

1. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

All faculty, whether full-time or part-time or temporary or permanent, will be evaluated periodically according to the processes specified in the FPPP¹ Section 8.0, *Evaluation of Faculty*, the CBA² – Article 15 – *Evaluation*, and additional departmental criteria outlined in this document.

1.1 TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS)

Please refer to FPPP Sections 8.2-8.4, [*Evaluation of Full-Time Temporary Faculty*] and CBA Article 15, *Evaluation*.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.2.d.4:

The PERSONNEL COMMITTEE shall notify the TEMPORARY FACULTY at the beginning of each personnel cycle that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to update his/her personnel file and supporting materials on an annual basis.

Pursuant to FPPP 8.2.d.5:

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. (See FPPP 8.2.d.5 for further details).

1.1.1 Part-Time Lecturers

Please refer to FPPP Section 8.2 and 8.4. [*Evaluation of Temporary Faculty and CBA Article 15, Evaluation*].

Pursuant to FPPP 8.2.d.1:

All part-time faculty 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. 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.

1.1.2 Full-Time Lecturers

Please refer specifically to FPPP Section 8.3, [*Evaluation of Full-Time Temporary Faculty*] and CBA Article 15, *Evaluation*.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.3:

All full-time TEMPORARY FACULTY 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. (See FPPP Section 8.3a for further

1 All references to the FPPP refer to the [Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures](http://www.csuchico.edu/faaf/Documents/FPPP1011.doc), <http://www.csuchico.edu/faaf/Documents/FPPP1011.doc>

2 All references to the CBA refer to the [Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 3](http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAatoc.shtml), http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAatoc.shtml

details).

1.2 PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Please refer to FPPP Section 8.5, *[Evaluation of] Tenure-Track (Probationary) Faculty*, CBA Article 13, *Probation and Tenure*, Article 15, *Evaluation*, and Section 2 below, *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Department Standards*.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.5:

Probationary Faculty are subject to two different types of performance evaluations. The first, called PERIODIC EVALUATION, focuses on providing the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by all involved with the process.

The second type of performance evaluation is called the PERFORMANCE REVIEW, wherein a critical assessment of the faculty member's performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal ratings of performance in each area of review are used, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.6:

Normally, PERIODIC EVALUATIONS are done in the faculty members' first, third, and fifth years; PERFORMANCE REVIEWS are conducted in the faculty members second, fourth, and sixth years. It is in this sixth year that the decision is made to offer tenure or to release the faculty member from employment.

Table 1 – *Schedule for Evaluations & Reviews*, is included as a reference to the "Normal Sequence of Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews (see FPPP Section 8.5.a.14).

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.15:

For those PROBATIONARY FACULTY with instructional assignments, student evaluations must be used (if available) with such other kinds of information the DEPARTMENT/UNIT normally uses in assessing teaching effectiveness. It must also include consideration of professional growth and achievement and other service to the University. (see FPPP, Section 8.5.a.15 for more details).

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.16 (*General Notes on Evaluation: Due Care*):

The Department/Unit faculty and Chair must carefully assess the performance record, taking account of the quality, as well as quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's achievements. The evaluation becomes (1) the primary information to the candidate regarding performance expectations and (2) the basis for evaluations at subsequent

LEVELS OF REVIEW.

The Department's and Chair's evaluations, based upon information in the WPAF, must be related to the established standards and criteria, and elucidated so that evaluators outside of the candidate's discipline can understand and further evaluate them.

Probationary faculty shall pay special attention to the department level criteria for evaluation as made explicit below, in Section 2 RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DEPARTMENT STANDARDS. For purposes of RTP evaluation, participation in scholarly activities is considered to be of lesser significance than the actual production and formal dissemination of scholarly work. It is recognized by the department however, that participation is valuable for professional growth and is to be encouraged and supported whenever possible.

1.3 TENURED FACULTY

Please refer to FPPP Section 8.6, [*Evaluation of*] *Tenured Faculty* and CBA Article 14, *Promotion*, Article 15, *Evaluation*, the attached Addendum, *Proposed Periodic Evaluation of ECC Tenured Faculty*, and Section 2 below, *Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Department Standards*.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.6.a:

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 also CBA, Article 14.3.)

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.6.b.1.a:

For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member's effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to PERIODIC EVALUATION at intervals no greater than five years. (See FPPP Section 8.6.b for further details).

