



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO

Department of Public Health and Health Services Administration

Personnel Policies and Procedures

Approved March 9, 2022

Department of Public Health and Health Services Administration Personnel Policies and Procedures

Provisionally approved 8-26-22 for AY 22/23 and extended to AY 23/24.

Standards must be compliant with the CBA and the FPPP. Conflicts between these standards and the CBA or the FPPP will be resolved pursuant to the CBA and then FPPP.

Table of Contents

1. The Department Personnel Committee.....	3
2. Appointment Standards.....	3
3. The Dossier	3
4. Developmental Feedback.....	3
5. Areas of Assessment.....	4
6. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching	4
7. Evaluation Criteria for Professional Growth & Achievement.....	7
8. Evaluation Criteria related to Contributions to the University & Community.....	9
9. Contribution to Strategic Plans & Goals of the Department, College, & University.....	11
10. Professional Role & Ethics.....	11
11. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Periodic Evaluation.....	11
12. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Performance Review for Retention.....	12
13. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Tenure	13
14. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Promotion.....	13
15. Early Tenure/Accelerated Promotion	14
16. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Tenured Professors	16
17. Periodic Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Lecturers.....	16
18. Evaluation criteria for lecturers who have applied for an range elevation	17
APPENDIX A: Strategic Priorities of the University (in bold) and the PHHA Mission Statement	18
APPENDIX B: Glossary of terms and hyperlinks to relevant documents	

In addition to the basic requirements set up by the FPPP document and the CBA, the Department of Public Health and Health Services Administration will employ the following criteria, guidelines, and procedures in its decisions regarding retention, tenure, and promotion.

1. The Department Personnel Committee

Personnel recommendations will be made by the Department Personnel Committee. The committee composition and election of the committee chair will follow the FPPP and the constitution of the department.

2. Appointment Standards

Tenure track faculty: The terminal degree for tenure track positions in the department is a doctorate in a health-related field matching the position description.

Lecturers: Must have a Master's degree in a health-related field relevant to the teaching assignment or extensive experience and specialization related to the teaching assignment. For courses in the professional process and core categories of the curriculum, lecturers must have current professional experience performing the processes being taught.

When making academic assignments the order of assignment for available work follows the CBA 12 and FPPP 7.0.

3. The Dossier

Faculty under review are to submit a dossier to provide evaluators with the information and materials needed to accurately judge the faculty member's performance in the areas listed below. The dossier should be developed according to FPPP 8.1. At minimum, two reflective statements are needed: one on teaching philosophy/ strategies/objectives and another on professional development. A detailed table summarizing SFOT scores for each course assignment and a reflection on the SFOT scores and student comments is required.

4. Developmental Feedback

To assist in the progression towards retention, tenure, or promotion, the committee will provide to the candidate developmental feedback in accordance with the FPPP (8.0).

Tenure track faculty are subject to two different types of performance evaluations. The first, called PERIODIC EVALUATION, focuses on providing the tenure track faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by all involved with the process.

The second type of performance evaluation for tenure track faculty 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.

Normally, Periodic Evaluations are done in the tenure track faculty members' first, third and fifth years: Performance Reviews are conducted in the faculty members' second, fourth and sixth years. It is in the sixth year that the decision is made to offer tenure (FPPP 8.4). At each review the personnel committee will provide written feedback on each category under review. In the next cycle of review, the candidate must provide evidence of having attended to the feedback.

Lecturers will undergo Periodic Evaluations in accordance with FPPP 8.2.

5. Areas of Assessment

The personnel committee will consider the following areas of assessment for each candidate for retention, tenure, and promotion as established in the FPPP (8.4) and those outlined below:

Each candidate shall be evaluated and rated noting strengths and weaknesses, on teaching, professional growth and achievement and other contributions to the university and community using the following ratings: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations . Two other areas, contributions to strategic plans and professional role and ethics will be evaluated but not ranked with one of the above descriptions. It is the responsibility of the candidate under review to provide evaluations of work performed outside the department. To some extent, exceptional performance in one area of review may compensate for lesser contributions in other areas of review (FPPP 8.4).

6. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

Excellent teaching is the first, minimum and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. The main role of the instructor is to create and support an innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environment. To this end, the following will be considered and evaluated:

Knowledge and currency in the field

- Organization of course content and materials
- Communication effectiveness in clarity of concepts, facts and ideas
- Utilization of appropriate and varied teaching methods
- Development and implementation of appropriate evaluation procedures
- Appropriate use of instructional technology.
- Evidence of a positive learning environment
- Provision of efficient and effective feedback
- Accessibility outside of class
- Prepare effective course syllabi and classroom materials.

Evidence in support of meeting expectations in teaching that should be supplied by the faculty member (all faculty):

- Current course syllabi
- Curriculum innovations
- Samples of evaluated student exams, papers and/or projects
- Examples of instructional technology utilized in class
- Evidence of student-centered learning activities
- Evidence of student outcome assessment plans, materials and results

Student Feedback Evaluations on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs):

SFOTs shall be administered accordance with approved procedures (8.1).

Written or online student feedback evaluations of teaching and learning (SFOT) shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student evaluations (8.1).

The modality of the class should align with the modality of the SFOTs.

Each faculty unit employee must prepare a table summarizing SFOTs, along with his/her comments and interpretations for placement in the dossier.

Peer Evaluations of Classroom Teaching:

Scheduled observation(s) of classroom teaching by faculty familiar with the course content are required. Classroom observations for lecturers will be completed by a tenure or tenure-track faculty member. Classroom observations for tenure/tenure track faculty members will be completed by a member of the Personnel Committee. For both lecturer and tenure track faculty, at least one classroom visit to assess the faculty member's teaching performance will be conducted per each review year. For tenured faculty, at least one classroom visit to assess the faculty member's teaching performance will be conducted in each 5 year review cycle. The observation write-up will address the points listed below. The Committee or the faculty member also may request other faculty within and outside the department who are familiar with the content area to submit written evaluation(s) of classroom observations to address the following:

- Does the instructor seem well prepared?
- Does the instructor synthesize, interpret, and summarize effectively?
- Does the instructor adjust to class level of comprehension, explain new/different concepts, and tolerate disagreement?
- Does the instructor hold student interest, encourage opinions and questions?

The faculty member must prepare a summarization of the peer evaluations along with his/her comments and interpretations for placement in the dossier.

On-line Instruction:

Online, synchronous classes will be observed and evaluated in the same manner as an in-person class.

For online, asynchronous classes: Material from an academic week will be used to assess teaching. This includes but is not limited to lectures, readings, discussion boards, assignments, and any other materials.

Academic Advising:

In cases where the faculty has assigned responsibility for academic advising their effectiveness will be determined by the following criteria:

- Appropriate knowledge and skills including general education and degree requirements and campus and community resources to support students
- Development and maintenance of organized and effective advising material
- Assisting students in developing educational plans that are based on assessment of abilities, aspirations, interests, and values and that promote smooth progress towards timely completion of majors/minors/certificates
- Articulating to students, the meaning of higher education and the intent of the Department's curriculum
- Assisting students in understanding academic policies and procedures
- Increasing student retention by providing a personal contact that students often need and request, thereby connecting them to the Department
- Monitoring student progress towards established goals and identify systemic and personal conditions that may impede student academic achievement. Developing appropriate interventions and assist students in overcoming educational and personal problems that may be barriers to degree completion
- Providing students with accurate information about academic progression and degree requirements.
- Assisting students in identifying potential internships
- Providing sufficient office hours to meet student needs, including additional hours during pre-registration times
- Communicating effectively with students, other faculty, and other departments on advising issues

Effective advising is demonstrated by:

- Providing students a correct and appropriate planning for timely graduation.
- Sufficient office hours and email response times.
- Demonstrated knowledge of basic general education information and requirements.
- Effective use of PeopleSoft and other advising software.
- Communicates effectively with the Program Coordinators and the Chair regarding course substitutions.
- Appropriate advice and information provided to students about academic and career goals.

