

Undergraduate Education (UED)

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

2022-23¹

Roles of Dean, Personnel Committee, and Personnel Committee Chair

In alignment with FPPP 8.0 and 9.0, the UED Personnel Committee and the Committee (?) Chair assume the combined? responsibilities of the Department and College Personnel Committee and, the UED Program Director (of Honors, FYE, etc.) assumes the responsibilities of a Department Chair, and the Dean of UED assumes the responsibilities of a College Dean.

The UED Personnel Committee must consist of at least two tenured faculty members (at least one of whom has experience with a UED program) whose home department receives a salary buyback during the academic year. If possible, the committee shall be chaired by a Director of a UED program.

Section 1. RTP Standards for Lecturers with UED Contracts²

Undergraduate Education (UED) will follow the policies and procedures outlined in FPPP 8.0 in preparing reports on retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) of faculty who teach in its programs (Honors, FYE, etc.).

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

For faculty being reviewed (see Section 3), the primary criteria for assessment of teaching effectiveness in unprioritized order include:

- Knowledge of the course content.
- Commitment to student success and learning.
- Commitment to improving teaching practice.
- Contributions to the University Strategic Priorities.

For the duration of the period being reviewed, instructional performance will be assessed using the types and sources of evidence set forth below.

¹ Reviewed on January 20, 2022 by a meeting of faculty with UED contracts and faculty receiving a salary buyback to teach for UED. Approved on February 16, 2022 by the UED Personnel Committee.

² UED does not hold tenure lines. Tenured/tenure-track faculty as well as lecturers with full-time appointments in other departments who teach in UED programs with a “buyout” are reviewed in a separate process outlined in Section 2.

The faculty member's dossier should demonstrate how the submitted evidence meets the above four criteria. All required evidence elements must be included in the faculty member's Personnel Action File and Dossier ("WPAF"). Elements listed as "Additional Evidence" are suggested items that may or may not be included, at the faculty member's discretion.

Required Evidence in the WPAF:

- Peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year (colleagues will arrange to visit classes and provide developmental and evaluative feedback).
- Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT), formerly Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

Required Evidence in the Dossier

Instructors with dossiers in other departments may submit the following items without customization for UED.

- Current Curriculum Vita (CV)
- A narrative that includes a reflective statement on the candidate's teaching philosophy/strategies/objectives and how these have impacted the candidate's teaching effectiveness
- A reflective statement on the candidate's professional development, as it relates to teaching effectiveness

Instructors with dossiers in other departments should submit the following items with customization for UED.

- A Copy of these UED Standards
- A reflective statement on Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT), formerly Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), in UED courses
- A reflective statement on peer reviews of teaching by UED Personnel Committee in UED courses
- Course syllabi

Additional Evidence in the Dossier

Instructors may include any other evidence of teaching evidence, which may include any of the following.

- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is one of the University Strategic Priorities and is central to the mission of UED. Therefore, the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments may be used by a candidate as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include: demonstration of zero equity gaps, efforts to reduce equity gaps in student performance or data showing reductions in equity gaps in the candidate's courses; the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning; the use of diverse course materials that include BIPOC and/or queer authors; the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy; the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of

assessment; and/or the completion of training and professional development opportunities that center equity, diversity, and inclusion.

- Creative work or scholarship, as it relates to teaching effectiveness;
- Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules;
- Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback;
- Curriculum development, including creating new courses, substantial course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement or program cohesion;
- Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement, inclusion of diverse experiences, undergraduate research, place-based learning, use of the Book in Common, or other High Impact Practices;
- Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g. team teaching or guest presentations);
- Evidence of using data to inform instructional practices (e.g., assessment);
- Evidence of student growth in response to faculty feedback on an assignment;
- Evidence of student achievements

Section 2. Appointment and Reappointment Process

UED follows the assignment order for available work according to CBA 12.29. However, in the absence of tenure lines in UED, the assignment order begins with lecturer faculty with UED entitlements. Each semester for UNIV courses and each year for Honors courses, the Program Directors of FYE and Honors will identify all sections available, then assign sections to lecturers with entitlements, and then advertise remaining sections to the campus.

Applications shall consist of a letter of interest, including evidence of consultation with Department Chairs where relevant, and a CV. The UED Personnel Committee will review applications for all available sections and provide the Director a list of qualified applicants. The Director will make recommendations to the Dean from the list of qualified applicants.

For applicants without a UED entitlement seeking reappointment (including tenured/tenure-track faculty, lecturers without entitlement, and lecturers with 1.0 contracts in other departments), the application requires evidence of teaching effectiveness (see below):

Required Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

- The most recent syllabus for each requested course re-appointment.
- The most recent teaching observation for each requested course re-appointment. The Program Director should conduct an observation of faculty with buybacks at least once every three semesters when the course is offered by the faculty.
- Reflection on teaching effectiveness for each requested course re-appointment. This must include a reflection on the most recent SFOTs and teaching observation for that course, and may include any of the “additional evidence” of teaching effectiveness for lecturers with UED contracts (see p.2, above).

Section 3. Review Process

All lecturers teaching UED courses who have or are eligible to earn entitlements in UED will be reviewed according to the processes and timelines outlined in FPPP 9.1.

Faculty teaching UED courses who have full-time appointments in other departments (1.0 lecturers and tenured/tenure-track faculty) and are employed by UED on a “buyout” basis do not undergo formal review but are regularly observed to inform the reappointment process described above.



Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

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

Approvals:

Chair/Director:	<u><i>Ellie Clifford Ertle</i></u> <small>Ellie Clifford Ertle (Sep 2, 2022 11:14 PDT)</small>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Dean:	<u><i>Kate McCarthy</i></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
OAPL:	<u><i>Mahalley D. Allen</i></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost:	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>	Date:	<u>Sep 4, 2022</u>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: Sept. 1, 2022

TO: Kate McCarthy, Dean

CC: Ellie Ertle, Associate Dean

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

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of UED Department RTP Standards

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

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

- Document needs to clarify that this is a document primarily focused on the hiring (is that here somewhere) and review of lecturers. Terminology gets confused with tenured/tenure track.
- Please address the many comments provided in the document to better align text with the FPPP and to address the various questions.

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

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.
4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

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