



California State University, Chico  
Office of Academic Personnel  
Campus Zip 024

**M E M O R A N D U M**

DATE: September 3, 2021

TO: The Academic Campus Community

FROM: Brian Oppy,  
Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: Changes to the FPPP 2022-2023

After a careful review of the 2021-2022 FPPP by the FASP Committee, the recommendation of the Academic Senate, and the approval of the President, the following revisions have been made to the FPPP for 2022-2023. Items removed are ~~struck out~~, items added are in **red**. The document can be found in its entirety at <http://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp/index.shtml>.

FPPP Section	Revision	Affected Parties
	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	
	<p><b>RATING</b></p> <p>The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all <i>levels of evaluation</i> in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community. Recognized <i>ratings</i> are <b>Superior</b> “Exceeds expectations”, <b>Effective</b> “Meets expectations”, and “Does not meet expectations”. <del>“inadequate,” “adequate,” “effective,” and “superior.”</del> <b>The use of hyphenated ratings (e.g., “effective-to-superior”) is NOT permissible.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Deans</li> <li>• Chairs</li> <li>• Personnel Committees</li> </ul>
10.3.3	<p>In each written <i>performance review report</i>, the reviews of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community will each conclude with a summary evaluation. These evaluations are defined in the remainder of this section <b>and supersede discipline-</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Deans</li> <li>• Chairs</li> <li>• Personnel Committee</li> </ul>

specific nomenclature as outlined in the Unit's department standards. Here, expectations are defined by the criteria specified in the Unit's department standards. ~~The use of hyphenated ratings (e.g., "effective-to-superior") is NOT permissible.~~

**Exceeds expectations Superior**

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 only for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.**

**Meets expectations Effective**

The candidate has ~~demonstrated~~ achieved competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, ~~impressive~~, 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 only 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).**

**Adequate**

~~The candidate has achieved satisfactory and acceptable (but not remarkable) levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. With certain exceptions, the evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a satisfactory contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated.~~

**Does not meet expectations Inadequate**

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** ~~at least adequate~~ contributions **with regard to the department's criteria** ~~to the academic community~~ in the area being evaluated. ~~"Inadequate" performance is an impermissible level of professionalism, and~~ **The significant deficiencies identified** require immediate attention and correction.

More specifically, as applies to each area of performance:

**INSTRUCTION**

**Exceeds Expectations Superior**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this document (FPPP), and the CBA.

**Meets expectations Effective**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's substantial professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. An evaluation of “Meets expectations” “effective” performance is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.

**Adequate**

The evidence suggests the candidate has achieved a satisfactory level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. An overall evaluation of “adequate” performance is the minimum level of achievement consistent with *retention*, but it is insufficient to justify the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.

**Does not meet expectations Inadequate**

The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.

**PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT**

**Exceeds expectations Superior**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed the *Department/Unit standards*, in other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

**Meets expectations Effective**

The evidence demonstrates substantial appreciable significant scholarly achievement with respect to professional contributions

and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

**Adequate**

~~The evidence demonstrates some scholarly achievement on the part of the candidate, with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA)~~

**Does not meet expectations Inadequate**

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

**SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)**

As stated above, the third area of evaluation is Service that contributes to shared governance, to the sStrategic pPlans, priorities, and gGoals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community. In each written performance review report, the evaluator(s) shall state whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to conform to University, College and Department/Unit plans, priorities, and goals and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department's/Unit's abilities to meet their strategic plans, priorities, and goals

**Exceeds expectations Superior**

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. ~~Where this area of evaluation refers to participation~~participating on committees and/or in the community, or facilitating activities. “Superior” “Exceeds expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) assuming the candidate's assumption of key roles on significant committees, (2) high levels of involvement and/or in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating significant activities as well as the demonstrating of consistent, on-going