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.6.c.1:

The DEAN, following consultation with the Department Chair, may initiate an early PERIODIC EVALUATION. Periodic Evaluations for tenured faculty shall not occur more frequently than once per year. (See FPPP Section 8.6.c for further details).

Periodic Evaluations of tenured faculty will be subject to the criteria detailed in the FPPP 8.6.b and in the *Periodic Evaluation of ECC Tenured Faculty* document prepared by the College Council (see attached Addendum). Where discrepancies between the documents occur, the more rigorous standards will be enforced.

Table 1 – Schedule for Evaluations & Reviews

Probationary Year	Type of Report	Report Writers
1 st Year	Periodic Evaluation	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Dean
2 nd Year	Performance Review	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Personnel Committee College Dean President and/or Designee
3 rd Year	Periodic Evaluation	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Dean
4 th Year	Performance Review	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Personnel Committee College Dean President and/or Designee
5 th Year	Periodic Evaluation	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Dean
6 th Year	Performance Review	Dept. Personnel Committee* Department Chair ** College Personnel Committee College Dean President and/or Designee

* May include the Department Chair when the Department Chair elects not to serve as a separate report writer.

** When the Department Chair elects not to serve as a member of the Department/Unit Personnel Committee.

2. RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DEPARTMENT STANDARDS

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.3:

The Department/Unit standards must be approved by the DEAN and Provost in order to be valid. Once approved, the standards shall be used at all LEVELS OF REVIEW.

Department/Unit standards (and any subsequent changes in them) must be approved prior to October 1 and become effective in the subsequent academic year.

Pursuant to FPPP Section 8.5.a.4:

Department/Unit standards shall recognize that different types of accomplishment are valued, and each candidate is not expected to excel in all areas in order to be retained, tenured, or promoted. While effective teaching is the primary, essential, and minimum criterion for success at this University, Department/Unit standards shall recognize that there are various ways for faculty to contribute to the University and to achieve professional success. Performance in Professional Growth and Achievement is expected of all faculty. Service is important and deserves appropriate recognition in the review process. To some extent, exceptional performance in one area of review may compensate for lesser contributions in other areas of review.

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. Candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion (RTP) are expected to fulfill all University requirements for retention, tenure, or promotion. Section 8.5 of the FPPP, along with Article 13 of the CBA, outlines these general requirements, while specific requirements of the Department are outlined herein.

In addition to the general requirements (FPPP Section 8.5 and CBA Article 13), 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.

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; and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.

2.2 INSTRUCTION

2.2.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is the primary and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and ultimately, promotion. The goal is a sustained record of growth in teaching effectiveness. It is required that the faculty member demonstrate his/her teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching will be consistent with the FPPP 8.5.a.17 and the CBA, Article 15. Here are some of the means by which faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness:

1. Teaching courses at an appropriate level and using course materials of appropriate rigor;
2. Being qualified to teach some Computer Science courses at the graduate level;
3. Maintaining high standards of student achievement as demonstrated by exams, reports, projects, and grade records;
4. Receiving student teaching evaluation ratings and comments from the University-approved Student Evaluation of Teaching (see FPPP Section 4.0) which indicate that the majority of students perceive that the faculty member is an effective teacher;
5. Obtaining peer evaluations from a cross-section of faculty (preferably not all from within the department) which assess the student learning experience positively;
6. Using a variety of pedagogical methods to improve the student learning experience, including but not limited to, the campus Learning Management System (LMS), Student Response Systems (clickers), simulation or modeling tools, and demonstration tools.

It is also desirable for the faculty member to demonstrate that they are engaged in activities that help sustain effective teaching and growth as an instructor. Some of the activities that cultivate effective teaching and enhance the teaching profession include -

1. Developing innovative teaching techniques and strategies which

- enhance the learning process;
- 2. Curriculum and program development;
- 3. Student advising;
- 4. Assisting in professional organizations, including contests and competitions;
- 5. Attending seminars, workshops, or short courses which address effective teaching methods and techniques;
- 6. Supervising students working on honors, research, or thesis projects.

2.2.2 On-line Instruction

Expectations, standards, data sources, and evaluative criteria for on-line instruction shall adhere to the requirements set forth for on-line instruction in the FPPP, Sections 8.5.a.17.b and 8.5.a.17.c.

