

# California State University, Chico Department of Sociology RTP Standards

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

---

Glossary of Abbreviations Used In This Document.....	2
1 Introduction .....	3
2 Purposes.....	3
3 Personnel Committee Membership.....	3
4 Personnel Committee Procedures .....	4
5 The Review Process.....	5
6 Dossier and The Working Personnel Action File .....	6
7 Peer Evaluations.....	6
8 Criteria and Guidelines for Review: Tenure-Track Faculty.....	7
8.1 Instruction.....	8
Meets Expectations.....	8
Exceeds Expectations .....	9
8.2 Professional Growth and Achievement .....	11
Meets Expectations.....	11
Exceeds Expectations .....	13
8.3 Service to the Department, College, University & Community .....	13
Meets Expectations.....	14
Exceeds Expectations .....	15
9 Retention .....	15
10 Tenure .....	15
11 Promotion .....	16
11.1 Associate Professor .....	16
11.2 Full Professor .....	16
12 Accelerated Tenure and Promotion.....	16
13 Evaluation Criteria & Procedures for Tenured Professors and FERP Faculty .....	17
14 Procedures for Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturer Reviews .....	18
15 Criteria for Review of Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturers .....	18
16 Range Elevation For Lecturers .....	20

## GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

---

**BIPOC:** Black, Indigenous, and People of Color

**BSS:** The College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, in which the Sociology Department is housed.

**CBA:** Collective Bargaining Agreement

**FDEV:** Faculty Development. This is an office on campus that provides programming to help faculty improve their teaching. They also sometimes offer programming to help with the area of professional achievement.

**FERP:** Faculty Early Retirement Program. This program allows faculty to retire but continue to work part-time for the University.

**FPPP:** Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures. This is an official document developed and updated annually by the University.

**MOI:** Mode of Instruction. There are many modes of instruction, but may include in-person, ChicoFlex, synchronous online, and asynchronous online.

**PAF:** Personnel Action File. This file of official documents is kept and maintained by the Dean's Office.

**QLT:** Quality Learning & Teaching. This is a detailed rubric for encouraging faculty to reflect upon and evaluate their own courses.

**SFOTs:** Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning

**TLP:** Technology and Learning Program

**WPAF:** Working Personnel Action File. This file is often referred to as the "dossier" or "binder," and is the one that you will add your narrative and supporting materials to. It should include some of the same documents (such as SFOTs and Peer Evaluations of Teaching) as the PAF, but goes beyond those in the PAF. Committees at all levels of review will primarily work from your WPAF.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

The Sociology Department Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Standards document has been developed in accordance with the University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures ([FPPP](#)) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding ([CBA](#)). It outlines standards, policies, and procedures that take into consideration the unique qualities and needs of the Sociology Department with its dual programs: the on-campus program and the Distance Education program. In this context, the Sociology Department will hereafter employ the following disciplinary-specific criteria, guidelines, and procedures in its decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion. These decisions will be made by the Personnel Committee.

## 2 PURPOSES

---

The purposes of the Sociology Department's Faculty RTP Standards are to delineate policies, procedures, and expectations related to the:

- Retention, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty
- Evaluation of part-time and full-time lecturers
- Fifth year evaluations of tenured faculty
- Range elevation for part-time and full-time lecturers

## 3 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

---

At least three members of the Sociology Department Personnel Committee shall be elected by all faculty in the department, including lecturers, tenure-track and tenured faculty. Lecturers get a vote proportional to the amount of assigned time they have in the department in the particular semester of the vote, as outlined in the [Sociology Department Constitution](#). Final tallies will be rounded to the nearest whole number to protect lecturers' anonymity in voting.

- a. Committee members must be tenured.
- b. No department member may serve on the Personnel Committee if their case for promotion will be reviewed that year by the Committee or if they are serving in the RTP process at another level. An exception to this may be made for faculty undergoing fifth-year reviews. They may serve on the Committee, but take a temporary leave from Committee business during their own review process.
- c. As stipulated by the [Sociology Department Constitution](#), faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the Department Personnel Committee. A FERP faculty member may only serve if they are employed during the entire portion of the review cycle for which that Committee is responsible, and the Dean approves.

