as (see FPPP 10.3.3):

Exceeds Expectations

The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement in the area being evaluated. "Exceeds Expectations" shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.

Meets Expectations

The candidate has demonstrated competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. An evaluation of "Meets Expectations" performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets expectations shall be concluded for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).

Does Not Meet Expectations

The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to the department's criteria in the area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction.

8.1   Department of Management Tenure and Promotion Standards.

Area	Retention*	Tenure	Accelerated Tenure‡	Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Full Prof. †	Accelerated Promotion to Assoc. or Full Prof. §
Instruction	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Professional Growth and Achievement	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

* Retention requires candidate ratings of "Meets Expectations" in all areas, except the Performance Review of Probationary Faculty Retention 1-2 Year, where two of the three areas requires a "Meets Expectations" rating.

†Promotion to Professor requires substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (see FPPP 11.1.2). The rank of Professor designates the faculty member as having achieved recognition as an outstanding member of the academic community and of his or her professional discipline based on sustained productive performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. A professor is a faculty member who has been recognized by his or her peers within the University and/or regionally, nationally or internationally for the quality of these contributions to his or her discipline. Examples include but are not limited to:
- Being appointed to the editorial board of a reputable journal
- Accepting an invitation to be an editor, co-editor, or contributor to a special issue of a reputable journal
- Being invited to be an editor, co-editor or contributor to a book addressing academic or professional issues related to your field
- Consistently presenting papers at regional, national or international conferences
- Conducting workshops, moderating a session, being on the organizing committee or performing other official duties at regional, national or international conferences
- Being personally invited to be part of a panel at a regional, national or international conference (workshop organizer, conference speaker, etc) due to recognized expertise in the field
- Consistent service as a reviewer for manuscripts submitted for publication at

reputable regional, national or international journals
- Being invited to serve the local or regional community (or beyond) due to recognized expertise in the field

‡ To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate professor, the candidate must: (1) have been rated Exceeds Expectations in a Performance Review as defined in FPPP 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. See FPPP 10.5.3

§ To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: (1) be ranked Exceeds Expectations in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review. See FPPP 11.1.3

8.2. Criteria Applied to Instruction

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of faculty. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, student feedback on teaching data (SFOTs) shall be used but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness and shall not be used when determining a candidate's knowledge of their field (FPPP 10.2.5.a). Therefore, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide data in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance.

In evaluating teaching effectiveness, the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation: (1) currency of knowledge of the field(s) in which the faculty member instructs, (2) organization and level of development of course materials; and (3) effective communication

        Below are some example questions faculty may use when describing their teaching performance, and RTP committees may use in evaluating materials submitted for review.
              a. Mastery of the course material. Do the materials used for teaching show

the faculty member's mastery of the subject matter that pertains to each course they teach? Do the teaching materials support the course description and learning outcomes for the course? Do the materials adequately cover the topic of the course? (Not evaluated using SFOTs)

b. Currency in their field – do the teaching materials show that the faculty member instructs using recently published findings in the field, in addition to research that is classic, or considered seminal works that helped define the field? (Not evaluated using SFOTs)

c. Quality of communication – Does the class visit show that the faculty member can clearly communicate with the students? Do the course materials clearly communicate expectations of the course to students

d. Organization of the learning experience – does the syllabus and schedule show a logical flow through the topics over time? Is the Learning Management System (i.e., Blackboard or Canvas) set up to allow students to easily navigate through the course? Are instructions organized and easy to understand?

e. Academic rigor, level of difficulty, and range of instructional materials – do the course materials show a level of difficulty appropriate to the level of the course (lower division, upper division core, option level, graduate, etc). Does the faculty member use a variety of materials to present concepts to enhance student learning, such as slides, guided notes, videos, assignments, quizzes and /or exams of varying degrees of difficulty, etc. Is the course sufficiently challenging but not overly difficult for the level of the student?

f. Existence and quality of student-centered learning environments- does it appear that faculty have created a positive learning environment for all students? Do faculty-student communications generally appear to be positive and respectful in nature, with a focus on learning?

g. Use of instructional technology – is appropriate technology used to promote learning?

8.2.a Ratings & Standards Applied to Instruction

Exceeds Expectations
The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. Candidates that exceed expectations will have **positive curricular impact <u>within and beyond</u>** their classroom through innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

Standards include, but are not limited to:
- Demonstrating superior teaching performance as evidenced by peer review.
- Demonstrating superior teaching performance as evidenced by student feedback.

- Demonstrating superior teaching across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
- Developing curricula through designing new courses and teaching state-of-the-art content.
- Developing and disseminating innovative and creative instructional methods.
- Mentoring other faculty members on teaching.
- Receiving teaching-related awards and/or recognitions.