2.2.3 Student Outcomes Assessment

In view of the current and growing demand for assessment of student learning, a well-organized plan for student assessment shall be demonstrated. This assessment will include taking steps to ensure that the relevant skills are being taught in core courses, and that pertinent, up-to-date material is covered in the courses the individual teaches. Whether by traditional exams, projects, written works, or by other means such as student portfolios, the details of and the results from the assessment of student learning and how it, in turn, has affected teaching shall be documented. In addition to the assessment of student learning in his/her particular courses, the faculty member shall link his/her assessment plan with the department or program assessment plan.

2.2.4 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

There are numerous ways that effective teaching supports the University Mission and stated priorities. Priority one is “we will continue to develop high-quality learning environments both inside and outside the classroom.” It is suggested that the faculty member review the University Strategic Plan, and discuss with peers how his/her teaching plan can enhance the University’s stature as a center for active, student-centered learning. The faculty member shall demonstrate how his/her teaching activities contribute to the department, college and university strategic plans. Such contributions may include but not be limited to: involvement with General Education, enhancement of instructional technology, introducing new material into the curriculum, etc.

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 Scholarship

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, the following list. They are listed in order of their value to the discipline and thus toward promotion. No less than two significant contributions must be made within the top three categories to be considered for promotion. Categories include:

1. Quality publications in refereed computer science related journals and refereed conference proceedings, as well as textbooks. Examples of the highest quality would be technical papers in the various publications of IEEE or ACM. Culminating refereed publications in prestigious journals are highly regarded and are generally considered more significant than conference proceedings or textbooks. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the publication itself. Both collaborative and independent research and publication will be equally considered, and valued according to the quality of contribution.
2. Development of externally funded research projects in the discipline, including contracts and grants, and the dissemination of their results to the broader research community. Non-refereed publications or presentations will require more quantity than refereed publications. Both collaborative and independent activities will be equally considered, and valued according to the quality of contribution.
3. Relevant consulting activities, including funded projects, contracts, grants, funded release time, and/or industry experience. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the consultant's or principal investigator's report, presentation materials, and/or evaluations/recommendations of the contracting body/employer, and, as permissible from the contracting party, dissemination of the results among peers. Non-refereed publications or presentations will require more quantity than refereed publications. Both collaborative and independent activities will be equally considered, and valued according to the quality of contribution.
4. Participation in professional development courses, seminars, conferences, or summer institutes. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the certificate of attendance or other evidence of attendance.
5. Membership and/or participation in professional society functions and activities, including editorial responsibilities for professional publications and other professional activities in support of the various functions of professional organizations. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be membership verification materials and other evidence of participation in activities in support of professional organizations.

2.3.2 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

There are ample opportunities for linkage between an individual's teaching, scholarship and professional activities, and the University's Strategic Plan, as outlined in the Mission and Priorities statements. It is suggested that the faculty member carefully review the University Strategic Plan, and demonstrate how his/her teaching, scholarship, professional and service activities contribute to the mission and priorities outlined in the University, College of ECC, and department strategic plans.

2.3.3 Professional Responsibility & Cooperative Interaction with Faculty, Staff, and Community

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 met at a satisfactory level, it need not be addressed by the faculty member or by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations.

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 met at a satisfactory level, it need not be addressed by the faculty member or by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations.

2.4 OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY

2.4.1 Curriculum and Program Development

There shall be evidence of activity in developing the curriculum in the department, through productive, cooperative interaction with other faculty. This includes activities that enhance the curriculum or that serve to link the curriculum with program assessment and the assessment of student outcomes. This also includes cooperative activities that support program review and program accreditation.

2.4.2 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

In addition to effective teaching, good scholarship and professional growth, there are other ways to support the strategic objectives of the department, college and university. Examples of such activities include -

1. Student recruitment and other similar outreach activities;
2. Fund-raising;
3. Development of relationships with industry or government which lead to employment opportunities for students, donations of cash or equipment, or research and development opportunities for faculty;
4. Development of relationships with K-12 students, teachers, and

- administrators that positively affect the university, the profession, and technical education, in particular;
5. Activities in support of student organizations;
 6. Organizing and/or hosting professional meetings, workshops or seminars;
 7. Involvement in community service activities;
 8. University service through activities such as service on university or college committees.