- d. The Committee may be augmented with faculty from other departments in closely related disciplines when necessary.
- e. In promotion considerations, Personnel Committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion.
- f. The sociology faculty will elect the Personnel Committee Chair, who must hold the rank of Full Professor.
- g. The Chair of the Committee is responsible for:
  - Assigning classroom visitations for all probationary faculty and faculty under review
  - Running the Personnel Committee meetings
  - Assuring that the proper documents are filled out for each review, and that they are turned in according to the required procedures and timelines

## 4 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

---

- a. The Personnel Committee shall elect its secretary each year from the membership of the Committee.
  - All Personnel Committee meetings shall be in executive session.
  - Confidentiality is a prerequisite for effective personnel procedure.
  - Any unauthorized discussion of personnel matters (exclusive of policy and procedures) with nonmembers of the Personnel Committee is considered a breach of confidentiality. Any breach of confidentiality will be considered as a violation of professional ethics. In particular, RECOMMENDATIONS from any faculty review process, including PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, PERIODIC EVALUATIONS, AND POST-TENURE REVIEWS shall be confidential.
  - Only the affected faculty member, appropriate administrators, the Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Success, the Committee members, and appropriate staff shall have access to written recommendations.
  - Candidates may choose to share their reports or the recommendations with faculty mentors and other appropriate people on campus for help in meeting the recommendations or preparing future dossiers.
- b. Minutes must be taken at all Committee meetings.
  - Minutes shall include: time, place, and date of meeting; members present and absent; and action taken.
  - For candidate interviews, detailed notes must be taken of the candidate's responses. No discussion of deliberations should be recorded in these minutes.
  - Written minutes of the interviews for faculty under review must be given to the College office to be placed in their PAF.
- c. Tenure-track and tenured faculty will be interviewed by the Personnel Committee prior to their final deliberation on personnel recommendations.

- d. Reports and recommendations must be submitted to faculty under review only in written form.
- e. Committee members who generally agree with the evaluations or recommendations, but who wish to submit an additional or alternative analysis and/or interpretation, may submit a concurring report.
- f. Abstentions and minority votes will be submitted in writing.
- g. A quorum consisting of a majority of the Committee, or a minimum of 3 members, whichever is greater, must be present to conduct business.
- h. No proxies are permitted.

## 5 THE REVIEW PROCESS

---

To assist in the progression towards retention, tenure, or promotion, the Committee will provide to the candidate developmental feedback in accordance with the FPPP ([8.0.1](#)).

Tenure-track probationary faculty are subject to two different types of performance evaluations.

- a. The first, called PERIODIC EVALUATION, focuses on providing the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of improving and/or maintaining performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by both candidates and the Committee. Normally, periodic evaluations are done in the faculty member's first, third, and fifth years. Faculty who are hired with years of service credit may have a different cycle. The Dean's Office will inform such candidates of where they are in their review cycle.
- b. The second type of performance evaluation is called the PERFORMANCE REVIEW, wherein an evaluative 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 determined, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member. Normally, performance reviews are conducted in the faculty member's second, fourth, and sixth years. Faculty who are hired with years of service credit may have a different cycle. The Dean's Office will inform such candidates of where they are in their review cycle.
- c. It is normally during the sixth-year performance evaluation that the decision is made to offer tenure or release the faculty member from employment in accordance with the FPPP ([10.0](#)).
- d. At each review (of both types), 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 from the previous review. Lack of attending to the feedback may be reason to lower a candidate's rating from the previous review cycle in a specific area.

- e. Lecturers will undergo review in accordance with the FPPP (9.0), and the criteria used in their evaluations are addressed separately in section 14, below.

## 6 DOSSIER AND THE WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE

---

The candidate is to submit a dossier to provide evaluators with the information and materials needed to accurately judge the candidate's performance in the areas listed below. The department will help guide the candidate in making certain that the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) accurately reflects the full performance record. However, ultimately, it is the candidate's responsibility to see that all materials favorable to retention, tenure, and/or promotion are included in the WPAF.

- a. All candidates should refer to the relevant sections of the FPPP ([sections 8, 10, and 11](#) for tenured and tenure-track faculty, and sections 8, 9, and 12, as appropriate, for lecturers), as well as the guidelines and templates from the Dean's Office, to ensure that all required documents are submitted.
- b. For tenure-track candidates, this includes a copy of the applicable Department Personnel Standards, a current curriculum vitae, and the following sections of the dossier: Narrative, Data and Interpretation, and an Index of any supplemental support material.
- c. The narrative should provide a context for the reviewers to understand and evaluate the activities and achievements contained in the dossier. The candidate should use the narrative to highlight the scope and quality of their performance in all the areas to be evaluated, making the case that the performance under review has met or exceeded expectations as stated in the Department Standards described below, as well as in relevant sections of the FPPP.
- d. When compiling materials in the dossier, the candidate should keep in mind that the quality of activities is more important than the quantity. Therefore, the materials included should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments. This should include the area of service, where qualitative information should be given about the service performed, not just a listing of committees.
- e. Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate how their work in the areas under review support the [University's Enduring Commitments and Strategic Priorities](#).

