POLICY 4

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A.   The Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (the Personnel Committee) of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be organized--in terms of function, structure, eligibility, and internal operation--in a manner consistent with procedures and policies delineated in relevant sections of the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document (FPPP) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

B.   In all areas of the personnel process, the retention, tenure, and promotion policies of the Department shall be consistent with relevant sections and/or subsections of the FPPP and CBA.

C.   Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning:

1. Student feedback on teaching and learning procedures in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP.
2. Student feedback on teaching and learning shall serve as one diagnostic device aimed at improvement of teaching effectiveness and as a means of evaluating the quality of teaching performance. Student feedback on teaching and learning data shall be used but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness.
3. Consistent with the CBA, written or electronic student feedback on teaching and learning shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes, including summer session classes, taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations as provided for in the FPPP and CBA. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.
4. Consistent with the CBA, student feedback on teaching and learning collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student feedback shall be a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).

D.   Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty:

1. Evaluation of lecturer faculty in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.
2. Lecturer faculty shall be evaluated with respect to their teaching and their duties as defined in their job description.
3. Student feedback on teaching and learning will be conducted for all lecturer faculty, and the reports of these evaluations will become part of the personnel action file of the faculty member.
4. Peer evaluations of lecturer faculty shall be sent to the College Dean, who shall establish a personnel action file for the faculty member involved. These files will be maintained by the College Office and are subject to the same rules and regulations governing personnel action files for tenure-line faculty. Appropriate support materials to be included in a personnel action file are outlined in the FPPP

E.   Performance Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion:

1.   Performance review for retention, tenure, and promotion, and promotion ranking in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.

2.   Timelines provided for assessing a candidate's instruction, professional development, and contributions to the university and community are general in nature. Due to the variety of disciplines and sub-disciplines in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice, departmental candidates may demonstrate whether they are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations in diverse ways, and the POLS Personnel Committee – with appropriate and documented justification – may diverge from timeline milestones when appropriate.

3.   Three areas of evaluation shall be considered for each candidate eligible for retention, tenure, or promotion: instruction; professional growth and achievement; and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community.

a.   <u>Instruction</u>. Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty. "Instruction" includes classroom and related instructional activities.

i.   Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall include the candidate's reflections and responses to peer observations of teaching and Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTS).

ii.   Peer observations completed by colleagues serve as evidence as part of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Classroom visits must be specific and appropriate to the mode of instruction and course classification. The faculty under review will receive written notice of a least five days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. This notice will be provided by the individual who will be completing their classroom visit after consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es). If there is no mutual agreement as to the class or time of the evaluation, the Personnel Committee Chair will schedule the time providing reasonable notice to the faulty member under review. The individual who visits the faculty member's class will assess, in writing, the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Classroom visits are conducted in a manner consistent with the FPPP and will take place at least once each RTP cycle.

iii.   The SFOTS are administered and archived as detailed in the FPPP. The Department will use the standardized University SFOT or may draw up its own course instruments and/or procedures subject to approval of the USFOT Committee. The SFOTS must be specific and appropriate to the mode of instructions (e.g., in person or online) and course classification (e.g., lecture, discussion, seminar, and supervision). Student feedback on

teaching and learning shall serve as one diagnostic device aimed at improvement of teaching effectiveness and as a means of evaluating the quality of teaching performance.

iv. The Personnel Committee uses student feedback on teaching and learning data but will not weigh them excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness. The candidate shall provide a summary of data from the SFOTs surveys that includes calculations of averages. See FPPP for details.

v. The candidate's narrative will include, but is not limited to, a reflection and analysis of the following:

a. **Area A: Required Evidence**
   1. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning
   2. Peer observations of classroom teaching.
   3. Course syllabi and materials (teaching portfolios, supervision of interns or independent study, syllabi and reading lists, examinations and class assignments, grading policy, plans, power points, etc.) to demonstrate faculty evidence of effective pedagogy, high expectations of students, and knowledge of the discipline.
   4. Evidence of curriculum development, including creating new courses or revisions, new course delivery modes, and updating of future iterations of syllabi and materials
   5. Evidence of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment.