Meets Expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. An evaluation of "Meets Expectations" performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. An evaluation of "Meet Expectations" corresponds to candidates having **positive curricular impact <u>within</u> their classroom** through innovation, creativity, and/or pedagogical scholarship.

Standards include, but are not limited to:
- Demonstrating effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer review.
- Demonstrating effective teaching performance as evidenced by student feedback on teaching.
- Demonstrating effective teaching across a variety of environments, courses, and student abilities.
- Adopting methodologies for teaching critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
- Adopting innovative and creative instructional methods.
- Contributing to curricula by teaching state-of-the-art content.
- Demonstrating assimilation of current and challenging content in the classroom.

Does Not Meet Expectations

The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed above, in the Department/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA.

8.3. Ratings & Standards Applied to Professional Growth and Achievement

Exceeds Expectations

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's significant, highly-regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed above, in Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA).

For candidates applying for tenure and / promotion, exceeding expectations is attained by accumulating seven (7) or more unique research-related works during their review period. At least five (5) works must come from peer-reviewed journal articles published in outlets

appearing on the College of Business Quality Journals list. In order to be rated "exceeds expectations" at least two (2) of the candidate's five (5) publications must be rated as "B" level journals (or higher).

Meets Expectations
The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA). The use of "appreciable" conveys the necessary trade off in producing influential scholarship and the quantity/types of scholarship produced. The definition of appreciable is "large or important enough to be noticed," allowing evaluators to focus on the quality of the work (i.e., to be noticed) rather than the quantity. The quality of these activities is more important the quantity of activities (see FPPP 8.1.3.e.4 and Appendix A in FASP policy implementing RTP changes, 2022-2023).

For candidates applying for tenure and / or promotion, meeting expectations is attained by accumulating five (5) or more unique research-related works during their review period. At least four (4) works must come from peer-reviewed journal articles published in outlets appearing on the College of Business Quality Journals list.   For retention, tenure and promotion, candidates must also provide evidence of a research pipeline. ~~leading to tenure and/or promotion~~.

Does Not Meet Expectations
The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA).

8.4. Ratings & Standards Applied to Service to the Department, College, University, and Community

Exceeds Expectations
The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. "Exceeds Expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) assuming key roles in significant committees, (2) high levels of involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating significant activities as well as demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to the University's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Examples include:
- Maintain an active involvement and provide leadership in Department, College, and/or University-wide committees and important internal projects.
- Maintain an active involvement within the faculty member's discipline (such as serving as a session chair, officer, or committee member in international, national, regional, or local academic or professional organizations and/or conferences).
- Serve as an editor, associate editor, or on the editorial board of academic journals or practitioner-oriented business publications.
- Other substantial service in the community with meaningful impact.

Meets Expectations
The evidence demonstrates the candidate's on-going involvement in activities listed above, in the

Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. "Meets Expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) occasionally assuming roles in important committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities, as well as demonstrating on-going contributions to the University's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

Examples include:
- Maintain an involvement in Department, College, and/or University-wide committees and internal projects.
- Maintain an involvement in the academic or professional organizations and/or conferences in the faculty member's discipline.
- Serve as a manuscript reviewer for academic journals and conferences.
- Other service in the community.

Does Not Meet Expectations
The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed above, in the Dept/Unit standards, in other sections of the FPPP, and in the CBA. "Does Not Meet Expectations" performance is evidenced by a lack of the candidate's (1) assuming roles on committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities as well as demonstrating limited contributions to the University's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.

8.5.   Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

The periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall follow the procedures in the FPPP.

.

9.0   Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty

9.1   The CBA specifies that the periodic evaluation of lecturer faculty will follow the periodic evaluation procedures for probationary, tenure-track faculty, and is intended to be developmental.

9.2   The periodic evaluation of part-time lecturer faculty shall follow the policies and procedures in the FPPP and the CBA including:

a.   At least one classroom visit is conducted each period of review. Classroom visitations may be conducted by probationary and tenured faculty, the Department Chair or designee, and others deemed qualified by the Personnel Committee. Visitation reports will be submitted on the College's designated form.

b.   A File Closure Form must be signed by the Chair of the Personnel Committee and a candidate by the deadline in the RTP calendar.

Provisional Standard approved 5-16-23 for AY 23/24 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 5-24-23 memo and attachments.

9.3   All lecturer faculty members' dossiers must document performance related to each appropriate criterion for evaluation as specified in the FPPP.

9.4   Lecturer faculty must maintain AACSB qualification status, as determined by the College Dean.

9.5   Lecturer faculty appointed to Range A or Range B are required to demonstrate "professional activity" appropriate to the instructional assignment. Lecturer faculty appointed to Range C or Range D are required to demonstrate Professional Growth and Achievement commensurate with the corresponding rank and work assignment. Consult the FPPP for details.

