

1. OVERVIEW

The university standards for retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) are governed by the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP), which are updated annually. For the latest version of the FPPP, go to our campus Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) website at <https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp.shtml>.

From the FPPP: “Three areas of evaluation must be considered at all review levels in making recommendations on retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP): Instruction; Professional Growth and Achievement; and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community.” This document seeks to clarify those areas of evaluation for all faculty of the Department of Computer Science.

2. DEPARTMENT STANDARDS

One of the most striking features of a faculty position in a comprehensive university is its multidimensionality. Teaching, scholarship, and service are critical components of every faculty member’s job. The mission statement of CSU, Chico affirms the importance of instruction, research, and public service. New hires to tenure-track positions in the Department of Computer Science shall be aware of the many facets of their position and the expectations of the university, college, and department.

In addition to the general requirements of the FPPP, the Computer Science candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion must meet one of the following requirements in the field of computing:

1. a doctorate in an appropriate discipline; or
2. a graduate degree in Computer Science, and a significant professional career and/or a national or international reputation as an expert in the field.

Any exceptions to these requirements and the timetable for meeting the requirements as they relate to retention, tenure, and/or promotion will be spelled out in the hiring letter.

The following standards are those required by the department for retention, tenure, and promotion. The distinction among the three RTP categories is only in the degree of achievement in each standard. Reports at all levels of review shall indicate whether or not progress toward retention, tenure, and/or promotion is satisfactory, and if not, what corrective action or additional accomplishment is required.

Provisional Standard Approved 8-31-22 for AY 22/23 contingent upon receipt of revision per the 8-31-22 memo and attachments.

Standards must be compliant with the CBA and the FPPP. Conflicts between these standards and the CBA or the FPPP will be resolved pursuant to the CBA and then FPPP.

2.1. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION

In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual shall normally possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to promotion. In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual shall possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to the promotion.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Full Professor shall have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation; in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.

To evaluate faculty for RTP purposes, the department will use the following rubrics for each of the three areas of evaluation.

2.2. INSTRUCTION

Instructional effectiveness is the primary and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and ultimately, promotion. When assessing a faculty member's instruction, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each instructional category shall be classified according to its quality:

- **Major:** These demonstrate standard activities
- **Rare:** These are rare activities that are non-standard that require extra effort or recognition.

Each instructional activity shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table.

Category	Major	Rare
Instructional Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Creates and/or revises courses.● Exhibits content knowledge.● Prepares materials and resources that are factually correct and are at an appropriate level for the courses taught.● Aligns course content to learning outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Prepares significant updates to course materials to stay current with research and industry practice.● An award recognizing contribution in instructional design● Participates in designing new programs, certificates, etc. .

Category	Major	Rare
Instructional Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demonstrates aptitude and skills that facilitate students' engagement and learning (e.g., approachability, enthusiasm, interactive skills) ● Communicates concepts effectively ● Checks for students' understanding of the presented material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● An award recognizing contribution in instructional delivery ● Usage of a variety of evidence-based pedagogical practices ● Practicing the state-of-the-art teaching strategies to maintain high level of students' engagement ● Developing innovative teaching methods ● Demonstrating aptitude and skills that allow to connect with students on personal level (e.g., caring for students' success)
Assessment of Student Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Uses common approaches for assessing student learning (e.g., tests, quizzes, projects) ● Provides reasonable feedback to students in relation to a class size ● Continuous improvement of assessment strategies based on SET/SFOT and peer comments ● Participating in program assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develops innovative tools, procedures or strategies for assessing student learning ● Develops innovative procedures for meaningful and effective feedback to students ● Adopt variety of successful tools and techniques from research

<p>Commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Helpful Available during office hours● Creating a safe learning environment where each student is encouraged to contribute to the learning process● Participate in local training, conferences, FLC, etc related to EDI	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Provides sustained extra office hours● Provides sustained extra tutoring sessions● Practices sustained individual approaches for struggling students● Utilizes the university's resources to promote equity, diversity and inclusion● Demonstrates aptitude and skills that allow to connect with students on personal
--	---	--

Category	Major	Rare
		<p>level (e.g., caring for students' success)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attends external conference, talks, or workshops on diversity, equity and inclusion ● Creates or programs (workshops, research activities, camps, etc.) that promote diversity, equity and inclusion
<p>Continuous Improvement of Teaching/Learning process¹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reflection of peer reviews and SET/SFOT to improve teaching/learning process ● Updating course materials to reflect SET/SFOT and peer comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attending an external CS educational conference (or workshops) ● Regular participation in local educational workshops, faculty learning communities, or conferences
<p>Subject-area Professional growth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of a textbook(s) or other relevant materials such as research papers, or trusted online resources to maintain subject knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Integrate content into a course learned from expert sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attending an external CS subject-related non-educational conference ○ Taking a course in subject area from a leader in the field ○ Having an external industry or research experience ● Integrates state-of-the-art research and/or technologies into courses

2.2.1. Evaluating Instruction

When evaluating faculty members on instruction, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

¹ SET/SFOT scores are less important than faculty addressing how they are continuously improving their

teaching based on the feedback from students and peers.

