

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
Personnel Policies and Procedures
(Approved: May 2016)

I. CMAS DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

A. FUNCTION

The committee shall review and make recommendations concerning hiring and appointment level, retention, tenure, and promotion.

B. STRUCTURE

Eligibility: All full-time tenured members of the department not currently under review and not currently serving at other levels in the department or college are eligible to serve on the department committee. FERP faculty may serve on RTP committees when the evaluation period does not extend beyond their semester of FERP. In the event an insufficient number of department members are available to serve, eligibility shall extend to all tenured faculty within the university. Probationary faculty may serve on search committees, if approved. FERP faculty may serve on search committees so long as they can fully participate in the search.

Election of committee members shall take place by the end of the preceding academic year or no later than the second week of the fall semester. The meeting and its purpose shall be announced to all faculty at least 5 business days in advance.

A list shall be prepared of all eligible faculty by the department Chair, the department faculty shall vote for a minimum of three eligible faculty each from each program, CMSD and CMST, to serve on the CMAS Personnel Committee. Elected program faculty will form the respective CMSD & CMST Personnel Subcommittees and collectively form the CMAS Personnel Committee, as explained in the CMAS Bylaws Section VI. 1. The final number of members shall be determined by the actual number of eligible faculty in the department at the time of the election. A minimum of one member must come from each program within the department (CMST and CMSD). Following the CMAS Personnel Committee formation, a college representative will be voted on, who cannot serve on the CMAS Personnel Committee. Election shall be by closed, written ballot with a simple majority required for election.

Review committees for Post-Tenure reviews (5th year review) shall consist of professors. Review committees for faculty review up to associate professor may be all professors or some combination of professors and associate professors totaling a minimum number of three.

II. CMAS DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE OPERATION

The committee shall function within the following guidelines:

- Current FPPP
- CME Handbook
- Section VI. 1-5 of the CMAS Bylaws
- The Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Evaluation Areas and Criteria (Section IX in this document)

III. CMAS APPOINTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The Department requires a faculty member to have the terminal degree or equivalent. The terminal degree shall be the doctorate in the appropriate field. Issues regarding the terminal degree or any equivalency must be resolved at the time of appointment, and should not, therefore, be in question for tenure or promotions.

- See current University FPPP 5.1.2.c.

IV. CMAS APPOINTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FOR PART-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY

1. Appointees shall be selected from a pool of applicants established by course in accord with approved University, College, and Department Affirmative Action Guidelines. Appointees shall be selected primarily on the basis of their qualifications and anticipated excellence as teachers, as indicated by previous relevant experience in teaching and/or academic or practical preparation for the course or courses to be taught.
2. Their level of appointment shall conform to the guidelines of the current Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document.
3. The pool shall be established by periodic and appropriate local and regional public notice of the positions available or anticipated.
4. The pool shall be evaluated and ranked by a concurrence between the Department Chair and the program faculty (CMST or CMSD). Program Faculty serving in this task will be identified when the Department Personnel Committee is formed. Final selection shall be based upon budget allocation, need, and availability of candidates.
5. Appointments shall be made by the Department Chair, in consultation with the Program Coordinator or Course Coordinators in the case of multi-sectional courses.

B. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FOR FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY

[See current FPPP 5.2]

V. CMAS EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION, ACCELERATED TENURE, ACCELERATED PROMOTION

All CMAS Faculty will be carefully and thoroughly evaluated following the current FPPP (10.0, 11.0) and guidelines provided below. Decisions about tenure and promotion shall be based on the full record since initial appointment, which shall include relevant accomplishments during years granted as credit for prior experience. In cases of promotion, the review process will take into account the faculty member's record of performance during all years since appointment or promotion to the present rank.

A. EXPECTATION OF THE PROBATIONARY FACULTY MEMBER

1. Retention (typical Performance Review in years 2 & 4)

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

The Probationary Faculty Member demonstrates effective and consistent development of skills in the following areas commensurate with year of evaluation:

- Instruction: Exemplifies the Teacher-Scholar model, demonstrates self-evaluation and improvement of performance based on evaluations. Expected rating: 4th year performance review and beyond: Minimum rating of Effective required.
- Professional Growth and Achievement: sustains scholarly inquiry, growth and some achievement in and beyond the classroom. Expected rating: 2nd and 4th year performance reviews: Minimum rating of Adequate required.
- Service: Provides willing, quality service consistent with program's strategic plan and is a collegial and collaborative team member. Expected rating: 2nd year performance review and beyond: Minimum rating of Effective required.

Program specific Rating details are described below in IX.

2. 6th year Tenure/Promotion Performance Review

Tenure and Promotion to Associate are typically granted at the end of the 6th probationary year, but can be earlier if service credit is granted. Because tenure shows great faith in the individual as a permanent member of the faculty and promotion as an award of advancement, the ratings to achieve Tenure and Promotion are necessarily rigorous. Minimal ratings required for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor are Effective in Teaching, Professional Growth & Achievement, and Service. Criteria are identical for both Tenure and Promotion.

The candidate going up for tenure and promotion will meet or exceed the expectation of the Probationary Faculty member. In addition, the candidate will show:

- Evidence of achievement to warrant an effective rating in all three evaluation areas.

B. EXPECTATION OF THE TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The Tenured Associate Professor demonstrates effective teaching, advising, and mentoring, shows sustained consistent scholarly inquiry, growth and accomplishments, and provides quality service with assumption of occasional key roles at the program level, with growing service to the college and university levels and/or community and professional levels. Work is consistent with strategic plans. The individual works as a collegial, collaborative, and willing team member.

The candidate going up for promotion to full Professor is typically in the 5th post tenure year, but can be requested in any year after. The candidate will meet or exceed the standards for Associate Professor, and in addition, will show:

- Evidence of accomplishments to warrant ratings of at least one Superior and two Effectives across the three categories.
- Substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the university itself

C. EXPECTATION OF THE FULL PROFESSOR

The Full Professor demonstrates effective teaching, mentoring, and advising, shows sustained, consistent scholarly inquiry, growth and accomplishments, and provides high quality, willing

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

service including lead and/or facilitative roles at the program level, and service at the college, university levels and/or community and professional levels; work is consistent with strategic plans. The individual works as a collegial, collaborative, and willing team member.

D. POST TENURE PERIODIC REVIEW

A Periodic Evaluation will be given every 5 years following the granting of Tenure. For the Associate Professor, this may be replaced with a Performance Review for promotion to Full.

E. EARLY TENURE AND PROMOTION

The FPPP (10.5) requires that for a recommendation of “early” tenure (i.e. prior to the beginning of the sixth consecutive probationary year) be accompanied by justification as a “special case.” The CMAS department defines a “special case” as an exception, or rare circumstance, wherein the candidate can demonstrate exceptional achievement in all CMAS evaluation areas reviewed above. For recommendation of early promotion the FPPP requires that a candidate must meet the criteria for “exceptional” as defined by the Department. The CMAS Department describes “exceptional achievement” for early tenure and promotion as three-pronged: It includes a temporal aspect, a quality aspect, and potential for sustained excellence. The temporal aspect refers to the candidate meeting the normal standards for tenure and promotion early. The candidate’s performance must reflect the level of experience and maturity normally associated with faculty holding the rank being sought. The quality aspect refers to excelling in at least one review area. Therefore, performance review ratings must result in at least two effectives and one Superior. Finally, the record must additionally demonstrate that the candidate’s performance is likely to continue its trajectory of excellence.

To clarify what is meant by meeting expectations for a candidate in their 6th year, Service will be used as an example. In a typical 4th year performance review (not early), the candidate’s Service contributions would be rated based on their current number of years of service (including any years of service credit). For example, to earn a rating of Effective or Superior, his/her Service contributions would need to reflect the caliber of contributions associated with those ratings for someone who has been at CSUC for four years. Similarly, if a candidate has been at CSUC for two years, but comes in with an additional two years of service credit, then his/her Service contributions must reflect the same caliber for a rating of Effective or Superior for one who has been at CSUC for four years. However, if in his/her 4th or 5th year, a candidate wishes to be reviewed for “early” tenure and promotion, then Service contributions must reach the caliber normally associated with a rating of Effective or Superior for someone who has been at CSUC for the 6 years. The same is true for the necessary ratings in Teaching and Professional Growth and Development.