## 7 PEER EVALUATIONS

---

Peer Evaluations of teaching will be conducted and evaluated for tenure-track and tenured faculty, and lecturers.

- a. It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and the Personnel Committee Chair to ensure that courses are evaluated when they should be, which is at least once per year for tenure-track faculty.

- b. Courses to be observed will be determined by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Personnel Committee, but a range of courses in the candidate's regular rotation should be evaluated over time. Additionally, over time, class observations should cover the range of modes of instruction (MOIs) that a candidate normally teaches or will likely continue to teach, and this should be a factor in determining which courses to observe.
- c. In accordance with article [15.14](#) of the CBA, the individual being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class.
- d. The observing faculty member will write a report using the evaluation criteria in the Peer Evaluation Form provided by the Personnel Committee Chair. The report must be discussed with and signed by the candidate prior to its entry into the WPAF.
- e. The candidate may also request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on their instructional effectiveness. A candidate-initiated visit is optional and outside the required peer evaluation.
- f. In accordance with the [FPPP 8.1.4.f](#), the evaluation of online classes should take place with the candidate present to give a narrative of online material. The scope of such evaluations shall be reasonably equivalent to the scope of one classroom visit. In certain circumstances, when suggested by the person being evaluated and agreed to by the evaluator, limited instructor-granted course access can be given at the discretion of the person being evaluated. In order to assess the effectiveness of instruction in online courses, additional and/or substitute methods of data gathering likely will be necessary. For example, while some online courses include real-time instruction by the faculty member—allowing for the equivalent of a classroom visitation—other courses might consist of asynchronous content exclusively. The candidate, with the department's assistance, is to provide a sufficient evidentiary basis for evaluation.

## 8 CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

---

Candidates will be evaluated in the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service. During Performance Reviews, they will be given a rating by the Committee of EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS, MEETS EXPECTATIONS, or DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS. MEETS EXPECTATIONS shows strong performance by the candidate, and should be interpreted as such by the candidate and everyone involved in the process. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS means that the candidate has risen to a level of *exceptional* performance. Candidates in their first years toward tenure are not expected to meet all of the criteria listed in each category. Rather, they will be judged on whether, given their current performance, they are on track to reasonably meet those criteria by the time they go up for tenure. Thus, an achievement in one's first or second year may be the basis for a rating of "EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS," but the same achievement two or three



years later, without additional achievements having been added, may result in a lower ranking than in the earlier review.

## 8.1 INSTRUCTION

Evaluation of the area of instruction must be based on both qualitative and quantitative evidence. In order to not have an over-emphasis on SFOTs, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide meaningful evidence, beyond just SFOTs, that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance.

### 8.1.1 Bare Minimum Requirements

All faculty are required to meet at a bare minimum the following standards for instruction:

- An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and one's professional role in and out of the classroom
- Competence in the subject matter
- Respectful, effective and professionally appropriate interaction with students in and out of class
- Use of suitable course content, materials, assessments, and technology
- Reasonable level of rigor for the class level in course content, process, and evaluation
- An understanding of the diverse needs of our students, and treating them in fair, balanced, and equitable ways. A pattern over time of substantiated claims from students of racism, sexism, homophobia, or ableism, or disparaging remarks about marginalized communities, whether in the classroom or in evaluation of students' work, would indicate that this minimum standard is not met.