Meets Expectations: Meets expectations candidates must satisfy all major activities, annually over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds expectations must meet expectations and have at least 3 distinct rare activities (bullet points), over the review period. At least one rare must come from the Instructional Design or Instructional Delivery activities.

2.3. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Professional growth and achievement are essential characteristics of effective instruction. It is by this means that faculty remain current in their discipline, maintain credibility with students and peers, and sustain their intellectual vitality. It is expected that the faculty member demonstrates and documents activities that contribute to his/her professional growth.

2.3.1. Scholarly Activities

Scholarship, in all its varied forms, has the common attribute of the creation of something that did not exist before which is then validated and communicated to others. Areas such as teaching and learning, and the discovery, integration or application of knowledge are all fundamental activities that constitute scholarly activities. The forms of scholarship that support professional growth and achievement in Computer Science include, but are not limited to, those listed in this section.

As a field, Computer Science evolves rapidly and areas within the field do not all adhere to the same standards of publication. For example, some areas follow a convention of ordering paper authors by the significance of their contribution while other areas order authors alphabetically. Likewise, the value of journal and conference publications differs by area. When the conventions for an area of research are deviating from the expectations described in this document, the faculty member shall supplement the records of their scholarship with a self-report assessment (along with sufficient evidence) to clarify and elaborate upon the significance of their scholarship. Conferences or journals that are predatory in nature do not count in faculty professional growth and achievement.

Both IEEE² and ACM³ require authors and co-authors to have made significant contributions to the intellectual merits of the scholarship as well as to the paper. Consequently, author orders on papers at venues sponsored by IEEE or ACM shall not impact the judgment of the quality of the faculty member's contribution. For other venues, evidence should be provided by the faculty member to attest to the significance of their authorship by the standards of that venue.

The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) are the leading professional and scholarly organizations for Computer Science. Conference papers and journals that are sponsored by ACM and/or IEEE are considered very high quality. In Computer Science, ACM and IEEE

² <http://ieeauthorcenter.ieee.org/publish-with-ieee/publishing-ethics/definition-of-authorship/>

³ <https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/authorship>

conference papers are peer-reviewed as complete papers (not just abstracts), published in conference proceedings, and are considered comparable quality to refereed journal articles. Both ACM Digital Library and IEEE Xplore include archived publications that are not from their respective venues; consequently, a publication’s presence in these databases alone does not necessarily evidence that the paper was published in an ACM or IEEE sponsored publication.

Computer Science is conducive to interdisciplinary scholarship that can yield quality publications that are not affiliated with either ACM or IEEE. When faculty publish in other venues, it is especially important to provide resources that demonstrate the standard practices of that particular discipline as well as the quality of the publication. For example, expectations for ordering authors may be cited in documentation from publishers or professional organizations.

When assessing a faculty member’s professional growth and achievement, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each professional growth and achievement outcome can be classified as a primary or supplementary outcome. The primary category shall be further classified according to its quality as follows:

Major: These outcomes demonstrate significant accomplishments with rigorous external validation.

Rare: These outcomes are rare accomplishments that exceed expectations by earning acknowledgment of quality among the highest in the field.

Each primary outcome shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table.

Primary Outcome Quality Classification Criteria		
Category	Major	Rare
Refereed Publications	Any peer-reviewed publication with venue corresponding acceptance rate ⁴ below 60% -OR- IEEE or ACM-sponsored publication -OR-	Venue with a corresponding acceptance rate below 25% -OR- Article in a journal that is prestigious in the research area -OR-

⁴ Acceptance rate of the venue during the same year the faculty member's paper was accepted

Primary Outcome Quality Classification Criteria

Category	Major	Rare
	Article in a journal with SJR Impact Factor ⁵ at least 0.5 -OR- Publication with at least 2 citations ⁶	Publication with at least 20 citations ⁷
External ⁸ Grants or Contracts	Role in an awarded grant/contract for at least \$10k	PI/Co-PI on awarded grant of at least \$100k overall budget
Textbooks	Chapter published by a university press -OR- Publicly available textbook or textbook chapter with evidence of adoption outside of CSU Chico by an accredited university -OR- Letter of support from an external expert in the subject of the textbook who evaluates it as high-quality	Textbook published by a university press -OR- Significant adoption and use of textbook, as demonstrated by evidence provided by the candidate

