

CSU Chico Department Personnel Policies and Procedures
(RTP Standards) Review

Spring 2019

Michelle Morris, Faculty Diversity Officer
Kendall Hall 109
530-898-4757
mrmorris@csuchico.edu

Background

Despite increasing numbers of diverse students enrolling in colleges and universities in recent decades, the faculty instructing them have remained fairly homogenous. Increasing the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty is a key priority of the University, as articulated in the University Diversity Council's (UDC) key performance indicators, and was also noted as an area to address by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation team. Collaboration across campus divisions and multi-faceted approaches are essential to meet this goal. Campuses that are making strides toward a diverse and inclusive faculty recognize that a long-term commitment is required to change systems that have historically marginalized various communities in the academy. These campuses have also invested significant resources implementing and evaluating equity-minded recruitment and retention policies and procedures.

Nationally, non-white faculty account for 27% of Assistant Professors, 23% percent of Associate and 18% of Full Professors (National Center for Education Statistics, <https://nces.ed.gov>). While these data include African American, Latinx, and Native American scholars as non-white, we may also wish to consider workforce diversity represented by international faculty and those identifying as Asian American, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern and North African, to name a few. As with students of color, "pipeline leaks" for faculty of color are evident by increasingly smaller numbers represented throughout career progression. Once hired, it is imperative that scholars be supported to advance successfully through retention, tenure and promotion (RTP).

Most department RTP standards were originally drafted when the California State University, Chico student population more closely mirrored its faculty and many have not been updated substantially since. In contrast, CSU Chico has experienced dramatic shifts in recent years, becoming a majority-minority University, receiving designation as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), and with over half of students identifying as First-Generation and Pell Grant eligible. Just as most RTP standards acknowledge the need for faculty to adapt their instruction to a changing technology landscape, so too should the standards address the impact of changing student demographics. Specifically, evidence of inclusive pedagogy, including teaching and assessment practices, extraordinary advising and mentoring that lead to closing achievement gaps, and continued professional growth toward an equity-minded, teacher-scholar model should be included among department criteria for retention, tenure and promotion.

The purpose of this review of department RTP standards was to identify best practices related to inclusive language as well as recognition of inclusive pedagogy and the invisible labor that diverse scholars often contribute to student success. Invisible labor, or cultural taxation as the California Faculty Association refers to it, addresses the burden placed on diverse faculty for their service to the university that is not adequately rewarded in the RTP process (CFA, <https://www.calfac.org/headline/continuing-conversation-cultural-taxation>). As with many campus efforts aimed at improving student outcomes, improving faculty recruitment and retention policies and practices will benefit *all* faculty, regardless of the identity(ies) they hold. Indeed, such efforts will contribute to an improved campus climate where colleagues feel valued, respected, and supported to thrive throughout their careers.

Methods

Forty-five department Personnel Policies and Procedures documents across the seven academic colleges were reviewed for inclusive language and equity-minded evaluation of instruction, professional growth and achievement and other contributions to the University and community. Notes were taken for each department and best practices as well as areas for improvement were identified.

Key Findings

There is great disparity across and in some cases within colleges in terms of department standards as currently written. Many have not been substantially revised for several years, several do not address lecturer evaluation and 5-year review of tenured faculty, and some include sections on department chair selection and hiring committee policies while others focus solely on RTP. Many make outdated references (e.g., Faculty Affairs vs. Academic Personnel) and/or use acronyms and terms that are not clearly defined (e.g., Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP), Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), dossier, and exceptional case).

The few documents that address the University Strategic Plan refer to a version before some or all of the priorities related to sustainability, civic engagement, and diversity, equity and inclusion were added. A new University Strategic Plan will be in place in fall 2019 and department standards should be revised accordingly. None of the documents address the University's HSI status and few acknowledge the increasingly diverse student population and/or inclusive teaching and assessment practices. Few refer to campus affirmative action and non-discrimination goals.

Recommendations

At a minimum, department RTP standards should:

1. Define superior, effective, adequate and inadequate evaluation ratings and clearly state the criteria for retention, tenure and promotion to associate and full professor, whether in text or table format;
2. Include criteria for early tenure and accelerated promotion (including the updated language in FPPP 10.5; accelerated promotion to full FPPP 11.1.3), as well as lecturer evaluation and 5-year review of tenured faculty;
3. State who is responsible for guiding candidates through the RTP process and when that will occur;
4. Include website links to current FPPP and CBA documents;
5. Recognize and reward evidence of inclusive pedagogy, regardless of discipline, to meet the needs of CSU Chico's diverse student body;
6. Recognize and reward service that demonstrates evidence of contributions to historically underserved populations; and
7. Require documentation of quality as well as quantity of service per FPPP 8.1.3.e.4: *"[o]ther materials that would help evaluators assess the candidate's performance in Other Contributions [Service] to the University and Community should be included. When compiling these materials, the candidate should keep in mind that*

the reviewers will assess the quality as well as the quantity of activities; therefore, this section of the dossier should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments about such quality and quantity.”