- Represent the PHHA department at campus-wide and department specific student recruitment/retention events as needed.

Service Learning:

In cases where the faculty has implemented service learning projects into the curriculum, these projects will be assessed based on the following criteria:

- Value of the service learning activity in providing practice of professional skills while serving an actual need in the community
- Amount of individual responsibility students have to the final outcome of the project
- Relationship of the project to the courses Student’s Learning Objectives (SLOs) set by the department and university strategic goals
- Number of “clients” served, quality of products produced and depth of the experience
- The amount of individual responsibility the candidate has in implementing the project

Curriculum Development:

If the faculty member has created or significantly revised an existing course, materials exhibiting the contribution should be included in the dossier. Participation in campus initiatives for course redesign, infusion of technology, etc. should also be documented here.

Overall Teaching Contributions:

Teaching assignments can vary greatly among members of the department. Teaching multiple preparations and teaching classes of differing levels is addressed in this category, as is involvement in general education (GE) courses and teaching classes that are writing and labor intensive.

7. Evaluation Criteria for Professional Growth & Achievement

The forms of professional growth and achievement common to the department’s disciplines and professions are listed below. The dossier must contain evidence of type, quality, quantity and time period assigned to each of the professional growth and development activities. The candidate is responsible for providing reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments about the value and contribution of the activities:

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor as well as promotion to full professor must complete the listed number of activities from each bolded category.

Professional growth and development refers to activities and accomplishments that directly increase the candidate’s professional expertise (knowledge and skills).

They can be viewed in two groups: (1) activities that change the candidate so they are better able to perform in their position; and (2) activities that allow the candidate to share the expertise they have gained with others in the community, the profession, and to other groups that can benefit from exposure to the work of the candidate.

Completions of the minimum from each of the five categories would result in a rating of meets expectations (1 - 5, as listed below).

Category 1:

Candidates must produce two (minimal) Peer-Reviewed Publications.

To meet the strategic goals of the university, and to encourage high quality scholarly contributions the faculty member will be required to justify the selection of the journal based on audience, professional organization affiliation, indices, and appropriateness of review process.

Special attention should be paid to avoiding predatory journals. Refer to this link for more information: <http://scholarlyoa.com/individual-journals/>

- Original research article, book, or book chapter in a health-related field
- Original higher education pedagogy research with a health or healthcare focus
- Original applied research in a health or healthcare setting including best practices, and case studies

The committee will evaluate justification based on the following:

For each publication, submit the following information:

- Show that articles have Digital Object Identifiers by including the DOIs of your work.
- Provide the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) for a journal, or the ISBN for a book.

In addition, the committee may ask for:

- The lead editor by name, institutional affiliation, and editorial email address.
- Up to 5 additional associate or senior editors for the journal by name and institutional affiliation.
- A copy of the correspondence letter(s), including the peer review.
- List databases and/or indices in which the journal appears (e.g. PubMed, ERIC, PSYCInfo, Google Scholar, JSTOR).

Any publications deemed insufficient based on these indicators will not be considered to meet this requirement.

Category 2:

Candidates must present two (minimal) Peer-Reviewed International, National or State Professional Conferences (not listed in order of importance, all are acceptable):

- Oral Presentation
- Poster Session

- Roundtable Presentation

Category 3:

Attendance and Membership:

- Attend four (minimal) International, National, or State Conferences in the promotion period (this includes the two from category 2 if the candidate attends the conference at which they present)
- Attend one Regional or Campus Conference or Workshop per year
- Membership in at least one relevant professional organization per year

Category 4:

Choose 1 from the following (not listed in order of importance, all are acceptable):

- Secure external funding
- Implement external grant projects – 1=.2 assigned time
- Collaborate on large scale federal and state grant products (publications, presentations) that use branding
- Edit a book or educational media
- Edit a reader for national distribution
- Author supplemental materials for a publisher
- Disseminate expertise to professional practitioners (consulting, workshops, in-service training, etc.)
- Serve as an editor for a professional journal
- Develop educational media or materials for professional dissemination

Category 5

Choose 1 from the following (not listed in order of importance, all are acceptable):

- Maintain professional credentials (e.g., CHES, FACHE, MCHES, etc.)
- Significant training in new technology (example: attend Academy E-Learning)
- Secure internal funding
- Present at campus scholarly events (CELT, BSS Colloquium)
- Serve as an expert witness

8. Evaluation Criteria related to Contributions to the University & Community

Candidates are expected to perform a range of services at the department, college, university and community/profession. Evidence of such contributions should appear in the candidate's dossier.