10.0   Conflict of Interest

Presently, the FPPP requires that, "Department/Unit and College constitutions and bylaws (or other guidelines) regarding Department/Unit and College Personnel Committees shall establish standards of conflict of interest regarding eligibility, beyond the "conflict of interest" rules stated elsewhere in this document, as the appropriate academic unit deems necessary." The Department of Management deems that no further standards are necessary.

11.0   Hiring

11.1   Upon notification of an authorization to hire a new faculty member, the department chair will initiate the process to form a hiring committee, following the current recruitment procedures and policies. The Department of Management considers hiring to be one of the most important functions of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and thus expects all eligible department faculty to participate in the process. In the case when the hiring process extends over two semesters, faculty can only participate if they are available for the duration of the entire hiring process. Temporary faculty may be invited to meet with tenure-track candidates, and provide feedback to the hiring committee on their observations.

11.2   The procedure for recommending new tenure-track faculty to the dean shall be conducted through a vote of all of the Department's tenured & tenure-track faculty who hold voting rights for that semester, as described in the most current COB & Department policies.

11.3   Participation in the hiring process is expected of every eligible voting member. The idea behind participating in these events is to become familiar enough with the records – such as available from the Hiring Committee – of each candidate

to make an informed vote at any point in the hiring process. This participation may be in the form of:

- Providing assistance to the Hiring Committee as part of the initial screening process (e.g., determining whether the applicants meet the minimum criteria for being valid candidates). However, only members of the hiring committee will have access to application materials. Faculty outside of the hiring committee will have access to CVs of candidates who are invited for interviews.

- Providing assistance to the Hiring Committee as part of the later screening process (e.g., ranking qualified candidates, performing phone interviews, performing reference checks).

- Attending at least one of the "professional" interaction opportunities (e.g., the candidate's job talk, teaching session) for candidates who make a campus visit

- Getting to know each candidate in a less formal way (e.g., coffee during a break during the campus visit, a meal, a reception, in-office discussion) for candidates who make a campus visit

11.4   Faculty who have not had the opportunity to become familiar enough with the candidates to make an informed judgment before voting are expected to recuse themselves from the vote (and not participate via proxy). However, all faculty may participate in pre-vote discussions in order to share what information he/she may have and to learn more from other faculty.

11.5   Appointment Standards for Lecturers. The FPPP requires that Department personnel policies include certain minimum standards for the appointment of lecturers. In order to maintain consistency within the college and across the BADM degree program, the Department of Management uses those standards established by the College of Business and published in the Policies and Procedures Manual. As those standards may occasionally change, they are incorporated into this document via this reference.

12.0   Range Elevation for Lecturers

FPPP 12.1.2b-d states: Criteria for range elevation for lecturer faculty… shall be appropriate to Lecturer work assignments. 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 besides instruction. Departments/Units shall clearly define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field in their personnel policy documents." (See

again Section 9.5 above).

12.1. If the faculty member's work assignment includes Instruction, then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as "Exceeds Expectations," and includes accomplishments recognized beyond the department and college. Instruction shall be evaluated in the same manner as described in Section 4 above. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for range elevation.

12.2. If the faculty member's work assignment includes Professional Growth and Achievement (PGA), then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as "Meets Expectations." See Section 5 above.

12.3. If the faculty member's work assignment includes Service, then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as "Meets Expectations." See Section 6 above.

13.0   Effective Date

Upon ratification by the faculty and approval by the Dean and Provost by October 1, 2022, these policies and procedures become effective with the 2022-2023 academic year.

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: *Kim Hinrichs*
Kim Hinrichs (Jun 6, 2023 11:02 PDT)   Date: Jun 6, 2023

Dean Review: Terence Lau (Jun 6, 2023 13:17 PDT)   Date: Jun 6, 2023

OAPL Review: *Mahalley D. Allen*   Date: Jun 7, 2023

Provost Approval: _____   Date: Jun 7, 2023

California State University **Chico**
Academic Personnel

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Kim Hinrichs, Department Chair

CC: Terence Lau, Dean

FROM: Mahalley Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of Department RTP Standards

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

Interim Provost Perez has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2023-2024 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

> 1. Provide criteria for the ratings of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" for all three evaluation categories for decisions about retention (preferably for years 2 and 4) and decisions about promotion to full professor.

> 2. Address additional comments in document.

Based on our review of recently reviewed department standards, we offer these general observations, which we highly recommend departments consider as they work on revising their provisionally approved standards.

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.

2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.

4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Friday, December 1, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and the Provost have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2024-2025 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

Our office will route for signatures your provisionally approved department standards in Adobe Sign and will post them to the Department Standards page. You may now provide these provisionally approved standards to faculty in your department.