Any Faculty member wishing to apply for early tenure and promotion must make a request in writing to the Department Chair and the Dean. The Departmental Personnel Committee may recommend that a faculty member request early tenure and promotion review. To ensure the appropriate review can be completed, a candidate must submit their request prior to or at the beginning for the Fall semester, well ahead of the Dossier due date published for Performance Reviews that year.

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

F. PROCESS OF EVALUATION FOR TENURE/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. Pre-Review

Probationary faculty will meet at least once each academic year with the department chair until they submit their application for tenure and promotion. Meetings should take place prior to the preparation of the dossier (see Section X. on Dossier Preparation), in the Fall for performance reviews and Spring for periodic evaluations. At the meeting, the chair will review the FPPP and department and program guidelines for RTP with the faculty member. The purpose of the meeting is to assist with goal development for continued improvement of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, and help determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. Additional meetings can be requested by the Chair or candidate, but ultimately it is the candidate's responsibility to seek assistance when needed. Description of dossier contents and organization is addressed below and in the relevant Appendices

2. Review Types and Period of Review

Performance Reviews for probationary faculty are typically given in years 2, 4, and 6, with the 6th year typically a review for tenure and promotion. Performance reviews contain developmental feedback when appropriate and summary evaluations/ratings for each of the evaluation areas Instruction, PGA, Other Contributions (Service) and Contributions to Strategic goals of the University. A Performance Review is given when the candidate is ready to go up for promotion to full, typically 5 years post tenure. Deficiencies in projected meeting of tenure and promotion criteria must be clearly noted. In year 4, a statement regarding the candidate's trajectory toward tenure and promotion must be included. Goals developed by the candidate and the associated improvements/changes will be reviewed both for periodic and performance evaluations. Periodic Evaluations for probationary faculty are typically in years 1, 3, and 5, and are primarily designed to provide developmental feedback to the candidate. For tenured faculty, a periodic review is given every 5 years post-tenure.

The review period dates will be specified in the charge given to the Personnel Committee for each candidate. For probationary faculty, both Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews will consider all work since time of position acceptance (or 1 to 2 years prior to acceptance based on service credit granted). For tenured faculty, all work from time of previous dossier submission will be considered.

VI. CMAS EVALUATION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF LECTURERS

The term "Lecturer" is the preferred term for representing Temporary Faculty by the CMAS department and will be used in this document. The Review Committee shall consist of immediate course supervisors, appropriate course coordinators, and other qualified faculty. Tenured and probationary faculty not serving on the personnel committee shall be expected to participate in the evaluation of lecturers as directed by the Department Chair.

A. EVALUATION OF LECTURERS (FPPP 9.0)

1. Categories for Evaluation (9.1.2)

- a. Part-time faculty shall submit relevant evidence or documentation in a dossier, to be prepared following the directions in Appendix D.

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- b. The primary mission of this university is teaching, which shall be the primary criterion for evaluating part-time and fifteen-unit base faculty.
 - c. At least one classroom visit shall take place at least once each academic year for the purpose of assessing the faculty member's teaching performance. Details regarding the time of the visits, the documentation of the assessment, etc. shall be determined by the department Personnel Committee prior to the start of the review process. Please consult Appendix D and E for more information on the Peer Evaluation Process.
 - d. In evaluating teaching the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation:
 - 1) Teaching Performance (including but not limited to):
 - Organization
 - Effective communication
 - 2) Performance in Non-Teaching Work Assignments (if applicable)
 - Work details specified in job description or appointment letter
 - 3) Currency in the Field
 - Their engaging in professional activity in the field appropriate to their teaching field as determined by department criteria
 - 4) Other contributions which represent positive assistance to the University and Department
2. Evidence of Teaching Performance shall consist of:
- a. Signed written peer evaluations
 - b. Student evaluations, administered every semester according to department procedures. These evaluations "shall not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching performance and shall not be used to determine a candidate's knowledge of his/her discipline."
 - According to 9.1.2.c.1, "It is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide supplemental evidence in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance."
 - c. Activities that demonstrate currency in the field.
 - d. Other duties (as specified in the job description or appointment letter); e.g. course coordination, internship supervision, assistant duties, coaching, etc., will be evaluated by appropriate feedback and evidence of performance.
 - e. Other contributions that represent positive assistance to the University and Department (e.g. assisting with forensics, Speech & Hearing Fair, outcomes assessment).
3. Evaluation Record (FPPP 9.1.3)
- a. The Department/Unit Personnel Committee shall submit a written report to the candidate and to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall concur, with or without comments, or not concur, with comments. The Department Chair shall transmit the report and his/her comments, if any, to the candidate and to the appropriate Dean for review and entry into the personnel action file.

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- b. The report shall contain an evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty member in his/her work assignment(s) and a statement as to whether the performance is satisfactory. If the faculty member has not performed satisfactorily, then the reasons for this conclusion shall be included in the report.
 - c. The report may include constructive suggestions for the faculty member's development related to his/her work assignment(s).
 - d. The report shall acknowledge other activities by the faculty member, not part of his/her work assignments(s), which result in a positive contribution to the University. FPPP – 2016/2017 – p. 53
 - e. The report shall not contain any recommendation regarding future employment.
4. Evaluation Procedures (FPPP 9.1.4)
- a. Each temporary faculty member neither eligible for nor currently holding a three-year appointment will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles of his/her appointment, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. This requirement may be waived for temporary faculty who are in their first semester of employment as described in CBA Article 15.25. At the discretion of the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, or upon the candidate's petition, a review may be scheduled in a year succeeding an annual or biennial review. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's work performance since the individual's initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent.
 - b. All temporary faculty members eligible for an initial three-year appointment pursuant to CBA Article 12.12 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.
 - c. When the Appropriate Administrator determines, based on the personnel action file, that an eligible temporary faculty member has performed in a satisfactory manner, and absent documented serious conduct problems, an initial three-year appointment shall be offered. Otherwise, an initial three-year appointment shall not be offered and the reasons for this determination shall be reduced to writing by the Appropriate Administrator and placed in the personnel action file.
 - d. All temporary faculty members holding three-year appointments and eligible for subsequent reappointment pursuant to CBA Articles 12.13, 15.26 and 15.29 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 President (or designee). The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire preceding three-year period.
 - e. When the Appropriate Administrator determines, based on the personnel action file, that a temporary faculty member already holding a three-year appointment has performed in a satisfactory manner, and absent documented serious conduct problems, a subsequent three-year FPPP – 2016/2017 – p. 54 appointment shall be offered as long as there is

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

sufficient work. Otherwise, a subsequent three year appointment shall not be offered and the reasons for this determination shall be reduced to writing by the Appropriate Administrator and placed in the personnel action file.

- f. The Personnel committee shall notify lecturers at the beginning of each personnel cycle that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to update his/her personnel file and Dossier/supporting materials if scheduled for review during that cycle. It is suggested all faculty update the Dossier and CV each year as a regular practice. Consult Appendix D on preparing a Dossier.
- g. The appropriate department Personnel Subcommittee shall submit a report to the CMAS Personnel Committee and once completed, to the candidate and to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall concur, with or without attached comments, or not concur, with attached comments. The Department Chair will transmit the report and his/her attached comments, if any, to the appropriate Dean for review and entry into the PAF (or WPAF). If the Department Chair is serving on the Department Personnel Committee, the report will go to the Dean. The report shall contain a written evaluation of teaching effectiveness and a statement as to whether the teaching performance is satisfactory.
- h. Lecturers moving within ranges will normally be evaluated following the procedures and guidelines noted above-.

C. EVALUATION PROCESS -- FULL-TIME LECTURERS

- 1. All full-time lecturers will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. If the candidate's course assignment changes, the review process returns to the initial two-year annual followed by either annual or biennial review cycle. Evaluation of full-time temporary faculty will follow the periodic evaluation procedures for tenure-track faculty. The timetable for evaluation of full-time Temporary Faculty, regardless of the number of years the individual has served, shall follow the schedule of Periodic Evaluation for probationary faculty, with evaluation notice to the individual due on or before May 15.
- 2. The areas of performance to be included in the Periodic Evaluations of each full-time lecturer shall be consistent with, and inclusive of, the individual's assigned duties, as specified at the time of hire. Should those assigned duties change, an explicit statement of the change will be placed into the PAF, so as to properly inform those conducting subsequent Periodic Evaluations.
- 3. The Periodic Evaluation of full-time lecturers will result in a performance report, but no recommendation regarding future employment will be made.