Completion of the minimum from each of the three categories would result in a rating of meets expectations.

Level 1 Department:

All tenure/tenure-track faculty are expected to:

- Serve on and regularly attend major Department Committees such as Curriculum Committee, Recruitment Committee, Personnel (if eligible)
- Chair at least one department committee per 5 year review cycle
- Represent the PHHA department a minimum of once per review cycle or as assigned at campus- wide and/or department specific student recruitment/retention events.
- Represent PHHA a minimum of once per year at graduation/recognition ceremonies and commencement

In addition, choose one of the following:

- Option coordinator
- Assessment coordinator
- Student organization advisor (department-based or general university)
- Accreditation coordinator
- Other major projects assigned by the Chair
- Department Chair or other administrative assignment

Level 2 College:

One of the following:

- Member and/or chair on at least one college level committee for at least one committee term per retention/promotion cycle
- Other college administrative assignment of semester appointment or longer

Level 3 University Service:

One of the following:

- Member and/or chair on at least one university level committee for at least one committee term per retention/promotion cycle
- Other university administrative assignment
- Year-long contribution to projects and/or programs that support the university strategic goals (example: diversity, sustainability, student retention, Associated Student Programs, etc.)

Level 4 Service to the Community and to the Profession:

Minimum of one of the below each year: (not used for a prior requirement)

- Service on or officer of a board of directors or a committee/task force of a health/healthcare related organization
- Grant writing for a health/healthcare related organization
- At least 5 health/healthcare related lectures to campus/community groups in a year's time
- Serving as an external committee member on an accreditation team
- Holding an office or chairing a committee of a relevant professional organization

- Grassroots work with underserved populations
- Organizing and coordinating health/healthcare advocacy coalition activities
- Review three articles for professional journals relevant to candidate's field
- Author two book reviews relevant to health/healthcare
- Coordinating a professional conference

9. Contribution to Strategic Plans & Goals of the Department, College, & University

The candidate's activities must support the department, college, and university strategic plans. The candidate should document in the dossier those activities that further the mission of the department, college, and university. The strategic priorities and mission statement of the college, university and department is located in Appendix A.

10. Professional Role & Ethics

All faculty are expected to adhere to the Professional Ethics and Standards contained in the FPPP . Also included, with respect to role, is the candidate's ability to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues. Collegiality is a professional criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties within a department. Faculty members do not operate in isolation from their departmental colleagues or from those in related disciplines. They must make decisions as a group regarding the curriculum, the scheduling and teaching of classes, the advising of students, and the allocation of resources and space. These responsibilities require cooperation and collegial interaction. None of them can be carried out successfully if each faculty members acts solely in his or her own personal interest. Criteria to determine collegiality:

- The candidate's professional abilities and relationships with colleagues must be compatible with the department mission and with its long term goals
- The candidate must exhibit an ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks
- The candidate must participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental policies and programs
- The candidate must maintain high standards of professional integrity
- The candidate must contribute to a work environment that is positive, respectful, collaborative, and fair

11. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Periodic Evaluation

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.0). Evidence must be provided by the candidate in the dossier in support of progression toward goals and objectives. Normally, Periodic Evaluations are done in the faculty members' first, third and fifth years. These evaluations are not rated but provide developmental feedback recognizing aspects of performance that are being done well as well as aspects of performance that need enhancement. At each level of the Periodic Evaluation the candidate should be comparing their performance against the expectations of the next year's Performance Review.

12. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Performance Review for Retention

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.0). Evidence must be provided by the candidate in the dossier in support of progression toward goals and objectives.

The candidate must have a minimum rating of 3 meets expectations to be considered as “progressing toward tenure” at the first Performance Review in the second year of their employment.

Definition of the ratings as used for both retention and promotion are listed below:

Exceeds expectations:

The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim 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.

Teaching. Candidates for retention must earn a minimum rating of meets expectations at all reviews in the area of teaching based on evidence provided in the dossier.

Professional Growth and Achievement. Candidates in their second year may have a rating of meets expectations. Candidates for retention in the fourth year must earn a minimum rating of meets expectations in the area of growth and achievement.

Other Contributions to the University and Community. Candidates in their second year may have a rating of meets expectations. Candidates for retention in their fourth year must earn a minimum rating of meets expectations in the area of other contributions.

Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University.

Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance.

Professional Role and Ethics. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance.

13. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Tenure

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.0). Evidence must be provided by the candidate in the dossier in support of progression toward goals and objectives. The candidate must have minimum overall ratings of **one exceeds expectations and two meets expectations** to be recommended for tenure. Specific area minimum requirements for tenure are outlined as follows:

Teaching. Candidates for tenure must receive a minimum rating of meets expectations in teaching.

Professional Growth and Achievement. Candidates for tenure must receive a minimum rating of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement.

Other Contributions to the University and Community. Candidates for tenure must receive a minimum rating of meets expectations in contributions.

Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University.

Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance. Performance is based on the candidate's willingness and ability to complete teaching and service assignments that meet the strategic plans and goals of the department, college and university. This includes willingness to adapt, redirect effort, retool and assume new responsibilities as the department, college and university develops new initiatives, program goals and priorities.

Professional Role and Ethics. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance.

14. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Promotion

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.0). Evidence must be provided by the candidate in the dossier in support of progression toward goals and objectives. Specific area minimum requirements are outlined as follows:

Promotion to Associate Professor:

Candidates must have minimum overall ratings of **one exceeds expectations and two meets expectations** to be promoted to associate professor.

Teaching. Candidates for promotion must be rated a minimum of meets expectations in the area of instruction based on evidence provided in the dossier

Professional Growth & Achievement. Candidates for promotion must be rated a minimum of meets expectations based on evidence provided in the dossier.

Other Contributions to the University and Community. Candidates for promotion must earn a minimum rating of meets expectations in the area of other contributions.

Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance. Performance is based on the candidate's willingness and ability to complete teaching and service assignments that meet the strategic plans and goals of the department, college, and university. This includes willingness to adapt, redirect effort, retool and assume new responsibilities as the department, college and university develops new initiatives, program goals and priorities.

Professional Role and Ethics. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance.

Promotion to Professor:

Candidates must have minimum overall ratings of two exceeds expectations and one meets expectations to be recommended for promotion to full professor.

Teaching. Candidates for promotion to Professor must be rated a minimum of exceeds expectations in the area of instruction based on evidence provided in the dossier.

Professional Growth and Achievement. Candidates for promotion to Professor must be rated a minimum of meets expectations in the area of growth and achievement.

Other Contributions to the University and Community. Candidates for promotion to Professor must be rated a minimum of meets expectations in the area of other contributions.

Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College and University. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance. Performance is based on the candidate's willingness and ability to complete teaching and service assignments that meet the strategic plans and goals of the department, college and university. This includes willingness to adapt, redirect effort, retool and assume new responsibilities as the department, college and university develops new initiatives, program goals and priorities.

Professional Role and Ethics. Candidates do not receive a ranking in this area but are provided with an evaluative description of their performance.

15. Early Tenure/Accelerated Promotion

In order to receive a recommendation for early tenure and accelerated promotion to associate professor and accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must be

recognized by the department as exceptional. Early tenure and/or accelerated promotion can be granted a maximum of two years early, and no earlier than before a candidate has served four years in physical residence at CSU, Chico. The candidate must receive **3 ratings of exceeding expectations** to be considered for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion.