8. Use inclusive language and equity-minded evaluation throughout (see list of **Best Practices** for specific examples).

Additional suggestions for personnel committee consideration are included under **Best Practices** below. These recommendations will strengthen campus RTP processes and therefore benefit all faculty under review as well as those who evaluate them. The findings can be shared electronically, made available on the Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) and UDC websites, and/or be presented at Provost’s Advisory Council (PAC) and Chairs’ Council meetings. Department chairs can forward to personnel committees and any who would like to meet individually to discuss their documents should contact Michelle Morris at mrmorris@csuchico.edu. Based on these findings, and in collaboration with OAPL and Faculty Development, content for trainings or workshops for both personnel committees and early career faculty may be developed.

Best Practices

Many departments across colleges include equity-minded evaluation policies and practices. The strongest RTP standards include enough detail to guide candidates under review and are concise and clearly written. Best practices for facilitating the success of all faculty throughout the RTP process, as well as those specifically related to workforce equity, diversity and inclusion goals include:

1. Table of Contents and page numbers
2. Glossary of terms in text or as an appendix (e.g., FPPP, CBA, WPAF, dossier, periodic evaluation, performance review)
3. Current FPPP, CBA and RTP calendar website links
4. Clearly articulated role of the personnel committee including frequency of RTP standards review and procedures for orienting candidates under review to the evaluation process and dossier development (e.g., candidate meets individually or the point person provides a fall orientation for everyone in the department under review that year)
5. Current offices and initiatives (e.g., Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) vs. Faculty Affairs, University Diversity Council priorities vs. Diversity Action Plan goals)
6. Current University Strategic Plan priorities (include as appendix or website link)
7. Department mission statement and relationship to RTP standards (review mission statement for student-centered and inclusive language); University mission statement

8. Clearly articulated expectation that faculty provide evidence of contributions to the success of our diverse student population (e.g., Hispanic-Serving Institution status with greater than 50% of students First-Gen, Pell Grant eligible, students of color)
9. Guiding principles related to professional conduct/Faculty Code of Ethics per FPPP (e.g., see Communication Arts and Sciences, College of Communication & Education; English, College of Humanities & Fine Arts; Multicultural and Gender Studies, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences)
10. Inclusive gender language throughout document (e.g., their and they instead of his/her, he/she)
11. Address joint appointment evaluation policies and procedures, if applicable
12. Flexibility to add a member external to the department to the personnel committee
13. Template for dossier content as well as RTP curriculum vitae if different from discipline specific CV
14. Template/rubric for peer class observation; online class observation procedures and Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) rubric; encourage candidate to invite additional peer class observations
15. Under evaluation of Instruction, expand beyond Chickering's 1987 *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* (e.g., use of AAC&U Equity-Minded practices; LEAP criteria: essential learning outcomes, principles of excellence, high-impact practices, authentic assessments, and students' signature work; Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics)

<https://www.aacu.org/publications/step-up-and-lead>

<https://www.aacu.org/leap>

<https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>

16. State that Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) data should not weigh heavily in evaluation of instruction per FPPP 10.2.5.a:

"[t]eaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty. Student evaluations of teaching data (SETs) shall be used, but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate's knowledge of his/her field. Therefore, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide data in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance. The candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence, beyond SETs, of teaching performance."

17. On *lists of potential activities* add:

- a. Evidence of inclusive pedagogy
- b. Leadership/officer position in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success (e.g., Black Faculty Staff Association, Chican@/Latin@ Council, 1st Gen and Proud Faculty and Staff Association, LGBTQ Faculty and Staff Association, Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association)
- c. Participation in and/or presenting at diversity, equity and inclusion professional development opportunities (e.g., Faculty Learning Community on Inclusive Pedagogy, Diversity Academy and/or Certificate Program, Safe Zone Ally Training)
- d. Extraordinary time advising and/or mentoring students
- e. Contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, Basic Needs Initiative priorities, healing-centered campus priorities