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, or Department Chair, may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

### 8.1.2 Ratings

#### MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Additionally, candidates who MEET EXPECTATIONS should show:

- Their peers who observe them consistently rate them as meeting department standards in teaching, allowing for improvement over time. Peer reviewers will give the class/module observed a rating from 0-10. As it will state on the peer observation template, the following scale will be used:
  - 0-3 does not meet standards
  - 4-6 meets standards

- 7-10 exceeds standards
- Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching
- Average student ratings over time of 4.0 and above, supported by the qualitative student feedback on SFOTs. In the College of BSS, all faculty up for review are asked to provide a summary table of their SFOTs as part of their dossier submission. In circumstances of personal tragedy or other exceptional and extenuating circumstances, a faculty member may request to exclude one entire semester's SFOTs (individual classes may not be cherry-picked) from the mathematical calculation of average student ratings. It is up to the Committee to decide if the request is approved. In the case where a faculty member has received approval to exclude a particular semester from the SFOTs in the mathematical calculation, they should still report them in the summary table, for reviewers at all levels to see. The fact that they have been excluded from the mathematical calculation should be acknowledged in both the faculty-written dossier and in the Department Personnel Committee's report.
- Improvement in student evaluations over time (when reasonably possible), especially after the first semester teaching a new course, or after teaching it in a new mode of instruction.

AND have done at least ONE of the following:

- Attended at least an average of 5 hours per year (or a total of 10 hours over a 2-year review period) of trainings, workshops, TLP consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes
- Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students
- Used a widely diverse set of course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors or perspectives, and incorporated culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, and/or created class assignments and activities that implement equitable and [authentic assessment](#)
- Participated in a semester- or year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or participated in an intensive summer learning program
- Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion

### EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

Candidates who EXCEED EXPECTATIONS will have demonstrated:

- Their peers who observe them consistently rate them as exceeding standards in teaching, allowing for improvement over time. Peer reviewers will give the class/module

observed a rating from 0-10. As it will state on the peer observation template, the following scale will be used:

- 0-3 does not meet standards
- 4-6 meets standards
- 7-10 exceeds standards
- Average student ratings over time of 4.25 and above, supported by the qualitative student feedback on SFOTs. A case for EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in instruction may also be made when the average of the quantitative evaluations does not calculate to 4.25, but major improvements and progress toward that goal have been demonstrated. The same rules and procedures apply for excluding one semester's SFOTs as discussed above under the heading MEETS EXPECTATIONS.
- Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching
- Improvement in student evaluations over time (when reasonably possible), especially after the first semester teaching a new course or after teaching it in a new mode of instruction

AND have done a minimum of THREE of the following:

- Advised or supervised honors theses, student research projects, or independent study; or served as faculty mentor for public (non-class) student presentations on campus or in the CSU, such as at the BSS Student Research Symposium, CSU Student Research Competition, a poster session at the BSS Research Colloquium, etc.
- Served as faculty mentor for students to present work at a regional or national academic conference
- Attended at least an average of 5 hours per year (or a total of 10 hours over a 2-year review period) of trainings, workshops, TLP consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes
- Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students
- Used a widely diverse set of course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors or perspectives, incorporated culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, and/or created class assignments and activities that implement equitable and [authentic assessment](#)
- Participated in a semester- or year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or participated in an intensive summer learning program
- Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion
- Served in an official role for other faculty as a trainer, facilitator, mentor, or evaluator in teaching. This includes being the mentor in a Faculty Learning Community, training other faculty in TLP-sponsored programs such as Go Virtual and Hyflex training, serving

as a QLT mentor, serving as a fellow or evaluator for a teaching-related program through FDEV, or being assigned an official mentoring role within the Department or College

- Served as a student mentor for the Teaching Apprenticeship, following the guidelines outlined in the Apprenticeship syllabus and contract
- Included students in the faculty's own research process
- Chaired or served on a master's committee (thesis, project, or exam) for another department or program

## 8.2 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

In order to achieve tenure, the candidate must fulfill the following expectations in the area of Professional Growth and Achievement:

### 8.2.1 Bare Minimum Requirements

All faculty are required to meet at a *bare minimum* the following standards for research and professional growth and achievement, consistent with the Faculty Code of Ethics ([FPPP, Appendix II](#))

- Intellectual honesty, including avoidance of plagiarism; falsifying data; taking credit for work that isn't their own or representing jointly-prepared work as their own; and exploiting work of colleagues for personal gain
- Acknowledgment of the use of Artificial Intelligence in the writing or preparing of research presentations or publications
- Ethical treatment of research participants, including receiving IRB approval for gathering data (when appropriate)
- Accurate representation of work on their CV and in the RTP dossier

Failure to reasonably meet these standards, when based on concrete evidence, may be sufficient for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS regardless of other criteria that may be met.