Exceptional is defined as consistently, during a time period of at least two reviews, working above one's rank in all of the areas under review. The exceptional candidate, who is eligible for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion to associate or full professor, is one who has achieved all of the expectations in each section and is consistently working beyond those expectations. Exceptional is defined as mastery and production of quality work in each section under review that reflects the abilities of a professor in the rank to which the candidate is applying.

For the area of teaching, the candidate has the distinction of being recognized as an example of teaching excellence and a teaching role model for peers in their discipline specialties. The candidate has exceeded expectations in teaching and has created innovative, model learning environments for their students. The candidate's teaching demonstrates the synergy of research, service and instruction.

If the candidate has formal academic advising duties, that effort is recognized in the teaching section of the review. For the purposes of early tenure and/or accelerated promotion, academic advising is evaluated by the candidate's ability to provide comprehensive and accurate advising for general education as well as the major, and possible minors and certificates.

For the area of professional growth and development, the candidate for early tenure and/or accelerated promotion has gone beyond completing the required number of activities and has committed to an inter-related set of professional activities that strategically contribute to their position as an expert in their field while enhancing their knowledge base and teaching as well as demonstrating a clear trajectory for future contributions to the department and the field. Among the activities completed by the candidate there must be evidence of contribution to the profession at the national level. The value of the candidate's growth and development activities is directly related to the candidate's role in the department and how those activities translate into the candidate's overall professional growth.

For the area of other contributions, the candidate has amassed a set of contributions at the department, college, university and community level beyond that expected of a professor at their current rank. They have a solid, extensive and sustained commitment toward department governance. They have actively contributed as a member and as a leader to the completion of vital department work such as curriculum development, coordination of an option or certificate, supervising a student organization, recruitment of new majors, assessment of learning and hiring of new faculty. At the college and university levels the candidate has played a significant role on committees that produce products and services related to effective functioning of the campus and service to our

students. At the community level the candidate has selected work that enhances the strategic goals of the university.

16. Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Tenured Professors

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.0). Tenured professors will submit a dossier with evidence of their teaching, professional growth and achievement and service at 5 year intervals. The dossier will include updated reflections on teaching philosophy and professional growth and achievement, as well as all of the other materials required in the dossier as listed earlier in this document. At least one classroom visitation will be conducted. Tenured professors will participate in the SFOT process at the same level as other faculty.

17. Periodic Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Lecturers

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (8.2). Lecturers who do not submit a dossier will not be retained. All lecturers neither eligible for or currently holding a three year appointment will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews.

All lecturers eligible for an initial three-year appointment shall undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the AY preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment.

All lecturers holding three-year appointment shall undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the third year of their appointment.

Instruction/Teaching Effectiveness. All lecturers are required to engage in, and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness as earlier described in this document (#6, Evaluation Criteria for Teaching).

In addition, evidence of attendance in seminars, workshops, conferences and other events focused on developing pedagogy are required (e.g., Faculty Development conferences and/or workshops, trainings by Technology & Learning Program, etc.).

Engagement in Professional Activity and Maintenance of Currency in the Field. All lecturers are required to submit a narrative and supporting documentation of their professional activity appropriate to each of their teaching assignments and their efforts to maintain currency which the department. The committee will evaluate currency based on following criteria:

- Employment in a setting relevant to each teaching assignment or provide a service in the community relevant to each teaching assignment. Such employment or service shall not include teaching similar courses in other departments or at other institutions.
- Belong to a minimum of one professional health organization relative to their teaching assignments.
- Attend a minimum of one relevant professional meeting, conference, workshop, or training, every year relevant to teaching assignments

- Attend a minimum of one state or national health professional meeting, conference, or convention every two years.
- Maintain professional credentials (CHES, FACHE, MCHES, etc.) or complete the equivalent continuing educational hours required for credentials.

Evidence toward this criteria may also be used for determining assignments.

Lecturers desiring to expand their teaching load to include a new course must be employed in a setting relevant to the new teaching assignment.