D. GRIEVANCE AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

Consult CBA Article 10.1 and FPPP 14.3

VII. CMAS RANGE ELEVATION FOR PART TIME FACULTY

For details, see CBA Article 12.16-20 and FPPP 12.1-2.

VIII. CMAS EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

Tenured faculty (1) not eligible for an SSI or (2) having served four years at the same rank normally will be reviewed annually for promotion unless the individual requests in writing that the review not take place in a particular academic year. (See CBA, Article 14.3. and FPPP 11.2 – 11.3.

IX. CMAS RTP EVALUATION AREAS AND CRITERIA

The Department of Communication Arts and Sciences (CMAS) consists of two separate programs, Communication Sciences and Disorders (CMSD) and Communication Studies (CMST). Both programs seek to attract, support and promote high quality faculty who are committed to the mission of the university, college, department and programs. While faculty from both programs are expected to work as a collaborative academic unit (see CMAS Guidelines for Collegial Communication, Appendix F), the CMSD and CMST faculty also embrace the disciplinary, professional and service differences that distinguish each program. Out of respect for our differences the CMAS Department has established evaluation criteria for each program, which are presented below. When a tenure-track and tenured faculty member is evaluated, reviewers will employ the section below specific to either CMSD and CMST.

The areas of evaluation for both programs include: 1) Instruction, 2) Professional Growth and Achievement, 3) Other Contributions to the University, and 4) Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University. The following section will contain two separate RTP Evaluation Areas and Criteria, one for CMSD (A) and CMST (B). *While the areas are identical, as are the expected ratings for retention, promotion and tenure, the criteria are specific to each program.* Program Personnel Subcommittees will conduct the full review of the candidate and evidence, following the Program Guidelines provided below, producing the report that will be forwarded to the CMAS Personnel Committee for endorsement, following the procedures established in the CMAS Bylaws Section VI. *Section IX is the only section in this document that addresses the CMSD and CMST programs separately, all other sections apply to both programs in terms of process, policy and procedures.*

A. COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS EVALUATION AREAS AND CRITERIA

The evaluation of CMSD faculty is based on clinically focused professional activities and stems directly from the CMSD program vision, mission, objectives and guiding principles. See Appendix A. For performance reviews, it is the candidate's responsibility to put forth expected ratings for each section and provide the rationale for the designated level of achievement. The committee will either confirm or recommend the most appropriate ratings in the department report.

1. INSTRUCTION (CMSD)

Instruction includes academic and clinical instruction and related instructional activities. Given that instruction is the primary activity of the typical CMSD faculty member it is expected that faculty will achieve a rating of at least Effective in this area by the fourth probationary year and beyond. Because all tenured/tenure track faculty are nationally certified and state licensed, currency in the field is primarily obtained through required Continuing Education Units (CEUs). It is expected that currency obtained through CEUs and scholarly inquiry are applied to instruction. If candidates are not licensed or certified they must provide evidence of currency in the field.

All faculty, Tenured, Probationary, must submit a dossier that provides evidence of their achievements. See Section X. for information on the Dossier.

Instruction will be evaluated based on quantity and quality. See Appendix B for a listing of examples of evidence pertinent to Instruction. Quantity is indicated by the number of different courses taught, enrollments, and number of other teaching related activities. For evaluation of Instructional Quality, there are 4 basic categories of evaluation:

- a. Teaching philosophy and implementation of philosophy; demonstration of implementation of Teacher-scholar model.
The teacher-scholar model is widely promoted within the CSU system, recognizing that student learning and the quality of teaching can be improved when faculty are actively engaged in research, scholarship and creative activities, and especially when faculty connect these activities to course content and/or actively involve students in these activities. The CMSD program believes that teacher-scholars should approach teaching, scholarship, and service in a holistic and integrative manner. Each of these activities complements and enriches the other. We further support the idea that scholarship can take various forms; the underlining qualities of all scholarship are expansion, clarification, organization, and/or development of knowledge. Our teacher-scholar model is further supported by Council on Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders (associated with CAA- ASHA, our primary accrediting body). CAPCSD recognizes that each of Boyer's (1991) four types of scholarship (Discovery; Integration; Application; and Teaching) provides a substantive contribution to the evidence-base for both clinical and education practices in CMSD. As such, CAPCSD encourages recognition of each of these research types when assessing the scholarly productivity of CMSD faculty.
- b. Teaching Effectiveness:
An effective teacher is one who is prepared, organized, has good classroom management, effective delivery, knowledge and currency in the field, ability to convey content, is rigorous (with high expectations), and fosters student success (provides timely and appropriate feedback; multiple opportunities for learning; promotes mutual respect in a positive learning environment). It is required that the candidate provides data from student evaluations of teaching and peer evaluations regarding these aspects of teaching effectiveness.
- c. Reflection, Development of goals, Implementation and results of improvement or change plans: Use of student, self, and peer evaluation data for improvement or change.
- d. Instructionally-related activities/accomplishments
Instructionally-related activities are described as pedagogical development, curriculum-

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

based work, instructional support outside the classroom (e.g., advising), teaching-related leadership (e.g., mentoring), and instruction-related recognition.

e. Classroom Observation Procedure- See Appendix E.

Ratings

- Superior: Demonstrates abundant and sustained high quality performance that exceeds expectations in at least three of the following areas: (1) Teacher-Scholar model, (2) Teaching Effectiveness, (3) Reflection and Improvement, and (4) other instructionally related activities or accomplishments. The fourth area must be at least Effective.
- Effective: Demonstrates proficient, sustained quality performance consistent with expectations in at least three of the following areas: (1) Teacher-Scholar model, Teaching Effectiveness, Reflection and Improvement, and other instructionally related activities or accomplishments. The fourth area must be at least Adequate. A minimum rating of Effective is required at 4th year and beyond.
- Adequate: Demonstrates minimally acceptable performance in quality and/or quantity; demonstrates fair development and accomplishment in two or more areas: Teacher-Scholar model, Teaching Effectiveness, Reflection and Improvement, and other instructionally related activities or accomplishments. The other area(s) must average Adequate or above. An Adequate in the 2nd year performance review indicates need for improvement to meet expectations for retention at 4th year, tenure and/or promotion.
- Inadequate: Little to no measurable evidence of quantity of teaching activities, and/or lack of Quality in two or more areas: Teacher-Scholar model, Teaching Effectiveness, Reflection and Improvement, and other instructionally related activities or accomplishments. Needs substantial improvement in order to meet expectations.

2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT (CMSD)

CMSD defines the Professional Growth and Achievement section as development and accomplishments resulting from scholarly work. CMSD accepts a broad variety of scholarly work and appreciates the unique contributions of the individual to the program, university, community, and profession.

a. Professional Growth

Professional growth is expected on a consistent basis and for all levels of performance review. Growth is the evidence of scholarly inquiry and activities. It includes work to maintain discipline currency through continuing education, which can be in the form of participation at workshops, conferences, self-study, etc., and includes substantial effort on works in progress, and less formal, less tangible aspects of professional development such as scholarly communications with academic peers, students, and other professionals.

The CMSD program defines **scholarly inquiry and activities** as those that share most or all of the following essential elements:

- 1) Literacy in current research and/or consumption of knowledge
- 2) Data collection, creation and/or implementation of ideas
- 3) Analysis, Interpretation, and/or synthesis of ideas

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- b. **Scholarly achievements** contain one or more elements listed above AND include one or more of the following:
- 1) Dissemination: Sharing of knowledge beyond the classroom in written, oral, or other format
 - 2) Evaluation: review/feedback and/or measurable impact of project, research, ideas (“impactful products”)
 - 3) Recognition: An honor, award or other recognition by professional peers at or beyond the university due to scholarly (professional) reputation.

See below for examples of scholarly activities and achievements.

- c. For evaluation, both quality and totality of work are considered, including the “constancy” of scholarly work. Quality includes the impact of the project, type of audience, type of review process, method of selection (e.g., competitive, invited) and venue for dissemination, and/or the level of recognition. If the candidate believes a scholarly product is worth a higher point value than is listed, it is his/her responsibility to provide evidence of quality to support the case for that point value. The sub-committee determines if that case is made.
- d. In addition to respecting and embracing traditional forms that require the work described above, such as scholarship of discovery, the CMSD program welcomes and encourages non-traditional forms of scholarship. Should faculty achievements fall outside of the elements described above, the candidate must provide the rationale and evidence for its inclusion as a scholarly product in order to be evaluated as such.