b. **Area B: Additional Evidence**
   1. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness may include an assessment of student work;
   2. The candidate may provide evidence of assessment strategies for their courses and discuss their relation to departmental or program goals.
   3. Professional development related to student success, and teaching and learning, such as faculty learning communities (FLC's), and ally certifications.
   4. Academic peer review of course modules and structure;
   5. Alternative student evaluation to be used to demonstrate the candidate's response to midsemester feedback or alternative feedback:
   6. Mentoring of students in a teaching capacity;
   7. Engaging in HSI related priorities;
   8. Employing Accessible Technology Initiatives;
   9. Efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the candidate's courses; OR Efforts to increase student success, which may include

efforts to address equity gaps, DFW rates, achievement gaps, or other metrics of success.

10. The implementation of University or other pedological resources to improve access to diverse opportunities for learning.

11. The incorporation of culturally inclusive pedagogy, such as the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors.

12. The completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion.

13. Other materials that will demonstrate teaching effectiveness and development.

vi. The following timeline provides an overview of how a candidate can achieve a rating of "meets expectations." Candidates who fail to meet the benchmarks on the timeline are generally considered to be rated as "does not meet expectations." Candidates who are well ahead of pace (in comparison to the timeline), may be considered for the rating of "exceeds expectations."

Year	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2nd year Performance Review	Area A. The candidate will reflect on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and suggestions in previous RTP reports, and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. **Candidates will engage in one or more of the activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, from Area B.**	Area A. The candidate will reflect on strong scores and comments from previous SFOTs and also demonstrate how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will receive strong peer observations and address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and suggestions in previous RTP reports, and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. **Candidates will**

		demonstrate **effective implementation** in **one or more of the activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, from Area B.**
4th year Performance Review	Area A. The candidate will reflect on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. A candidate with low SFOTS will demonstrate improvement over time. If improvements have not been made, the candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve their SFOTs or discuss why improvement has not been obtained. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will demonstrate consistency. **Candidates will engage in one or more of the activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, from area B**. The candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students. .	Area A. The candidate will reflect on <u>strong</u> scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will receive strong peer observations and address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will demonstrate consistency. **Candidates will demonstrate <u>effective implementation</u> in one or more of the activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness, from area B**. The candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their

		teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students. .
6th year Performance Review	The candidate will reflect on scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. A candidate with low SFOTS will demonstrate improvement over time. If improvements have not been made, the candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve their SFOTs or discuss why improvement has not been obtained. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will demonstrate consistency. **Candidates will engage in three or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness in Category B.** The candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students.	The candidate will reflect on <u>strong</u> scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will receive strong peer observations and address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will demonstrate continued consistency. **Candidates will demonstrate <u>effective implementation</u> in two or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness in Category B.** The

		candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate	To qualify for accelerated tenure and promotion, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed within 6th year retention at an earlier phase of review AND Demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to the department's typical full-time assignment.	
Full Promotion	The candidate will reflect on scores and comments from SFOTs during the period under review, and demonstrate how they have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will address the suggestions from their peer observation(s) of teaching and employ those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. A candidate with lower SFOTS will demonstrate improvement over time. If improvements have not been made, the candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve their SFOTs or discuss why improvement has not been obtained. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will	The candidate will reflect on strong scores and comments from previous SFOTs and demonstrate how have responded to issues or trends that need improvement. The candidate will receive a strong peer observation and address the suggestions from their peer observations of teaching and employ

	demonstrate consistency. **Candidates will engage in three or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness in Category B.** The candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students.	those suggestions or address why they did not accept those suggestions. The candidate with higher initial SFOTS will demonstrate continued consistency. **Candidates will demonstrate <u>effective implementation</u> in two or more activities demonstrating teaching effectiveness in Category B.** The candidate will address and demonstrate the steps they have taken to improve the overall quality of their teaching since hiring. The candidate will discuss their role as faculty in their major(s) and how their overall teaching contributes to the department's programs, reflects their pedagogical interests, and serves our students.

Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor	To qualify for accelerated tenure to full professor, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed within full promotion at an earlier phase of review. AND Demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue. AND Clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.	
5-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty	No rating system	

b. <u>Professional Growth and Achievement</u>. The Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice strongly encourages candidates to highlight professional development activities which meet university strategic priorities, including professional development that serves the North State Service area and/or promotes equity, diversity, and inclusion. Professional development must be clearly connected to the candidate's scholarly agenda and their academic role at Chico State as a teacher, scholar, and community member. The Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice appreciates interdisciplinary scholarship and encourages candidates to pursue professional development activities and achievements which are intriguing to the candidate, make important contributions to a scholarly community, and are academically-relevant to the university and department.

Professional development categories are designed to encourage progress toward key deliverables and achievements necessary to earn promotion. Area A includes the highest standard of activities and achievements that demonstrate the candidate's professional development. Area B includes other important activities and achievements that contribute to a candidate's body of scholarly work. Area C includes activities and achievements that demonstrate the candidate's progression toward achievements in Areas A and B. Candidates should demonstrate, through the use of evidence and their narrative, how their professional development activities and achievements successfully meet the requirements established below in how they align with the candidate's professional trajectory at the time the dossier is submitted.

      i. **Professional Development Categories**
         a. <u>**Area A High Quality/Impact Activities**</u>
            1. Author or co-author of a published book in a peer-reviewed press

2. Author or co-author of a published article in a peer-reviewed journal or law review
3. Author or co-author of a published book chapter in a peer-reviewed press
4. Receipt of an award or fellowship from a prestigious, external source, such as Fulbright
5. This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments (i.e. receipt of a grant from a prestigious funding source such as NSF or NIH).

b. **Area B Other Professional Development Activities**
1. Edited or co-edited a book or special issue of a journal
2. Book review
3. Encyclopedia entries
4. Submission of or securing an external grant as PI or Co-PI
5. Continued administration of a grant or contract
6. Invited presentations at other academic or professional institutions (does not include guest lectures in classes)
7. Receipt of awards, fellowships, prizes
8. Contribution to reputable media sources related to the candidate's research, such as opinion editorials, podcast appearances, etc.
9. Providing expert testimony or other professional consultation that impacts policy
10. Significant creative activity that incorporates candidate's professionally related research and scholarship, such as blog posts, videos, or exhibitions
11. A community or government report or whitepaper
12. Extensive mentorship around research of undergraduate or graduate students
13. This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments

c. **Area C Research Development**
1. Evidence of submission of an authored or co-authored manuscript to a refereed journal, law review, or peer-reviewed book press
2. Presentation of original work at conferences
3. Data collection efforts
4. Receipt of internal professional development awards, including strategic funds
5. Other evidence of scholarship or work in progress

ii. The following timeline provides an overview of how a candidate can achieve a rating of "meets expectations" as well as "does not meet expectations" and "exceeds expectations" with respect to professional development.

Performance Review	Does not meet expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2nd Year Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).	Evidence of scholarly or creative activity in areas A, B, or C has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations (see Meets Expectations column)	Evidence of scholarly activity from Area B or C	More than one piece of scholarly activity from Area C AND One piece of scholarly activity from Area A or Area B
4th Year Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).	Candidate does not have work from Area A under review and lacks items from areas B or C. (see Meets Expectations column)	Evidence of submission of an authored or co-authored manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal, law review, peer-reviewed book chapter, or submission of a peer-reviewed book press AND Additional scholarly activity from Area B and/or C	Evidence of scholarly accomplishment from Area A AND Scholarly activity from Area B and/or C
6th Year Retention, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring	Candidate is missing required numbers of published work from areas A and B, as established in "Meets Expectations"	A primary author on a peer-reviewed book OR Two other pieces of evidence from Area A and two pieces from Area B and/or C.	A primary author on a peer-reviewed book and one other piece of evidence from Area A OR Three or more pieces of evidence from Area A OR