### 8.2.2 Ratings

#### MEETS EXPECTATIONS

SECTION A: The candidate **MUST** meet at least ONE of the following:

- Authored or coauthored a published book in areas of their expertise or teaching (in a non-vanity press)
- Authored or coauthored two published articles of sociology in peer-reviewed journals or book chapters in areas of their expertise or teaching (in a non-vanity press)

- Secured an external grant of at least \$10,000, and authored or coauthored an article in a peer-reviewed journal or a book chapter in areas of their expertise or teaching (in a non-vanity press)

SECTION B: In addition to Section A, the candidate must earn a minimum of TEN additional points by the time they go up for tenure to in order to get a rating of MEETS EXPECTATIONS:

*ONE Point:*

- Presented at a regional, national, or international conference (At least 60% of a presentation needs to be different from their other presentations in order to earn a separate point.)
- Presented at a poster session at a regional, national, or international conference
- Submitted an article, book proposal, or chapter that is currently under review
- Authored a book review
- Authored a sociology-related article or op-ed in a newspaper or magazine
- Disseminated research results/new ideas in their areas of research or teaching via internet or other technology
- Reviewed an article or book for a publisher or journal
- Wrote an encyclopedia entry (for an encyclopedia relevant to sociology)
- Participated as an expert in a national audio/visual media program

*TWO Points:*

- Served as a member of a journal editorial board
- Wrote a research report
- Submitted an external grant that was unfunded
- Secured an internal grant of at least \$5000
- Served as guest editor of an issue of a journal
- Was paid for an off-campus event as an Invited Speaker on areas of their research expertise or teaching

*THREE Points:*

- Developed or produced a film or other non-print media that is peer-reviewed or nationally recognized

*FOUR Points:*

- Edited or co-edited a book
- Published an additional article (beyond that in Section A) in a peer-reviewed journal
- Published a chapter of a book in areas of their expertise or teaching (beyond that in Section A)
- Secured an external grant (beyond that which is in Section A) of at least \$10,000

*FIVE Points:*

- Authored or coauthored a book in areas of their expertise or teaching (beyond that which is in Section A)
- Served as the editor of a journal

In years leading up to tenure, the candidate will be evaluated on professional growth and achievement as **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** when:

- they demonstrate evidence of sufficient progress toward meeting Section A; and
- that, based on the evidence, the Committee reasonably expects they will have achieved the necessary 10 points from Section B by the time they go up for tenure.

### EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

In years leading up to tenure, the candidate will be evaluated as **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** when they demonstrate:

- evidence of significant progress toward meeting Section A; and
- that, based on the evidence, the Committee reasonably expects the candidate will have achieved at least 14 points or more from Section B by the time they go up for tenure

## 8.3 Service to the Department, College, University & Community

Service is meant to contribute to the Strategic Priorities and Enduring Commitments of the University at the levels of the department, college, university and/or community. Evaluation in the area of service is based not just on the number of activities or committees, but on the work involved with and the achievements of those committees in the particular years served. The candidate should provide descriptions and (when appropriate) evidence of committee/group workloads, leadership and other key roles in those, personal contributions to the committees/groups, and outcomes or achievements of the committees/groups.

### 8.3.1 Bare Minimum Requirements

All faculty are required to meet at a *bare minimum* the following standards for service:

- Regularly attend faculty meetings in their entirety
- Serve on and actively participate in departmental committees and the work of those committees (after the first year on the tenure track) commensurate with time in rank
- Participate in other mandatory department meetings/events
- Demonstrate a willingness to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues, including completing assignments in a timely fashion and responding to email
- Participate on active department committees (number of committees or intensity of committee workload should be commensurate with rank and time in rank)

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after feedback from peers, the Committee, Department Chair, or Dean may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

### 8.3.2 Ratings

#### MEETS EXPECTATIONS

To receive a rating of MEETS EXPECTATIONS, the candidate must further demonstrate active participation in faculty meetings and on department committees, which could include:

- Working on projects
- Developing or revising policies
- Writing or revising reports
- Staffing tables at various events such as Chico Preview Day or Choose Chico Day
- Other activities that demonstrate engagement and active participation

Beyond the department, the candidate must have also actively participated on College and/or University committees (number of committees or intensity of committee workload should be commensurate with rank and time in rank).