Ratings

The table below shows minimum point values required for each performance review year and level of position.

	Adequate	Effective	Superior
2 nd year	5 points with scholarship for manuscript in progress	10 points with scholarship for manuscript in progress	15 points with scholarship for manuscript in progress
4 th year	10 points with manuscript in progress	15 points with manuscript in progress	20 points with manuscript in progress
6 th year/ Tenure/Promotion to Associate	15 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication	20 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication	25 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication
Promotion to Full Professor	20 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication	25 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication	30 points including one 5-point (or greater) publication

Less than the stated value for Adequate will result in a rating of Inadequate.

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

The following lists include examples of common forms of professional achievement in CMSD.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor the candidate must have one 5-point (or greater) publication as part of his/her point total. For Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor, the values include the requirement of one 5-point (or greater) publication beyond that used for promotion to Associate as part of his/her point total. The additional points can be any combination of the items listed here; additional items will be considered with the candidate's stated expected point value and rationale.

6 points

- Scholarly books with respected publisher
- Textbooks (not including self-published books)

5 points

- Articles (peer reviewed)
 - ✓ Scholarly Journals
 - ✓ Proceedings (when subject to additional review)
- Significant competitive external grants, fellowships, or contracts awarded
- Lead role in CAA-ASHA full re-accreditation report
- Editorship of a major scholarly journal
- Significant leadership in a national or regional organization
- Development of a specialized clinic that has been disseminated, evaluated, and/or recognized
- Substantial revisions of already published textbook

4 points

- Chapters in edited scholarly books
- Refereed conference papers at major international, national, and regional associations
- Competitively awarded fellowships, grants and contracts external to the campus
- Refereed proceedings or papers
- Editorial Board of a major journal
- Development and dissemination of clinical/teaching curriculum or resources
- Development of refereed CEU or professional development modules/trainings/workshops/ tutorials

3 points

- Non-refereed presentations at professional conferences
- Development of a specialized clinic that has longevity (3+ semesters)
- Developing expertise in a new clinical area via activities such as conferences, sabbatical work, and/or significant self-study.
- Significant work on a 5-year university assessment report
- External grants or contracts awarded (not competitive)
- Development of non-referred CEU or professional development modules/trainings/workshops/tutorials

2 points

- Gathering data and authoring a section of a full re-accreditation report (e.g., CAA-ASHA, NCATE, CTC)
- Gathering data and writing a annual/biannual report (CAA-ASHA, NCATE, CTC)
- Internal grants or contracts awarded

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- Non-reviewed non-scholarly publications (e.g. professional journal, newsletter, newspaper)
- Grant proposals submitted (external to the campus)
- Invited community presentations (in area of expertise)
- Award or honor (point value may be more based on the significance of the honor/award)

1 point

- Gathering data and substantial authoring of University assessment work
- Development of a specialized clinic
- Internal grants or research contracts submitted

**3. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY (CMSD)
(SERVICE)**

The CMSD program places high value on service as an essential component of faculty work. The primary focus of CMSD faculty service will be at the program level due to accreditations requirements (i.e., CAA-ASHA, NCATE, CTC) and clinical training obligations. After the first probationary year, each faculty member will provide major advising, which may require additional office hours in order to meet student need.

- a. The program functions as a committee of the whole. All faculty members participate in all program committees: e.g. Curriculum, Graduate Application Review, Graduate Interviews, Comprehensive Exams, Assessment, Accreditation, and other scheduled and Ad Hoc committees. See Appendix C for Service examples.
- b. In order to function efficiently as a committee of the whole to make and enact the best programmatic decisions, faculty must be collaborative, collegial, and function effectively as a team member (refer to Guidelines for Collegial Communication in Appendix F).
- c. Commensurate with the level of academic appointment, it is expected that tenured faculty will serve beyond the program. A variety of activities across university levels, in the community or with the profession can satisfy this expectation. For promotion to full professor, recognition at/or beyond the university is required.
- d. Service is evaluated for both quantity and quality. The candidate is responsible for detailing the quantitative and qualitative aspects of their performance in each major service activity. See Appendix C for examples of service activities.
 - 1) Quantity is defined as the breadth (number) of service activities and the time involvement for each.
 - 2) Quality includes the candidate's level of contribution to the service (e.g., assumption of key roles) and the impact the candidate's contribution has had on the project or work.
 - a). A key role is defined as participation that involves leadership, decision-making, and/or taking initiative on an activity.
 - 3) Evidence of quantity and quality must include candidate's description of the activity and should include external letters from committee leads or other documentation addressing the candidate's involvement and impact.

Ratings

- Superior: Demonstrates abundant and sustained high quality service that includes multiple lead and/or facilitative roles at the program level, and notable service to other university levels, community or profession. Additionally, candidate is a highly collegial, collaborative team member.
- Effective: Provides quality service consistent to the program; occasional assumption of a key role and provides some service to other university levels, community or profession commensurate with level of academic appointment. Candidate is a collegial, collaborative team member who meets expectations for level of appointment. Effective is the minimum rating required for 2nd year retention, tenure and promotion.
- Adequate: Demonstrates minimal service to the program in quality and/or quantity and/or lacks collegial and collaborative team member skills.
- Inadequate: No measurable evidence of quantity or quality service to the program, even with substantial mentoring; may show lack of willingness to participate; Inadequate is an unacceptable rating for retention.

4. CONTRIBUTIONS TO STRATEGIC PLAN AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY (CMSD)

The candidate must demonstrate an ability to adhere to University, College and Department/Program plans and demonstrate performance that generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department/Program's abilities to meet their strategic goals. This area of evaluation does not require a rating: The evidence of Teaching, Scholarship and Service will be reviewed relative to strategic plans and goals. To facilitate this process, the candidate will provide information in the narrative portion of the dossier that relates to adherence to strategic plans and goals at all levels of the university.

A. COMMUNICATION STUDIES EVALUATION AREAS AND CRITERIA

1. INSTRUCTION (CMST)

Contribution to the creation and support of innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environments is the first, minimum and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty. The goal of the department is teaching that results in achievement of effective student learning outcomes that can be accomplished in a variety of ways. While the following description is not comprehensive, it does suggest the complexity of teaching roles in the Department. All activities legitimately a part of a candidate's instructional assignment must be considered in the evaluation process.

- a. Areas of instruction for which faculty may be responsible include:
- 1) Regularly scheduled classes (including those for general education) and related instructional activities
 - 2) Supervision of on-campus and off-campus internships
 - 3) Various programs of instruction, on-campus (e.g., Honors, EOP, FYE).
 - 4) In-service instruction or other instruction, which includes on or off campus activities, weekend workshops, and conferences.
 - 5) Teaching-related leadership roles (e.g., course coordinator, TA supervisor)
 - 6) Chairing thesis committees

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016

- 7) Independent Study instruction
- b. Evidence of teaching quality will be primarily derived from the following categories of information:
- 1) Data reports that include:
 - Data from the Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs). These data shall be weighted in accordance with the current FPPP. The university requires all faculty to have SETs each semester in each course.
 - Data from the departmentally approved peer observation reports.
 - 2) Candidates' self reflection on instruction (including summary of SETs and peer observation reports) and teaching narrative
 - 3) Candidate teaching materials and other evidence that may include:
 - Student assessment practices (e.g., course GPAs placed in context, grading standards/rubrics, samples of graded work, feedback on assignments)
 - Involvement in significant campus teaching initiatives (e.g., service learning, civic engagement, CELT, technology and teaching).
 - Written anecdotal information supplied by faculty and students.
 - Representative instructional material such as course syllabi, assignments, instructional support, presentations and handouts.
 - Examples of student achievement other than customary measures used for grading; for example, recognition of student work by an external group or agency.
 - Effective use of technology for teaching
 - 4) Evidence of activities to enhance instruction (e.g., high-impact practices, pedagogy-based improvements, problem-based learning, interdisciplinary efforts, technology innovations, workload management improvements, etc.)
 - 5) The interview between the faculty member under review and the RTP Committee.
- c. Classroom Observation Procedure – See Appendix E

Ratings

- To achieve a rating of **Superior** in instruction, a candidate should have very strong and consistent evidence of excellent teaching in most categories, listed above.
- For an **Effective** rating, a candidate should have strong evidence of competent teaching in most categories..
- For an **Adequate** rating, a candidate should have evidence that reflects minimally acceptable teaching.
- An **Inadequate** rating indicates that the evidence fails to demonstrate satisfactory teaching.