appointments will begin on the date of appointment).		AND The candidate demonstrates consistent activities reflecting their current and future research agenda.	Two pieces of scholarly activity from Area A and three pieces of scholarly activity from Area B. AND The candidate demonstrates consistent activities reflecting their current and future research agenda.
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate	To qualify for accelerated tenure and promotion, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed within 6th year retention at an earlier phase of review AND Demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to the department's typical tull-time assignment.		
Promotion to Full Professor Review (5 years during the Review Period)	Candidate is missing required numbers of scholarly accomplishment from area A since the last review, as established in "Meets Expectations"	Two pieces of evidence from Area A, since the last review	Three or more pieces of evidence from Area A, since the last review.
Accelerated Promotion to Full	To qualify for accelerated promotion to full, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed within Promotion to Full Professor Review, at an earlier phase of review. AND		

| | Demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue

AND

Clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. |
|---|---|

c.   Service: The third area of evaluation is Service that contributes to shared governance, to the strategic plans, priorities, and goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community. Much of the service in Areas A and B addresses strategic goals and priorities at the Department, College, and University levels. In their service narrative, candidates should identify how their service speaks to the strategic priories and goals.
.

i. Service Categories
   a. **Area A High and/or Consistent Level of Involvement on Significant Committees and/or within the Profession/Community**

   A key role is defined as: Leadership and/or significant contribution to a committee and/or service role.

   The candidate will address in their service narrative how they contributed to a leadership role or in what other significant capacity they served. In addition, the candidate will address the significance of the committees in their narrative where applicable.

   Involvement within the Profession/Community: The Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice values service contributions to the profession/community at any level - local, state, national, and/or international.

   Examples include but are not limited to:
   1. Serving as a committee chair
   2. Serving on a sub-committee which involves substantial contributions
   3. Serving as a graduate thesis/professional paper chair
   4. Serving as a program and/or internship coordinator
   5. Graduate thesis/professional paper advising
   6. Participation in the organization of campus events
   7. Advising student organizations

8. Serving on Academic Senate
9. General Education Pathway Coordinator
10. Evidence of community-engaged research
11. Evidence of significant community involvement relevant to research, teaching, and/or university mission/strategic plan
12. Evidence of service that demonstrates innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, civic engagement, and service to the North State (per FPPP)
13. Evidence of significant service to the discipline, external to the university (e.g., conference chair, section chair, editorial board membership)
14. Presentation at campus wide conferences and workshops
15. This is not an exhaustive list of significant service; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other activities

b. **Area B Other Service Contributions** The candidate will address in their service narrative how they contributed to the committee or event and in what capacity they served. Candidates should reflect on how the service has contributed to the campus community and on their own professional development.

1. Actively serving on a department/college/university committee (including regular attendance at meetings and participation in completion of committee work).
2. Participation in Town Hall Meeting as consultant and/or attendee at least once per Academic Year
3. Attendance at POLS Student Research Symposium or the BSS Student Research Symposium at least once per Academic Year
4. Attendance at POLS Constitution Day speaker event
5. Participation in department recruitment events, such as Wildcat Welcome or Choose Chico, at least once per Academic Year
6. Attendance at campus wide conferences and workshops
7. Attendance at BSS Faculty Colloquium
8. Attendance at College Student Recognition ceremonies at least one per Academic Year
9. Attendance/Participation at BSS Commencement or Graduate Commencement
10. Attendance at POLS student group events, such as CLIC event, Model UN dinner, Pi Sigma Alpha or CJSA speaker event, etc. at least once per Academic Year
11. Moot court participation
12. Other department, college, university, or relevant community events

13. Other service to the profession/community
14. This is not an exhaustive list of significant service; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other activities

ii. The following timeline provides an overview of how a candidate can achieve a rating of "meets expectations" as well as "does not meet expectations" and "exceeds expectations" with respect to service