Furthermore, to receive a rating of MEETS EXPECTATIONS candidates must also be able to demonstrate regular participation in a minimum of THREE of the following activities:

- Served as Advisor to an active student group
- Served on a community board or organization in a way that utilizes their sociological skills and areas of expertise
- Participated in a committee, held an appointment or was an officer in a sociology-related organization
- Provided multiple guest lectures to classes, or on-campus presentations to student groups
- Provided multiple on-campus presentations or trainings to faculty or staff
- Provided expertise to organizations, agencies, or community groups
- Worked with students, staff and faculty to help others gain recognition for their exceptional work, achievements, honors, and contributions
- Provided extraordinary advising and mentoring activities not included under the area of Instruction
- Contributed to the Department or University beyond the classroom aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, or otherwise helping the Department, College or University to meet the needs of our underserved students
- Participated in other activities that the candidate can demonstrate provide a service to students, the Department, the College, the University, and/or the community

## EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

The candidate must be able to demonstrate service contributions that are substantially above that which is expected for the MEETS EXPECTATIONS rating. “Substantially above” will normally mean significantly engaging in SIX or more of the activities above, or an exceptionally heavy workload in a smaller number of those. It is up to the candidate to explain the scope and extent of the work done, and to make a case for why it went beyond meeting expectations.

## 9 RETENTION

---

Retention or non-retention of a probationary faculty member should be based on assessment of the candidate’s activities during the period under review.

- a. Persons in tenure-track positions must be making expected progress toward the achievement of tenure in order to merit retention as specified above. Expected progress in the area of professional development is defined as demonstrated manuscript development or ongoing data collection, and/or continued accumulation of points on the list provided in Section B of the Professional Growth and Achievement section of this document (8.2.2).
- b. Retention shall be reviewed as a *progression* over the six-year cycle towards achieving the instructional skills, professional growth and development, and participation in university service needed to achieve tenure.
- c. In order to be recommended for retention in years 2 and 4, faculty must be rated at least as MEETS EXPECTATIONS commensurate with their time in rank in all three areas; have been actively striving to meet the Committee’s recommendations in previous years; and have shown improvement as they progress toward tenure.
- d. If a candidate fails to meet the BARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS in any area, as laid out in this document, it is reason not to retain.

## 10 TENURE

---

For tenure, a candidate must, at a minimum, MEET EXPECTATIONS in all three areas.

- a. Time in rank, including credit for prior year(s) of service, should follow the guidelines of the University’s FPPP ([5.1](#)).
- b. A person may request in writing to be reviewed for accelerated (“early”) tenure before meeting the required years of service. A justification as a special case will then be considered by the Personnel Committee. Guidelines for accelerated tenure decisions are below.



# 11 PROMOTION

---

## 11.1 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In order to be promoted to Associate Professor, a candidate must, at a minimum, show clear evidence that they MEET EXPECTATIONS in all three areas.

Tenure usually, but not always, comes with the granting of a promotion. They are two separate votes at each level of review.

## 11.2 FULL PROFESSOR

- a. Faculty who have spent normal time in the rank of Associate Professor will make a choice whether they wish to be reviewed for promotion to Full Professor. If they choose not to go up for promotion, this choice must be conveyed, in writing, to the Dean's Office when they ask each year.
- b. If the BARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS laid out in sections 8.1.1, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1 in this document are not met for any area, the candidate will have DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS in that area, which will exclude the candidate from promotion to Full Professor.
- c. For promotion to Full Professor, Professional Achievement is expected to go beyond what the candidate brought with them from graduate school or their previous position. That is, they must show research activities that have gone beyond their dissertation work or research already under way or in process of being published when they were hired on the tenure track at Chico State. Those attaining the promotion to Full Professor are expected to have taken their research activities in new directions, or to have built upon their prior research in ways that demonstrate significant progress in their line of inquiry.
- d. For promotion to Full Professor, in the area of Service, the candidate must show that they have taken important leadership or other key roles in the department and beyond.
- e. Candidates who do not have normal time in rank may ask in writing to be considered for accelerated promotion. A justification as a special case will then be considered by the Personnel Committee.

# 12 ACCELERATED TENURE AND PROMOTION

---

According to the FPPP ([10.4.5](#)), probationary faculty can make a written request for consideration for accelerated ("early") tenure and/or promotion prior to meeting the required years of service. In addition, Associate Professors may also request consideration for accelerated ("early") promotion to Full Professor prior to meeting the required time in rank.

- a. The candidate must provide substantial evidence of being truly exceptional for promotion and for a special case for tenure.
- b. They must have achieved a rating of EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in all three areas of evaluation.