2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT (CMST)

CSU, Chico is fundamentally a teaching institution, however, performance in **professional growth and achievement** is expected of all tenured/tenure track faculty. **Professional growth and achievement** at a comprehensive university may take many forms. In

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016

Communication Studies, **professional growth** is a necessary but not sufficient requirement of *retention*, whereas **professional achievement** is a necessary but not sufficient requirement of *tenure and promotion*.

- a. Professional **growth** is evidenced by currency in the discipline that best represents the training and experience of the faculty member, as well as active participation in the discipline. Examples of such currency and active participation include but are not limited to:
 - Regular attendance at the conferences of the major professional associations and societies representing the faculty member's discipline or related discipline;
 - Serving as a referee, panel member or critic relative to the papers presented at such conferences; and
 - Attending workshops for the purpose of acquiring skills necessary for professional achievement.
 - Successful completion of continuing education activities related to the discipline.
- b. Faculty should provide evidence of scholarly contributions to the field as evidence of professional **achievement**. Professional achievement refers to the faculty member's contribution to the knowledge base, theoretical and practical, of the field. The CMST program supports achievements related to broader scholarship on teaching and learning, areas of achievement that span or fall in between teaching, research and service, and more traditional scholarship resulting in publications and presentations of specified quality and quantity. Therefore, the CMST program welcomes clear justification of other, non-traditional, but still rigorous professional achievement, such as public scholarship, applied or technical reports, and significant presentations, that are not necessarily listed in the levels below.
- c. The candidate may provide evidence and rationale for other related activities to be considered as professional achievement. The candidate's products will be evaluated by the committee for quality, scholarly, and applied impact. The following lists include examples of common forms of professional achievement in CMST.

Level 1

- Scholarly books with respected publisher (may be evaluated as the equivalent of two to three articles, based on the significance of the work).
- Textbooks (not including self-published books)
- Articles (peer reviewed) (candidate to provide evidence of quality of publication)
 - Scholarly Journals
 - Proceedings (when subject to additional review)
- Chapters in edited scholarly books
- Significant competitive external grants, fellowships, or contracts awarded
- Editorship of a major scholarly journal
- Significant leadership in a national or regional organization.

Level 2

- Refereed conference papers at major national and regional associations
- Competitively awarded fellowships, grants and contracts external to the campus
- Refereed proceedings or papers
- Editorial Board of a major journal
- Significant awards and honors (value to be determined by RTP Committee based on significance of the award/honor).
- Substantial revisions of already published textbooks

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

Level 3

- Non-refereed presentations at professional conferences
 - Non-reviewed non-scholarly publications (e.g. professional journal, newsletter, newspaper)
 - Grant proposals submitted (external to the campus)
 - Internal grants or research contracts awarded
- d. In cases where the work of a faculty member has not been subjected to rigorous external review but achievement is claimed, the candidate will submit his/her work to an external review conducted by three individuals exceptionally well qualified to adjudicate the claim. These individuals will be selected by the RTP Committee on the basis of a list of five potential external reviewers submitted by the faculty member.
- e. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to appropriately categorize information relevant to the RTP Committee's evaluation of professional growth and achievement, clearly document this information. The candidate is responsible for justifying the level of each professional achievement.

Ratings

- To achieve a **Superior** rating in Professional Growth and Achievement, candidates should have either: (a) several high quality Level 1 accomplishments; (b) multiple high quality Level 1 accomplishments and several Level 2 achievements; or (c) multiple high quality Level 1 accomplishments, multiple Level 2 accomplishments, and multiple Level 3 accomplishments.
 - For a rating of **Effective**, candidates should have multiple high quality Level 1 accomplishment, or multiple Level 1 accomplishments, along with at least several other accomplishments at Levels 2 or 3.
 - To achieve a rating of **Adequate**, faculty in their fourth year and beyond must have at least one Level 1 accomplishment, along with several other accomplishments at Levels 2 or 3. Professional growth, in the form of progress toward achievements in Level 1, along with some accomplishments in Levels 2 or 3, shall be considered in performance review ratings for faculty in their first through third probationary years. For all other review years, the lack of any Level 1 accomplishments shall result in a rating of **Inadequate**.
3. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY (CMST)
(SERVICE)

Each faculty member is expected to carry a reasonable share of committee and other work assignments that are a normal part of the *department, college and university*. Contributions will be evaluated according to their significance. Level of service is commensurate with academic appointment; as faculty members advance in rank, they shall be expected to contribute more *significant service within and beyond the department*.

- a. Contributions to the Department: Participation in *regular* committee work and other activity necessary for the normal functioning of the Department is expected of all faculty members. Examples of service activities include but are not limited to:
- participating in program assessment (R)

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- service on MA related committees (R)
- serving as department chair, program director/coordinator, graduate coordinator, internship coordinator, course coordinators for multi-sectioned courses (such as general education courses), assessment facilitator
- departmental advising (R)
- student recruitment (R)
- developing and revising *undergraduate and graduate* curriculum materials (R)
- giving faculty workshops
- department and college scholarships
- advising student clubs
- serving on other important and/or time-consuming committees, such as Personnel or Search Committees

(R) = Regular service

- b. Contributions to the College, University, and Community: Various service opportunities to college, university and community are available; faculty are expected to participate commensurate with rank.
- c. Contributions to the Discipline: Consultancies with organizations external to the university and offices held in and services for professional association will be evaluated according to the significance of the contribution and its relevance to a faculty members training and teaching responsibilities. Examples of disciplinary service may include: reviewing papers and proposals for conferences; reviewing papers for journals; serving on scholarship, grant, or award committees

Ratings (will be reflective of rank)

- **Superior** performance is evidenced by the candidate's consistently high level of involvement and assumption of key roles on significant University, College, and/or Department committees, as well as the demonstration of consistent, on-going contributions to such committees.
- **Effective** performance is evidenced by the candidate's consistent, on-going contributions and occasional assumption of key roles on significant University, College, and/or Department committees.
- **Adequate** performance is evidenced by the candidate's regular service contributions and infrequent assumption of key roles on University, College, and/or Department committees.
- **Inadequate** performance is evidenced by the candidate's lack of assumption of key roles on University, College, and/or Department committees and only limited participation on committees at these levels.

4. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY (CMST)

The candidate must demonstrate an ability to adhere to University, College and Department/Program plans and demonstrate performance that generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department/Program's abilities to meet their strategic goals. This area of evaluation does not require a rating: The evidence of Teaching, Scholarship and Service will be reviewed relative to strategic plans and goals. To facilitate this process, the candidate will

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

provide information in the narrative portion of the dossier that relates to adherence to strategic plans and goals at all levels of the university.

X. CMAS DOSSIERS

A. TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Candidates being reviewed for retention, tenure and/or promotion are to submit a dossier according to the current FPPP guidelines 8.1.3, to the Dean's office according to the given timeline. Post Tenure Review Faculty (i.e., 5th year reviews) are to submit a dossier according to the current FPPP (11.2) guidelines to the Department office according to the given timeline. The purpose of the dossier is to provide evaluators with the information and materials necessary to accurately judge the candidate's performance in the areas under review. Present the dossier information in a 1.5" maximum, 3-ring binder, and a Supplementary Evidence 3-ring Binder that can be up to 3". Any items not required by the dossier shall be indexed in the Supplementary binder, to be kept in the college office during the RTP review cycle. Consult the CME Handbook and the directions provide below. The dossier shall be updated at least annually and shall contain the following material:

1. 1-2 page summary of your accomplishments (Teaching, PGA, Service) at the front of your dossier as a quick reference sheet for reviewers.
2. A copy of the current Department Personnel Policy and Procedures document
3. Current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
4. A Narrative
In addition to the above elements, the candidate shall provide a Narrative in the dossier. As noted in the current FPPP 8.1.3.e.3. "The Narrative should provide a context for the reviewers to understand and evaluate the candidate's activities and achievements contained in the dossier. The candidate should use the narrative to highlight the scope and quality of his/her 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, other sections of the FPPP, and the CBA." The Narrative should clearly frame relevant accomplishments and evidence provided as support in the dossier or Supplementary Binder. The Narrative will succinctly and directly address all areas of evaluation and specifically include:
 - a. Focus on Instruction including:
 - A reflective statement on his/her teaching philosophy/strategies/objectives and how these have impacted the candidate's teaching.
 - A reflection upon relevant SETs, as summarized in the instructional supporting materials, for the review period, including observations about strengths & weaknesses, as well as implemented or planned improvements.
 - A description of how the candidate's professional development and scholarship has been integrated into his/her teaching or how the Teacher-Scholar model is followed.
 - b. Focus on Professional Growth and Achievement including:
 - A reflective assessment of scholarly work, both growth and achievements. If necessary, include a trajectory of certain works to clarify progress and/or unanticipated delays. Clarification of achievement quality and significance should also be addressed.