Performance Review	Does not meet expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
2nd Year Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).	Evidence of service activity has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations (see Meets Expectations column)	Evidence of department committee work AND Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B	Evidence of *any* service activity from Area A AND Evidence of department committee work AND Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B
4th Year Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will	Evidence of service activity has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations (see Meets Expectations column)	Evidence of *any* service activity from Area A AND Evidence of department committee work AND	Evidence of *high level* service activity from Area A AND Evidence of department committee work AND

begin on the date of appointment).		Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B	Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B
6ᵗʰ Year Retention, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Review For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin on May 31 in the academic year preceding the appointment (spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment).	Evidence of service activity has not demonstrated a level of performance that meets expectations (see Meets Expectations column)	Evidence of *consistent* service activity from Area A AND Evidence of department committee work AND Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B	Evidence of *high level and consistent* service activity from Area A AND Evidence of department committee work AND Evidence of service to the profession and/or community AND Evidence of other service activity from Area B
Accelerated Tenure and Promotion to Associate	To qualify for accelerated tenure and promotion, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" in all categories of evaluation listed within 6th year retention at an earlier phase of review AND Demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue. AND Have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to the department's typical tull-time assignment.		

Promotion to Full Professor Review (5 years during the Review Period)	Candidate is missing accomplishment from area A since the last review, as established in "Meets Expectations"	Evidence of *consistent* service activity from Area A since the last review	Evidence of *high level and consistent* service activity from Area A since the last review
Accelerated Promotion to Full	To qualify for accelerated promotion to full, a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceeds expectations" listed within Promotion to Full Professor Review, at an earlier phase of review. AND Demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue AND Clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.		

4. The Department Chair and the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee will inform new faculty members of the need to maintain a dossier and the types of materials to be included in it. The Department Chair will also provide a new member of the faculty with a copy of the Department's RTP Policy.

5. Data gathering on candidates for retention, tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA.

6. General procedures for evaluation and performance review in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP and CBA. In each area of evaluation (i.e. instruction; professional growth and achievement; and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community), the ratings of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations will be assigned in a manner consistent with the FPPP.

7. Specific Evaluation and Review Procedures. Specific evaluation and review procedures of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP. The timeline for promotion from assistant to associate professor and associate to full professor is described in the CBA

8. Policies Relating Specifically to Retention, Tenure, and Promotion: The policies relating specifically to retention, tenure, and promotion of the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice shall be consistent with the FPPP.

9. Expectations for Tenure And Promotion:

   a. Please see Department standards and timelines above.
   b. In consideration of tenure or promotion, the period of review shall be the entire probationary period (including years of prior service credit, if any). Consideration shall be given to the development and continuity of the candidate's total performance during the review period. Where prior credits have been granted, these credits plus performance rendered since being appointed to the faculty at California State University, Chico shall, together, constitute the data base for the review.
   c. As tenure normally involves a long-term commitment by the University to the faculty member, tenure review shall be particularly rigorous in each of the evaluation areas.
   d. The normal pattern shall be consideration for tenure in the sixth consecutive year of full-time probationary employment, including service credited toward tenure from employment at another post- secondary educational institution in accordance with conditions stipulated in writing at the time of probationary employment.
   e. Evidence of performance while at California State University, Chico, shall be the primary consideration in all tenure decisions.
   f. In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual normally shall possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneously with promotion.

10. Expectations for Accelerated Tenure or Promotion: Tenure or promotion may be conferred earlier than the normal sixth year of employment.
    a. Please see section "E. Performance Review for Retention, Tenure and Promotion" above.
    b. Consideration of tenure or promotion before the beginning of the sixth consecutive fulltime probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of "accelerated tenure or promotion." A decision on tenure before the sixth year is necessarily based on less evidence of performance within rank than tenure granted on a normal timeline. For this reason, decisions for accelerated tenure will require that faculty meet a higher standard than they would for tenure granted on a normal timeline. This higher standard is the definition of an "exceptional record" for accelerated tenure or promotion.
    c. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion to associate, the candidate must (1) be rated as exceeds expectation in all three categories of evaluation; *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.
    d. To qualify for accelerated promotion to full, the candidate must (1) be rated as exceeds expectation in all three categories of evaluation; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue; and (3) clearly

demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.

    e. Any faculty member wishing to apply for accelerated tenure or promotion must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. In the request, the candidate should offer a brief description of how they meet the criteria for eligibility for accelerated tenure or promotion. This request shall be included in the candidate's Personnel Action File and in the candidate's Dossier prior to closure of each.

    f. As outlined in the FPPP, the faculty member under review has the right to submit a response or rebuttal at every level of review.