- c. In considering the uniqueness of a special case for accelerated tenure/promotion or promotion to Full Professor, the standard applied is at a much higher level than expectations for “on time” tenure and promotions. The greater the divergence from “normal time in service,” the more evidence is required to determine exceptional performance in all three areas of review.
- d. For accelerated tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must also demonstrate the likelihood their 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.
- e. For accelerated promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must also demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue and clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.

## 13 EVALUATION CRITERIA & PROCEDURES FOR TENURED PROFESSORS AND FERP FACULTY

---

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the FPPP (see [section 8](#)).

- a. Tenured professors will submit a dossier with evidence of their teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service at intervals no greater than five years.
- b. They must provide their curriculum vitae, SFOTs, and other supporting evidence in the three areas of review. A narrative or interpretation of the data is not required, but is optional for faculty who want to highlight recent achievements, and is encouraged for faculty who want to explain special circumstances.
- c. At least one classroom visitation should be conducted during the review period.
- d. Other responsibilities held by the faculty member that are identified in the [CBA](#) and deemed relevant to the position should also be evaluated.
- e. Evaluations of Full Professors and of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are not expected to be as comprehensive or rigorous as the evaluations normally conducted for faculty prior to promotion to Full Professor.
- f. Tenured and FERP faculty must participate in the SFOT process at the same level as other faculty.
- g. After assessing the data but prior to writing the report, the Committee shall interview candidates to clarify any unresolved questions. Minutes of the interview should be taken.
- h. The report from the Sociology Department shall be completed and forwarded to the Dean in accordance with the FPPP schedule.
  - a. The Personnel Committee Chair and the Dean will meet with the faculty under review to discuss the Committee’s report. The Dean has the option of writing a report.
  - b. Additional evaluations of tenured faculty can be initiated by the Dean per the [FPPP 11.3.1](#).

## 14 PROCEDURES FOR LECTURER REVIEWS

---

Evaluation procedures will follow those outlined in the [FPPP 9.0](#). The guidelines below are meant to augment those sections.

- a. Lecturers are required to submit a dossier that at minimum includes a reflective narrative on teaching, a current curriculum vitae, SFOTs, and Peer Evaluations.
- b. Lecturers will be notified by the Dean's Office and/or Personnel Chair if they will be having a review during a particular academic year, and of the due date for submission of their dossier.
- c. Lecturers who are neither eligible for nor currently holding a three-year appointment will undergo an annual review and classroom observation for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial, rather than annual, reviews ([FPPP 9.1.4.a](#)). The review shall consider the candidate's work performance since their initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent.
- d. Lecturers eligible for an initial three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire six or more years of consecutive service on the same campus that make up the qualifying period for the initial three-year appointment ([FPPP 9.1.4.b](#)).
- e. Lecturers holding three-year appointments who are eligible for subsequent reappointment shall be evaluated in the third year of their appointment, and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of either the employee or the Dean. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire preceding three-year period ([FPPP 9.1.4.d](#)).
- f. Reviews will normally not be conducted during a lecturer's first semester.
- g. All lecturers will participate in the normal SFOT process for all classes taught.

## 15 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF LECTURERS

---

Lecturers are required to provide evidence that they have performed SATISFACTORILY in the area of Instruction, including their SFOTs, peer classroom observations, and other materials according to the [FPPP](#) and guidelines from the Dean's Office.

### SATISFACTORY

All faculty are required to meet at a bare minimum the following standards.

- An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and one's professional role in and out of the classroom
- Competence in the subject matter

- Effective and professionally appropriate interaction with students in and out of class
- Use of suitable course content, materials, assessments, and technology
- Reasonable level of rigor in course content, process, and evaluation

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, or Department Chair may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of UNSATISFACTORY, regardless of other criteria that may be met.

Additionally, to receive a rating of SATISFACTORY, candidates should show:

- Their peers who observe them consistently rate them as meeting standards in their teaching, allowing for improvement over time. Peer reviewers will give the class/module observed a rating from 0-10. As it will state on the peer observation template, the following scale will be used:
  - 0-3 does not meet standards
  - 4-6 meets standards
  - 7-10 exceeds standards
- Average student ratings over time of 4.0 and above, supported by the qualitative student feedback on SFOTs. In the College of BSS, all faculty up for review are asked to provide a summary table of their SFOTs as part of their dossier submission. In circumstances of personal tragedy or other exceptional and extenuating circumstances, a faculty member may request to exclude one entire semester's SFOTs (individual classes may not be cherry-picked) from the mathematical calculation of average student ratings. It is up to the Committee to decide if the request is approved. In the case where a faculty member has received approval to exclude a particular semester from the SFOTs in the mathematical calculation, they should still report them in the summary table, for reviewers at all levels to see. The fact that they have been excluded from the mathematical calculation should be acknowledged in both the faculty-written dossier and in the Department Personnel Committee's report.
- Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching
- Improvement in student evaluations over time (when reasonably possible), especially after the first semester teaching a new course, or using a new mode of instruction