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- c. Focus on Other Contributions to the University(Service) including:
 - Accomplishments or activity appropriate for candidate rank or exceeding rank expectations and clarification and/or details of service if not regular departmental activity
 - d. Focus on his/her Contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University.
 - Specify activities in support of Plans and Goals
 - e. Focus on the goals and objectives for instructional, professional development and achievement, and/or service activity he/she plans to accomplish in the next review cycle.
5. Evidence (see FPPP 8.1.3.e.4 and CME Handbook Appendix 8)
- a. The candidate will present evidence that he/she is performing the tasks for which he/she was hired, and to which he/she is assigned. Primary and selective evidence only is provided in the dossier, with other supplemental evidence provided in the Supplementary Binder. Faculty should consult the CME Handbook, Appendix 8 for additional guidance. As appropriate to the individual faculty member's circumstances, dossier or supplemental binder contents include;
 - 1) Instruction. Evidence regarding teaching effectiveness should address the Department-Program standards to be considered in the evaluation and other relevant support materials noted in section IX above for CMSD (A.1 and Appendix B) or CMST Program (B.1).
 - 2) Professional Growth and Achievement. When compiling materials, the candidate should keep in mind that the quality of these activities is more important than the quantity of activities. The materials should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments regarding such quality. Materials included should reflect expectations noted in section IX above for CMSD (A.2 and Appendix C) or CMST Program (B.2).
 - 3) Other Contributions to the University and Community (also referred to as "Service"). When compiling these materials, the candidate should keep in mind that 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. Materials included should reflect expectations noted in section IX above for CMSD (A.3 and Appendix C) or CMST Program (B.3).
 - 4) Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, the Academic Plan of Academic Affairs, and University. While the materials in the above described dossier sections will likely address much or all of a candidate's performance relative to strategic plans and goals, the candidate should make sure that any additional evidence regarding performance towards these goals is included in the dossier in this section, if needed. The candidate should provide clear directions in the Narrative portion to the evidence in the dossier that relates to strategic plans and goals.
 - b. Candidates will need to show discipline in selecting the materials to include as support, using only those that provide the best direct evidence for achievement and activity addressed in the Narrative, as those are to be the relevant items for consideration in the performance or periodic review.

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

- c. Current suggestions for the Dossier preparation recommend it be no larger than a 3” binder. If there is a need for more space for lengthy items, candidates are encouraged to place those items in a secondary binder, noting their location in the Narrative.

B. LECTURERS

As noted in section VI. A, “The term ‘Lecturer’ is the preferred term for representing Temporary Faculty by the CMAS department”. Candidates are to submit an updated and current dossier (or “supplemental evidence” according to the current FPPP 9.1.2.c.1 guidelines) to the Department office according to the given timeline. Please see FPPP 9.1.2. and Appendix D for more details about the Dossier.

XI. CMAS INTERVIEWS

- A. Each full-time faculty member under review shall have an interview with the full Program Personnel Subcommittee prior to the University deadline for the relevant RTP report (FPPP 10.2.6).
- B. The purpose of the interview shall be to answer unresolved questions on the part of any of the participants in the retention, tenure, or promotion process. Committee members may question the faculty member regarding any issue affecting the retention, tenure, or promotion decision- making process. The faculty member must be afforded an opportunity at this meeting to respond to these questions and to receive answers to his/her inquiries about the retention, tenure, or promotion process. Other CMAS department Personnel Committee members and the Chair may be present at this meeting (if not already attending). The chair may participate in it either as Chair or as a member of the department RTP committee (FPPP 10.2.6).
- C. The interview during periodic reviews will consist of a discussion of strengths and deficiencies and offer feedback when necessary, as well as identifying sources of aid to promote strengths and correct deficiencies.
- D. The interview during performance reviews will also provide an assessment of the candidates performance in the evaluation areas and feedback for any areas in need of improvement.
- E. Minutes of the questions, responses and answers shall be kept. At a minimum, such minutes shall contain a written digest of the substance of the interview. They shall become a part of the WPAF.

APPENDICES
Appendix A: Description of Program - CMSD

A.1. Vision

The CMSD program is envisioned to be a model training program for developing the highest quality professionals, and to be a model clinical facility, recognized throughout the California North state for high-quality speech-language and hearing services.

A. 2. Mission

The mission of the Communication Sciences and Disorders (CMSD) program is to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to enter the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology through an enriched, flexible, and innovative learning environment, both academically and clinically, that fosters quality of thought and creative, research-based problem-solving, life-long learning and consummate professionalism. To meet these ends, the program aims to employ expert, student-oriented faculty and staff. We are dedicated to program growth and to the procurement of the necessary supportive resources. We continue to enhance associations with the university and local communities to provide greater interdisciplinary and collaborative research and clinical opportunities for our students, clients, and faculty. The CMSD program is committed to being a model clinical facility, recognized throughout the California North state for both the advancement of student learning and for high quality, state-of-the-art services, outreach, and resources to the community.

A.3. Strategic Objectives

Based on the two primary goals of excellence in academic and clinical education and excellence in clinical service in speech-language pathology, the CMSD program is committed to the following strategic objectives.

***Objective 1)** Promote and maintain a student learning environment that fosters intellectual curiosity, creative problem-solving, and use of research and technology in teaching and learning through an innovative, flexible curriculum with service learning and community service opportunities.*

***Objective 2)** Promote the Teacher-Scholar model that encourages faculty to infuse experiential learning, evidence-based practice and peer-reviewed research into the learning process; and to disseminate basic and applied research into the community via publications, presentations, and tutorials.*

***Objective 3)** Employ a sufficient number of expert faculty and staff in order to meet mission goals.*

***Objective 4)** Promote scholarly growth and achievement by supporting professional education and research opportunities for faculty and local SLP professionals*

***Objective 5)** Prepare graduate students for professional licensure, certification, and credentialing, employment in any setting, and when appropriate, doctoral level training.*

***Objective 6)** Promote the highest standards for academics and clinical training in order to maintain national accreditation through CAA- ASHA, regional accreditation through (WASC, NCATE), and*

state accreditation through CCTC.

Objective 7) *Through the Center for Communication Disorders, provide quality service to the North state-at large, university, and K-12 communities, through the use of technology, research, and excellence in clinical teaching, including currency in clinical knowledge and interdisciplinary approaches, through continued training of faculty and supervisors.*

Objective 8) *Accommodate a growing program by improving, strategically managing, and systematically evaluating adequacy of resources for faculty, staff, and facilities.*

A. 4. CMSD's Guiding Principles for Evaluation

The following guiding principles are supported by CMSD faculty and are consistent with FPPP, CBA and the University's and program's goals and objectives.

Based on the following beliefs of who we are as CSU, Chico professors in the fields of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, we ascribe to these principles to guide us in our desire to develop and achieve professionally and to provide evaluation guidelines for retention, tenure and promotion.

We believe:

- in the primacy of teaching at this institution and have the expectation of academic and clinical teaching excellence for all CMSD faculty
- that teaching must be informed by current, relevant research literacy and clinical practice, which leads us to support the Teacher-Scholar model. Refer to definition below.
- that the evaluation areas of teaching, PGA and service can and often overlap, which necessitates CMSD to evaluate faculty as holistically as possible
- that "The richness of faculty talent should be celebrated, not restricted. Only as the distinctiveness of each professor is affirmed will the potential of scholarship be fully realized." (Boyer, 1990, p. 27)
- that much of our program work is better done in collaboration with others and therefore we expect collegiality and high level ability to work as a team, abiding by ASHA's Code of Ethics and Faculty Code of Conduct; we embrace Interprofessional Education and Practice
- in supporting individual differences in strengths and competencies and fully realize that some will demonstrate strengths in a primary area
- that CMSD's required continued state of program evaluation due to accreditations by 3 different bodies, development and improvement constitute substantial faculty time and energy that must be recognized and compensated for in the evaluation process
- that our unique clinical education model defines us, brings scholarly rigor to our program with evidence-based practice required in teaching and scholarship, and allows us to provide much needed speech, language and hearing services to the North state.