Supplementary activities shall each be assessed as equivalent value to a fraction of a major primary outcome. Accordingly, multiple supplementary activities may accumulate to the equivalent value of major primary outcomes. However, no number of supplementary activities shall count as equivalent to rare primary outcomes. The following table summarizes the fractional value of each supplementary activity:

⁵ Scimago Journal and Country Rank: <http://www.scimagojr.com/>

⁶ Citation count excludes “self-citations” (cited by the same faculty member in a different paper)

⁷ Citation count excludes “self-citations” (cited by the same faculty member in a different paper)

⁸ External grants/contracts include any with funding sources other than California State University, Chico

Supplementary Activity	Major Outcome Equivalency
Submitting an unfunded external grant proposal of at least \$10K	0.5
Role in an awarded external grant/contract for less than \$10k	0.5
Publicly available textbook or textbook chapter written	0.5
Patents, inventions, and other such developments of a significant scientific or engineering nature	0.5
Prestigious (inter)national award/recognition (e.g. ACM or IEEE Fellow)	0.5
Serving on a grant review panel	0.5
Delivering an invited talk at a conference or society meeting (e.g. keynote speaker)	0.5
Conference program committee member	0.5
Editor of a journal, conference proceedings, or book	0.5
Awarded internal grant(s)/contract(s)	0.3
Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry	0.2
Invited reviewer of journal articles, conference articles, chapters, or books	0.1
Mentoring a student's research that results in publication (that the faculty member did NOT co-author)	0.1

2.3.2. Evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement

When evaluating faculty members on professional growth and achievement, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings over the review period. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

Period of Evaluation	Meets Expectations	Exceed Expectations
2nd Year Probationary	At least 1 primary major outcome, that can be supplemental outcomes	At least 1 primary major outcome, not including supplemental outcomes
4th Year Probationary	At least 2 primary major outcomes, that can be supplemental outcomes	At least 2 primary major outcomes, not including supplemental outcomes
Tenure and/or Promotion	At least 4 primary major outcomes, of them, supplemental outcomes can only account for at most 2 equivalent primary major outcomes.	Equivalent to at least 6 primary outcomes where at least one of them is a rare outcome, and supplemental outcomes can only account for at most 2 equivalent primary major outcomes.

2.4. SERVICE

When assessing a faculty member’s service, both quantity and quality shall be considered. Each service category shall be classified according to its quality:

- **Major:** These demonstrate standard activities
- **Rare:** These are rare activities that are non-standard that require extra effort or recognition.

Each service activity shall be classified according to the highest criteria it meets, as described in the following table.

Category	Major	Rare
Student Advising	Candidate is involved in mandatory advising and other academic advising duties.	The candidate receives an award in recognition of advising excellence
Student Recruitment, Retention, Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity efforts	<p>Candidate is actively involved in student recruitment and retention efforts at the department level.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Choose Chico Day ● Sending students to Grace Hopper Celebration 	<p>Candidate is actively involved in student recruitment and retention efforts beyond the department level.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● College outreach programs
Advisor or Coach for a Student Club or Organization	<p>Candidate serves as (1) advisor for a recognized student club or organization on campus; or (2) coach for a student competition team.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UPE faculty advisor 2. ACM faculty advisor 3. USRO faculty advisor 4. ICPC coach 5. NCL coach 	N/A
Committee Membership	<p>Candidate sustains membership on a college- or department-level committee.</p> <p><u>Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Serves multiple years on the curriculum committee 	Candidates serves on a university or system-wide committee
Leadership in Committees	Candidate serves as a chair for a department-level committee.	The candidate serves as a chair for a university, college, or system-level committee.
Graduate Committee Involvement	Adviser or member of an MS committee.	Adviser or member of a Ph.D. committee for a candidate at another institution.