In accordance with [section 9.1.3.d](#) of the FPPP, lecturers may discuss research, publications, or service that are not part of their work assignment, but which result in positive contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, University and/or to the Community. While these activities are not required, evidence of these contributions may be acknowledged in the Department's evaluation, though such activities will not directly affect the evaluation of the lecturer's teaching.

## 16 RANGE ELEVATION FOR LECTURERS

---

When hired, lecturers are assigned to a range (A, B, or C) based on their qualifications, experience, and course assignments. Range elevation is a promotion from one salary range to the next (for example, from Lecturer A to Lecturer B). It is a significant promotion that comes with at least a 5% salary increase. Range elevation is considered comparable to moving from Assistant Professor to Associate, or from Associate to Full for those on the tenure track. Lecturers must apply for range elevation as a separate process than the RTP review process.

For eligibility and details, refer to the FPPP, [section 12](#). The Dean's Office will notify lecturers when they are eligible for range elevation.

The FPPP stipulates that candidates "must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is most recent. Professional growth and development is defined as 'teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field,'" and requires each department to clearly define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field.

To this end, we define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field as the following:

In addition to meeting the BARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS for instruction (defined above in this document), the candidate who demonstrates teaching excellence will show:

- Their peers who observe them consistently rate them as exceeding standards in the classroom observation, allowing for improvement over time. Peer reviewers will give the class/module observed a rating from 0-10. As it will state on the peer observation template, the following scale will be used:
  - 0-3 does not meet standards
  - 4-6 meets standards
  - 7-10 exceeds standards
- Average student ratings of 4.25 and above. In the College of BSS, all faculty up for review are asked to provide a summary table of their SFOTs as part of their dossier submission. In circumstances of personal tragedy or other exceptional and extenuating circumstances, a faculty member may request to exclude one entire semester's SFOTs (individual classes may not be cherry-picked) from the mathematical calculation of average student ratings. It is up to the Committee to decide if the request is approved. In the case where a faculty member has received approval to exclude a particular semester from the SFOTs in the mathematical calculation, they should still report them in the summary table, for reviewers at all levels to see. The fact that they have been excluded from the mathematical calculation should be acknowledged in both the faculty-written dossier and in the Department Personnel Committee's report.
- Evidence of having incorporated student feedback into their teaching

AND have done a minimum of ONE of the following:

- Advised or supervised an honors thesis, student research project, or independent study
- Attended at least an average of 5 hours per year, or a total of 15 hours over a 3-year contract period, of trainings, workshops, TLP consulting sessions, or presentations on improving teaching, using new or innovative technologies in the classroom, new pedagogies, and/or improving equity, diversity, and inclusion in classes
- Participated in a semester- or year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or participated in an intensive summer learning program
- Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion
- Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students
- Used a widely diverse set of course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors or perspectives, incorporated culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, and/or created class assignments and activities that implement equitable and [authentic assessment](#)
- Served in an official role for other faculty as a trainer, facilitator, mentor, or evaluator in teaching. This includes being the mentor in an FLC, training other faculty in TLP-sponsored programs such as Go Virtual and Hyflex training, serving as a QLT mentor, serving as a fellow or evaluator for a teaching-related program through FDEV, or being assigned an official mentoring role within the Department or College
- Served as a mentor for the Teaching Apprenticeship, following the guidelines outlined in the Apprenticeship syllabus and contract
- Significant service to department committees
- Repeated attendance or presentation at regional, national, or international conferences
- Earning an external grant for research or teaching-related activities, or for community projects related to their areas of teaching or expertise in sociology
- Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal or of a book chapter in the area of their expertise or teaching (in a non-vanity press)
- Serving on a committee of a sociology-related organization




## Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

---

Process:

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

---

Chair/Director Approval:   
Liahna Gordon (Mar 17, 2025 10:02 PDT) Date: Mar 17, 2025

Dean Review:   
Ryan Patton (Mar 17, 2025 11:14 PDT) Date: Mar 17, 2025

Provost/Designee Approval:  Date: Mar 22, 2025