    g. Prior to the forwarding of a candidate's file to the President, the candidate may withdraw their application for accelerated tenure or promotion without prejudice. All relevant personnel reports (Department/Unit, Chair, College Dean, Provost) from that cycle will be expunged from the candidate's records (WPAF and PAF).

    h. A tenured faculty member wishing to apply for accelerated promotion to full professor must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. In the request, the candidate shall offer a brief description of how they meet the criteria for eligibility for accelerated promotion. This request shall be included in the candidate's Personnel Action File and in the candidate's Dossier prior to closure of each.

    i. Prior to the final decision, the candidate may withdraw their application for promotion without prejudice. All relevant personnel reports (Department/Unit, Chair, College Dean, and Provost) from that cycle will be expunged from the candidate's records (WPAF and PAF).

11. Definitions of Ratings:

    a. In each written performance review report, the reviews of instruction, professional growth and achievement, and service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and university as well as the community will include a summary rating. The use of hyphenated ratings is not permissible.

        i. <u>Exceed Expectations</u>: 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 (See Department standards and timelines above.)

        ii. <u>Meets Expectations:</u> 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.) (See Department standards and timelines above.)

    iii. <u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> 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. (See Department standards and timelines above.)

12. Equivalency: Normally, tenure will not be granted without possession of the Ph.D. degree or terminal degree relevant to the faculty member's academic field (i.e. Juris Doctorate degree).

F. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty:

1. Evaluation of tenured faculty in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice will occur every five years and will follow procedures consistent with the FPPP. Specific criteria to be considered shall include:

    a. Teaching, which shall be evaluated in the same way it is evaluated in other performance reviews.
    b. Currency in the field or fields of the faculty member, which shall be evaluated as follows: The writing of a self-assessment indicating areas of instruction and research interests and indicating how currency is being maintained. Indicators might include, but not necessarily be limited to, publications, grants, conferences attended, participation in faculty development programs, advanced work completed, and other relevant work activities.

2. The subcommittee shall meet with the faculty member to review the self-assessment and other items that have been presented to the subcommittee and to raise any concerns the subcommittee or chair might have. The Department Chair will participate as a member of the subcommittee.
3. The subcommittee shall submit a written evaluation for consideration to the full Personnel Committee.
4. The Department Chair and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation.
5. The Department Personnel Committee shall submit the evaluation to the College Dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel action file.

G. Criteria for Lecturer Range Elevation

1. 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.
2. The application for range elevation shall consist of a written letter or memorandum clearly stating the applicant's request, a complete up-to-date vita, and documentation of teaching excellence and currency in the field since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is more recent. Although not required, the documentation may include a description of other activities or accomplishments that contribute to the instructional mission of the University.
3. 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.
4. Teaching excellence: Teaching excellence is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for the range elevation of lecturers in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice.

   a. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for range elevation.
   b. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the sources required for the Periodic Evaluation Process for Lecturers, e.g.: Course outlines and related guides; course content and types of evaluation of student work; peer classroom evaluations, Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT).
   c. In evaluating teaching excellence, the following shall be the main criteria:
       i. Knowledge of the academic field.
       ii. Classroom culture
       iii. Peer evaluations.
       iv. Student feedback on teaching and learning.
   d. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the lecturer's courses.

   5. Maintaining currency in the academic field is not a substitute for teaching excellence. A variety of means may be used to support currency in the field, including, but not limited to, continued education, research (broadly defined as related to the academic fields of the department, including applied research in education), scholarship, grants, conference attendance, participation in faculty development programs, and other relevant work and professional activities. Expectations for activities supporting currency shall be consistent with the candidate's range classification and responsibilities. Evaluations of lecturer faculty may also include evaluation of any other activities or achievements related to the individual's work assignment(s) that contribute to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College and University as well as the Community. Such activities or achievements may include, but are not limited to, innovations in diversity, sustainability, service learning, and civic engagement, and service to the North State.

California State University **Chico**
Academic Personnel

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: *Jennifer Wilking*   Date: May 20, 2023

Dean Review: *Eddie Vela*   Date: May 20, 2023

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

Provost Approval: _____   Date: May 25, 2023