Category	Major	Rare
Community Outreach	<p>Candidate is actively doing work for regional, state, or local organizations.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working with ECC's McCloud Institute for Simulation Sciences. 2. Inspire HS Board 3. Boys & Girls Club 4. GirlsWhoCode 	<p>The candidate is actively doing work for a national or international organization.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board of Director member for NCWIT 2. Board of Director member for CRA 3. The executive committee for Boy Scouts of America
Reviewer for a Funding Agency	<p>Candidate is a reviewer for a regional, local, or university-level funding unit.</p>	<p>The candidate is a reviewer for a national or federal funding agency (e.g. NSF).</p>
Reviewer for conference or journal proceedings	<p>Candidate is a reviewer for a regional, local, or university-level conference or journal.</p>	<p>The candidate is a reviewer for a national or international conference or journal with reasonable quality.</p>
Editorial Work	<p>Candidate serves as a member of the Editorial Board on a peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings</p>	<p>Candidate serves as Editor or Associate Editor on a peer-reviewed journal or conference with high quality.</p>
Awards	<p>Candidate recognized with a university award for work as an advisor or for work in service organizations.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chico State Outstanding Faculty Service Award 2. Chico State Outstanding Academic Advisor Award 3. Glenn Kendall Public Service Award 	<p>Candidate recognized with an external award for work in service organizations.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACM Distinguished Service Award 2. IEEE Outstanding Service Award

Participation in a Recognized	Candidate serves as a committee member in a	Candidate (1) is an elected officer such as President, VP,
--------------------------------------	---	--

Category	Major	Rare
National or International Professional Organization	recognized national or international professional organization. Examples such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACM ● IEEE ● ASEE 	Secretary, Board of Trustees; or (2) serving as chair of a committee in a recognized national or international professional organization.
Faculty Mentorship	Candidate is actively involved in mentoring junior faculty in their home college and/or their home department.	The candidate is involved in mentoring faculty at the university level. <u>Examples:</u> 1. Lead in a campus Faculty Learning Community (FLC)
Leadership Role in the College	Candidate serves as Program Director or Department Vice-/Associate-Chair in the college.	The candidate serves as Associate Dean or Department Chair in the college.

2.4.1. Evaluating Service

When evaluating faculty members on service, the preceding guidelines shall inform the ratings. Faculty members shall be rated accordingly:

Meets Expectations: At least 3 separate, independent documented Major service activities, annually over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations to Associate: Meets expectations and at least two rare activities over the review period.

Exceeds Expectations to Full: Meets expectations and at least three rare activities over the review period.

2.5. RATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Upon scheduled performance reviews, the department review committee shall rate the faculty member on their performance for each of the three primary criteria: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service.

It is expected that the faculty member shall maintain high technical, professional, and ethical standards in their interaction with students, colleagues, staff, administration, the community, and the profession. If this standard is not met, it needs to be addressed by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations along with any necessary support documentation.

In addition to a faculty member's responsibility to maintain high ethical standards, it is meaningful to recognize the importance of maintaining a demeanor of respect for, and cooperative interaction with colleagues, staff, and the administration in carrying out the mission of the university. Whether it is in connection with committee work, outreach activities, curriculum development, or program assessment, faculty are expected to function cooperatively with others to further the stature of the program, department, college, and university. If this standard is not met, it needs to be addressed by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations along with any necessary support documentation.

2.5.1. Rating Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion

To qualify for tenure and/or promotion, faculty members are expected to meet at least a rating of Meets Expectations in all three criteria: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service. These expectations are summarized in the table below:

Category	Minimum Expected Rating
Instruction	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
Professional Growth and Achievement	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
Service	<i>Meets Expectations</i>

2.5.2. Rating Expectations for Accelerated Tenure and/or Promotion

To qualify for accelerated tenure and/or promotion, faculty members are expected to show exemplary performance, demonstrated by no ratings below Exceeds Expectations.

Category	Minimum Expected Rating
Instruction	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>
Professional Growth and Achievement	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>
Service	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>

Recommendation for **accelerated tenure** requires meeting the criteria for early promotion while demonstrating continued effectiveness in professional growth and achievement while maintaining a full teaching load for two sequential semesters.



Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

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

Approvals:

Chair/Director:	<u>Tyson R. Henry</u>	Date:	<u>Sep 6, 2022</u>
Dean:	<u>Blake Wentz</u>	Date:	<u>Sep 6, 2022</u>
OAPL:	<u>Mahalley D. Allen</u>	Date:	<u>Sep 7, 2022</u>
Provost:	<u>[Signature]</u>	Date:	<u>Sep 8, 2022</u>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2022

TO: Tyson Henry, Department Chair

CC: Blake Wentz, Dean

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

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of CSCI Department RTP Standards

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

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

- Document is missing information for lecturers and needs more clarity on retention reviews, e.g. periodic and performance.
- Document does not communicate the full requirements for accelerated to either associate or full. Note these requirements are in different sections of the FPPP.
- Is it true that there is no differentiation of achievement in instruction for all ranks? That is how the document reads.
- Clarify that 2.5.1 is applicable to both assistant to associate and associate to full.
- Document is missing information on periodic reviews of tenured faculty.
- Miscellaneous comments are provided to improve the document. For example, see the many comments on the service activities.

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

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

full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

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

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

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