**Appendix B: Examples of Evidence for the four basic categories of instruction - CMSD
(non-exhaustive list)**

Area 1: Teaching Philosophy

Pedagogical approaches consistent with the Teacher-Scholar model

- links current basic scientific foundations and theories to current evidence-based practice in prevention, assessment and treatment.

Use of Service learning/ community service opportunities for students

Use of IPE, Collaborations, Team or co-teaching when available and appropriate

Use of variety of teaching techniques

- case studies
- group work
- EBP
- instructional technologies, other classroom innovations

Differentiated instruction (to meet students at different learning levels)

Updates instructional materials to remain current

Area 2: Teaching Effectiveness

Manages teaching environment

- Course organization
- Preparation
- Clear content delivery,
- foster student participation

Evaluates results (SETs and student letters, peer evals, self-evals)

Uses multiple methods for evaluation of student performance

Evidence of student growth following class

Demonstrates respect for students (Fosters a respectful learning environment)

Models professional behavior we wish to see in our students

Available for students

- Maintain appropriate office hours

Area 3: Reflection, Improvement Plans, and Implementation

Use of student, self, and peer evaluation data for improvements

Uses reflection for systematic improvements

Has clear expectations for goals

Attends Workshops/professional development focused on teaching practices

Area 4: Teaching Related Activities

Participation in Academy eLearning

Attendance at teaching workshops that promote innovation

Significant revamp of courses or new course proposal with ASHA standards in mind

Lead role in Independent studies

Lead role on a student thesis or other mentoring activities

Curriculum Development

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016

Teaching awards

Letters from former students, colleagues, community partners

Creating/evaluating comprehensive exams and “HOLD” assignments

Teaching related leadership roles

Off campus, community instruction, or after-hours instruction.

**Appendix C: Service Examples - CMSD
(non-exhaustive list)**

Program Committees of the Whole:

Curriculum
Search
Grad Selection
Grad Performance Review
Assessment
Accreditation
Program Facilities, Equip and Materials
Comprehensive Exam
RTP
Advisory Board
Scholarship Committee for CMSD

Positions (Leadership roles):

Program Director
Advisory Board Chair
Graduate Coordinator
Clinic Director
Internship Coordinator
Associate Clinic Director
Assessment Coordinator
Accreditation Coordinator
NSSLHA Faculty Advisor
Honors/Thesis/Project Chair

Department: RTP Committee; Scholarship
Chair/committee; Library; Curriculum;
Chair/committee; CFA Representative

College: RTP; Curriculum; Leaves; Scholarship;
Faculty Grievance Committee

University: FASP; Academic Senate; EPPC; APR
Committee

Profession

Journal or Book reviewer
Paid or unpaid consulting, clinical work
Professional Organizations: Offices held or
other services performed
Continuing Education Program review

Other work:

Advising
Graduate Recommendation Letters
Student Support Letters
Recruit (e.g., Choose Chico, Prevw Day)
Program Promotion
Summer Orientation
Service related Workshops, Trainings and
Presentations

Community

Establishment and maintenance of
university-community partnerships
Inservices
Offices held or committee participation
in Advisory Boards
Other activities

Appendix D: Part Time Instructor Dossier – Both CMSD & CMST

You are asked to submit an updated Dossier each year when being reviewed, so that the Personnel Committee can write your Periodic Evaluation Report. The Personnel Committee requests that you submit the following information in your dossier and supplemental binder. After you have developed your first dossier, you can then update information that is relevant since your LAST report. Please note that “updated” and “current” means all elements of the Dossier (including the CV) include the most recent teaching and/or professional experiences that are to be considered in evaluations since the last review date to the dossier due date.

The report is made up of the following areas and to aid the committee in performing evaluations, all lecturers are asked to provide specific information needed, as noted below.

1. Teaching Performance

If you have taught classes previously, please provide a summary of SET results (the full SETs reports are included in your WPAF, so you do not need to also reprint in your Dossier). Of particular interest are the overall means across the main areas of evaluation (A-I) for each course. Additionally, you may want to calculate an Overall Mean for certain areas across semesters for the same class. Please note that we are looking for SET results for the classes taught since your last report; however, we are happy to see all SET results if you have summarized these already. There should also be a brief summary of written comments, indicating themes, both positive and any concerns or problems voiced by students. In addition to the summary of SETs quantitative and qualitative information, you need to provide a reflection on those scores and comments, specifically noting strengths and weakness areas, as well as including specific plans for improvements in weaker areas.

In addition, in order to provide meaningful evidence of teaching performance, the candidate should include the following in the dossier (see current FPPP) as needed and relevant (be judicious), all items should be current and updated for the courses you are currently teaching or taught since your last report:

- Course syllabi
- Creative teaching materials
- Sample graded tests
- Samples of evaluated student papers and/or projects
- Descriptions of student-centered learning activities, and/or student outcome assessment plans, materials and results
- Evidence of involvement in general studies courses
- Description/evidence of curriculum and program development (e.g., new courses and programs).

2. Performance in Non-Teaching Work Assignments

Address any work details specified in job description or appointment letter and/or provide evidence of performance in any area of work assignment other than teaching.

3. Currency in the Field & Professional Activity: (please list any activities that are applicable)

- Presentations made
- Publications

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016

- Workshops/Conferences attended
- Other Activities to maintain currency and knowledge
- Professional Organization Membership
- Community Involvement

4. Other Contributions to the University - please list departmental or university activities you have participated in besides your current classes that represent positive assistance to the department or university.

Appendix E: Peer Observation Process – Both CMST & CMSD

For either tenure-track (full-time) or lectures (part-time), a representative from the CMAS Personnel Committee will contact the faculty member to arrange for a classroom visit on an appropriate day of instruction, and will confirm the date and time of the observation at least 5 days or more in advance. Evaluations will be conducted on regularly assigned classes and/or new assignments.

All visitations and reports for any lecturer must be completed PRIOR to the evaluation report deadline, allowing enough time for the lecturer to review and sign the report. This date will be earlier than RTP calendar due dates for observations or reports, in order to facilitate the completion of a report. Observations for lecturers without pending reports, must be completed by the stated deadline and should be avoided in the last 2 weeks of any given semester. Observations for full-time faculty under review must be completed prior to the scheduled interview with the Personnel Committee, this date will be earlier than the RTP calendar due dates for observations.

Prior to the observation and in order to provide a focus for the observer, the faculty member will consult with the observer and provide information as needed on:

- Goals for class session, agenda or outline
- Strategies to be used to achieve goals
- Materials to be read in advance, if relevant

The Peer Observation Report will provide descriptive and evaluative information addressing the following areas (see below for actual report format for lecturer and full-time):

- Effectiveness of the delivery of the lesson
- Effectiveness of the communication during the lesson
- Demonstrated knowledge in the field during the lesson
 - For lecturers, individual ratings for each of the areas above and an Overall Rating is provided for the particular session, this rating is either: Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory
 - For full-time faculty, individual ratings for each of the areas above and an Overall rating is provided for the particular session, this rating ranges from Inadequate, Adequate, Effective, to Superior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES
 PEER EVALUATION REPORT – PART TIME-Lecturer

Name of Faculty Member Being Reviewed:

Reviewer's Name:

Rank:

Course:

Was Observed At:

Time Date

I. In order to provide a context for your subsequent and more particular evaluations and comments, please give a brief (2-3 sentence) description of the content and activities for the instructional period observed.