	<p>contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community such activities.</p> <p><b>Meets expectations Effective</b>  The evidence demonstrates the candidate's <del>consistent</del>, on-going involvement in activities listed in the <i>Department/Unit standards</i>, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. <del>Where this area of evaluation refers to participation</del> <b>participating</b> on committees and/or in the community, <del>or facilitating activities.</del> “Effective “Meets expectations” performance is evidenced by (1) the candidate's occasionally <del>assumption</del> <b>assuming</b> of key roles on significant committees, (2) <b>involvement</b> and/or in the community <b>or profession</b>, and/or (3) <b>facilitating activities</b>, as well as <del>the demonstration of consistent</del>, on-going contributions to <b>the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community such activities.</b></p> <p><b>Adequate</b>  The evidence demonstrates occasional involvement in activities listed in the <i>Department/Unit standards</i>, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. <del>Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees and/or in the community,</del> “adequate” performance is evidenced by the candidate's infrequent <del>assumption of key roles on committees and/or in the community while, nevertheless, maintaining regular participation in activities at these levels.</del></p> <p><b>Does not meet expectations Inadequate</b>  The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed in the <i>Department/Unit standards</i>, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. <del>Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees and/or in the community, or facilitating activities.</del> “Inadequate” “Does not meet expectations” performance is evidenced by <b>a lack of the candidate's lack of assumption (1) assuming</b> of key roles on committees, (2) <b>involvement</b> and/or in the community <b>or profession</b>, and/or (3) <b>facilitating activities</b> <b>and as well as only limited participation in activities at these levels demonstrating limited contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.</b></p>	
10.5.3	<p>To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) <del>be have been</del> rated <del>Superior</del> <b>Exceeds Expectations in a Performance Review</b> as defined in 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; <i>and</i> (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Deans</li> <li>• Chairs</li> <li>• Personnel Committee</li> </ul>

	<p>continue; <i>and</i> (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full-time assignment.</p>	
<p>11.1.3</p>	<p>To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: (1) be ranked <del>Superior</del> <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; <i>and</i> (2) <del>have exceeded the expectations of Superior in all three categories of evaluation;</del> <i>and</i> (3) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, <i>and</i> (4-3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Deans</li> <li>• Chairs</li> <li>• Personnel Committee</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Appendix A</b></p> <p><b>Guidance for transition to the current Summary Evaluation rating system.</b></p> <p>The new rating system is intended to solve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To more appropriately align the title of the Summary Evaluation to the RTP decision outcome.</li> <li>2. To more appropriately establish &amp; communicate the requirements and timing for accelerated tenure.</li> <li>3. To eliminate the incentive to assign a low Summary Evaluation in early years of a career in order to show progress over time in the career.</li> <li>4. When evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement, the shift in the language to “<i>appreciable</i>” rather than “<i>substantial and significant</i>” scholarship conveys the necessary trade off in producing influential scholarship and the quantity/types of scholarship produced. The definition of appreciable is “<i>large or important enough to be noticed,</i>” allowing evaluators to focus on the quality of work (i.e., <i>to be noticed</i>) rather than the quantity. This revision also comports with FPPP 8.1.3.e4 which specifically directs the candidate to “<i>keep in mind that the quality of these activities is more important than the quantity of activities.</i>”</li> <li>5. The addition of “<i>professional activities</i>” to evaluation of Professional Growth and Achievement is intended to better account for the variety of activities beyond traditional scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) that constitute the professional growth and achievements of faculty. As noted in the existing standard, in the context of a teacher-scholar institution scholarly</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Deans</li> <li>• Chairs</li> <li>• Personnel Committee</li> </ul>

	<p>contributions may be made <i>“to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community.”</i> This additional language acknowledges that it is possible for candidates to grow and achieve through activities (scholarly or professional) that focus on students, the candidate’s discipline, or the broader professional community.</p> <p>6. When evaluating Service, the shift to a list of three different descriptors of service - <i>“assuming roles on significant committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities”</i> - conveys that there are multiple pathways to serving the university including non-institutional roles and temporary activities. Specifically, evaluators should weigh evidence of service beyond formal institutional roles - such as task forces, mentoring, community engagement, or putting on events/activities that enrich the University. Additionally, all service contributions should be considered in the context of <i>“contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.”</i> This concluding clause should encourage the candidates to frame and the evaluators to evaluate service with reference to the diversity of roles that CSU, Chico plays in the lives of students and the North State.</p> <p>In general, it is recommended to translate Summary Evaluations into the new format in the following manner:</p> <p>“Superior” would translate into “Exceeds expectations.” “Effective” and “Adequate” could translate into “Meets expectations.” “Inadequate” shall translate into “Does not meet expectations.”</p> <p>However, the Unit’s department standards are the appropriate authority for defining expectations.</p> <p>For example, if the Unit’s department standards for a specific area define a Summary Evaluation of “Effective” as the minimum rating for awarding tenure, then:</p> <p>“Effective” could translate into “Meets expectations.” “Adequate” could translate into “Does not meet expectations.” “Inadequate” shall translate into “Does not meet expectations.”</p>	
--	---	--