Other Assigned Responsibilities.

- Adhere to the curriculum set by the department.
- Cooperate with coordinators of multi-section general education and service courses in which they teach.
- Prepare effective course syllabi and classroom materials.
- Be accessible via email to colleagues and students.

18. Evaluation criteria for lecturers who have applied for an range elevation

Those wishing to apply for a range elevation should carefully review CBA Article 12 and FPPP 8.3.

APPENDIX A: Strategic Priorities of the University and the PHHA Mission Statement

California State University, [Chico Strategic Priorities](#):

- **Equity, Diversity & Inclusion**

Cultivate and nurture a welcoming and inclusive campus where students, faculty, and staff have an equitable opportunity to thrive.

- Recognize that historically underserved students have not had equal access or opportunity for educational success
- Maximize the recruitment, retention, support, and graduation of diverse students
- Eliminate achievement gaps by providing excellence in education and support to all students
- Promote hiring and retention that contributes to a diverse and inclusive community that reflects student demographics
- Develop and enhance policies, programs, and activities that support an inclusive, accessible, and equitable learning and working environment
- Honor the distinct values, beliefs, identities, and cultures of our students, faculty, staff, and community
- Address real-world issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion through interdisciplinary and international experiences
- Cultivate an environment that embraces diversity of thought, freedom of expression, and respect for others

- **Civic & Global Engagement**

Build stronger and more vibrant communities by connecting the University and community in mutually beneficial ways to effect meaningful change in the world around us.

- Emphasize University-community partnerships that are collaborative, participatory, empowering, systemic, and transformative
- Engage students, faculty, staff, and community members through experiential learning and internship opportunities with the communities of the North State and beyond
- Create an environment committed to the active pursuit of global engagement, service, social justice, and connectedness
- Instill a culture of philanthropy and social engagement
- Broaden opportunities for civic and global engagement in our academic programs

- **Resilient & Sustainable Systems**

Advance environmental, social, and economic sustainability; striving toward a just and resilient future.

- Work to be climate neutral by 2030

- Cultivate knowledge, research, and practice to increase awareness that our individual and collective actions have impact regionally, nationally, and globally
- Be wise stewards of resources and embrace sustainability and resilience as a way of living
- Integrate sustainability and resilience into curriculum, research, and campus operations to better serve students and meet the needs of society
- Recover and adapt to significant difficulties or challenges and recognize our responsibility to forge resiliency in the communities we serve

Public Health and Health Services Administration Mission Statement

To provide our students with a multi-disciplinary, competency and service based curriculum to work effectively in diverse communities, healthcare financing and delivery systems, and health organizations to meet emerging national and global health needs.

APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CBA – [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)

FPPP – [Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures](#)

PHHA – Public Health & Health Services Administration Department

SFOT - Student Feedback Evaluations on Teaching and Learning







Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

- a) Department votes, if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review and approval;
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean approved Word document to OAPL via email for review;
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the dean, then forwards OAPL approved document to Provost for approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns approved document to OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footnote to page 1 of the document:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Standard 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.

Approvals:

Chair/Director:	<u> <small>Stanley Salinas (Aug 31, 2022 13:40 PDT)</small></u>	Date:	<u>Aug 31, 2022</u>
Dean:	<u></u>	Date:	<u>Aug 31, 2022</u>
OAPL:	<u></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost:	<u></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 4, 2022</u>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 26, 2022

TO: Stan Salinas, Department Chair

CC: Eddie Vela, Dean

FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of PHHA Department RTP Standards

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

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 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:

- Lacks definition for meeting and exceeding expectations for instruction.
- No criteria for exceeds expectations for PGA or for Service.
- Section 9. Contributions to strategic plans belong with Service per FPPP.
- Section 13. Requires one exceeds expectations – out of compliance with FPPP
- Section 14. Ditto with Section 13.
- Section 15. Ditto with Section 13 comments.
- Some additional suggestions made for clarity and consistency to the FPPP.

Based on our review of recently submitted 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 Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 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.