II. In general, the instructor demonstrated effective delivery of the lesson:

• Time used efficiently/effectively	1	2	3	4	5
• Prepared	1	2	3	4	5
• Organized	1	2	3	4	5
• Clearly presented	1	2	3	4	5
• Appropriate for student level	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>			<i>Satisfactory</i>	
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

Comment:

III. The instructor demonstrated effective communication in the classroom

• Encourages student participation	1	2	3	4	5
• Fostered student interaction	1	2	3	4	5
• Demonstrated respect for students	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>			<i>Satisfactory</i>	
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

Comment:

IV. The instructor's presentation of the lesson demonstrated knowledge in the field

• Clear demonstration of knowledge in the field in relation to lesson	1	2	3	4	5	
• Relevance and/or significance of information made clear	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Able to answer student questions	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>			<i>Satisfactory</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	

Comment:

V. Based on my observations of this instructor on this particular day, I judge the professor's teaching to be (circle one of the following university-approved adjectives):

Unsatisfactory

Satisfactory

Comment:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES
PEER EVALUATION REPORT – FULL TIME-Tenure/Tenure Track

Name of Faculty Member Being Reviewed:

Reviewer’s Name:

Rank:

Course:

Was Observed At:

Time Date

I. In order to provide a context for your subsequent and more particular evaluations and comments, please give a brief (2-3 sentences) description of the content and activities for the instructional period observed.

II. In general, the professor demonstrated effective delivery of the lesson:

- Time used efficiently/effectively 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Prepared 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Organized 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Clearly presented 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Appropriate for student level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<i>Inadequate</i>								
<i>Adequate</i>								
<i>Effective</i>								
<i>Superior</i>								
Overall Ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Comments:

III. The professor demonstrated effective communication in the classroom

- Encourages student participation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Fostered student interaction 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Demonstrated respect for students 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<i>Inadequate</i>								
<i>Adequate</i>								
<i>Effective</i>								
<i>Superior</i>								
Overall Ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Comments:

IV. The professor’s presentation of the lesson demonstrated knowledge in the field

- Clear demonstration of knowledge in the field in relation to lesson
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Relevance and/or significance of information made clear
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 n/a
- Able to answer student questions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 n/a

<i>Inadequate</i>								
<i>Adequate</i>								
<i>Effective</i>								
<i>Superior</i>								
Overall Ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

Comments:

V. Based on my observations of this instructor on this particular day, I judge the professor's teaching to be (circle one of the following university-approved adjectives):

Inadequate

Adequate

Effective

Superior

Comments:

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Date Submitted:

Cc: Personnel File:
(5 days after submission)

Student Evaluation of Supervisor

Please evaluate your Clinic / Diagnostic Supervisor and return this form to Jackie McMillan no later than 2:00 pm, _____

Date:

Supervisor:

Semester:

Which class is this evaluation for? *

CMSD 684 (Clinical Practicum)

CMSD 682 (Speech Diagnostics)

Evaluation

1. Overall summary as a supervisor

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

2. Expectations regarding clinical responsibilities communicated to students

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

3. Procedures for writing and submitting lesson plans and/or evaluation

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

4. Held scheduled conferences with student

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

5. When lesson plans are submitted in advance, lesson plans were viewed prior to sessions and returned to student in time to make any changes indicated

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

6. Fulfilled observation commitment to student

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

7. Evidenced knowledge of communication disorder for which supervision was provided

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

**Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016**

8. Served as a resource person in supplementing theoretical information with practical suggestions regarding clinical activities

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

9. Encouraged student to become more independent as the term progressed

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

10. Promoted active participation of student during supervisor/clinician conferences

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

11. Evidenced receptivity to feedback from student

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

12. Areas of weakness communicated to student with suggestions for improvement

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

13. Areas of strength communicated to student

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

14. Suggestions regarding clinical activities accompanied by the rationale governing them

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

15. Evidenced a willingness to permit a variety of valid procedures within the framework of broadening the student's experience without jeopardizing client's performance

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

16. Written and verbal comments included both positive and negative feedback regarding all aspects of clinical functioning

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

17. Exhibited fairness in evaluating in-session performance *

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

18. Exhibited fairness in evaluation written work

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

19. Helpfulness of suggestions

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

20. Exhibited flexibility in all aspects of clinical supervision

NA	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory			Outstanding		
NA <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	6 <input type="radio"/>	7 <input type="radio"/>	8 <input type="radio"/>	9 <input type="radio"/>

Comments:

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION ARTS & SCIENCES
GRADUATE ASSISTANT EVALUATION FORM**

Name of Graduate Assistant _____

Name and Title of Supervisor _____

Department of Assignment _____

Brief description of duties _____

The performance of this graduate assistant during the _____ semester of 20____ was:

_____ Superior

_____ Effective

_____ Adequate

_____ Minimal

_____ Inadequate

Comments:

Signed _____ (Supervisor) _____ Date

I have received a copy of this evaluation

Signed _____ (Graduate Assistant) _____ Date

Appendix F:
CMAS Guidelines for Collegial Communication – Both CMSD & CMST
Full Version

The following guidelines for collegial communication were adopted by the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences to formalize our commitment to respectful professional interactions. This document was created collaboratively and serves as a guide for desired behavior among colleagues, and may be referenced as such to facilitate discussion of collegiality at the individual or group level. We acknowledge diverse communication styles fit within the desired behaviors and are committed to working toward the achievement of shared understanding, rather than agreement per se.

1. Be Respectful

-Examples of respectful communication include:

- Communicating nonverbally and verbally that colleagues are valued, even and especially while disagreeing.
- Adopting attitudes of patience and acceptance for diverse perspectives and ways of contributing is valued.
- An attitude demonstrating that you value another person, their points of view, and accepting them as they are
- Being polite and kind, even when you are having a bad day
- Not gossiping about people – Talking to each other about problems, instead of about each other is valued.
- Telling the truth – Honesty is valued.

Communication behaviors that show respect:

- One person speaks at a time
- Allow each person to make their point before interjecting
- Assert opinions respectfully
- If more than one person wants to contribute, raise hand to be acknowledged by facilitator
- Accept & appreciate personal opinion, particularly dissenting viewpoints
- Focus on solutions to problems, rather than fault-finding or blame
- Show general politeness, such as extending greetings or expressing concern and compassion

2. Communicate with Honesty/ transparency

3. Be an Active Listener/Participant

- Monitor your verbal and non-verbal behaviors; be self-aware
- Pay attention: Refrain from doing other work during meetings
- Refrain from forming your response or counterargument while person is speaking. Write a short note to keep it in mind when it is your turn to speak
- Use non-verbal “encouragers”
- Avoid side conversations
- Speak up for clarification when more information is needed
- Summarize the speaker’s points as you go and ask for clarification: “I heard you say XX; is that what you meant?”

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Performance and Periodic Evaluation Procedures May 2016

In order to listen actively we need to understand the following:

- Purpose of the conversation (to obtain information; to discuss; to complain; to understand; for enjoyment; to learn)
- Expected time frame of conversation
- Decision level required and by when

4. Engage in thoughtful, informed participation

- Prepare for meetings
- Complete your tasks on time.
- Follow through with responsibilities; if can't, ask for assistance.
- Learn the resources that are available to you so you can look up information for yourself

5. Encourage participation- inclusion

- Make sure all who wish to contribute can do so (let facilitator know if s/he not acknowledged someone)
- Engage in respectful, active listening

6. Appreciate individual differences in communication preferences:

- Casual conversation/small talk- some like it, some hate it. Be respectful of people's time. If you need to be done with the conversation: "I know you have more to say, but I have to get back to work now."
- Confrontation: Some fight, some fly, others freeze. Need to respect the other person's style. The confronter needs to defer to the non-confronter. If s/he is not ready to have an effective conversation, schedule a later time to talk about it. Nothing needs to be resolved immediately, and if there are emotions associated with it, it is often good practice to put some time between an incident and discussing it.

7. Show Discretion

- Careful with confidential or sensitive information in front of students or in public places
- Refrain from telling other people's stories, particularly when there are no facts or there are confidentiality issues to consider.

Email specifics

Consider the above, plus:

1. Subject lines:

- Information on urgency/priority can be in subject line: urgent, high priority, etc.
- Keep a thread going if emails are tied to same subject.
- Change subject line or write new email if it is a new subject

2. Content:

- Length: keep it as short and simple as possible
- Tone: respectful, re-read to check
- Details: provide brief background information, if necessary. Be clear on what response is needed, to whom, and by when.
- Determine when item should be put on a meeting agenda instead of send in an email because it is either too lengthy to explain or too complex. If it can't wait for a meeting, provide the details, but include urgent in subject line.

3. As the receiver of email, you are responsible to follow through with the request as specified in the email. Please keep in mind that the information is needed and important to the sender.

Meeting specifics

Consider the above, plus:

1. Prioritize agenda items
2. Meet in smaller groups when possible to discuss ahead of larger meetings and make preliminary decisions: Options, committees
3. Start meetings on time
4. Have focused discussion
5. Make decisions as needed
6. End on time