



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 document to OAPL for review;
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with 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) OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footnote to page 1 of document:
 - a. Uploads document to OAPL website,
 - b. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to OAPL website location,
 - c. Emails Department Standards Approval Sheet to Department Chair for completion.

Approvals:

Chair/Director: Rebecca Justeson Date: Jul 13, 2021
Rebecca Justeson (Jul 13, 2021 LLL25 PDF)

Dean: Angie Anthony Date: Jul 13, 2021

OAPL: _____ Date: 8-31-21

Provost: _____ Date: _____

21-22

School of Education

Department Standards: FPPP reference guide to RTP and Evaluation

All general personnel procedures and practices in the department shall be governed and guided by university guidelines set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Unit 3), CSU Chico's Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures (FPPP), and campus Executive Memoranda. The following guidelines are provided as a reference guide to the FPPP sections that govern evaluations of tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty.



Table of Contents

1.0	<i>SOE MISSION</i>	4
1.1	Mission	4
2.0	<i>SOE PERSONNEL/SEARCH COMMITTEE</i>	4
2.1	Function of the Personnel Committee	5
2.2	Structure of the Personnel Committee	5
2.3	Selection of the Personnel Committee	5
2.4	Operation of the Personnel Committee	5
2.5	SOE Search Processes	6
2.6	Lecturer Faculty Hiring Process (.50 or greater)	7
2.7	SOE Personnel Committee for Post-Tenured and Lecturer Faculty Reviews	7
3.0	<i>REVISION</i>	8
4.0	<i>DIVERSITY</i>	8
5.0	<i>APPOINTMENTS</i>	8
6.0	<i>ACCELERATED TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION</i>	9
7.0	<i>GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR ALL REVIEWS</i>	9
7.1	Procedures for Classroom Observations	10
7.2	Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFoTL)	11
7.3	Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision	11
8.0	<i>CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY</i>	11
8.1	Evaluation Lecturer Faculty	11
8.2	Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (See FPPP Section 12.0 – CBA Article 12.16-20)	12
9.0	<i>PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY</i>	12
10.0	<i>EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY</i>	13
10.1	Evaluation Categories and Standards	13
<i>INSTRUCTION</i>		13
	Rubric for Category I. Instruction	16
<i>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT</i>		17
	Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)	19

<i>SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY</i>	20
Rubric for Category III. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)	22
<i>11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION</i>	23
<i>12.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY</i>	23
<i>13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED</i>	23
<i>SOE PPP Appendices</i>	24
Appendix A: Review of Supervisors	25
Appendix B: University Supervisor Evaluation	26
Appendix C: Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty	28
Appendix D: Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty	32
Appendix E: The Lecturer Faculty Dossier for Periodic Evaluation	34
Appendix F: Range Elevation	35
Appendix G: Sample Phone Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process	36
Appendix H: Sample Interview Day Agenda	1
Appendix I: Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning : School of Education	2



California State University, Chico

School of Education Personnel Policies and Procedures

2021-22

The School of Education (SOE) Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the school, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE mission guides the evaluation of faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of 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.

The SOE has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the anchor and guide for interpreting the rubric. These standards, some of which are based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPT), are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.¹ The candidate submits evidence to align with the elements under each standard (see table of suggested types of evidence). The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Expectations of performance are commensurate with years of service and professorial rank of the candidate. As a result, these varying expectations of development provide a context for utilizing the rubric in performance review and periodic evaluation. In all areas relating to hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure, the [Collective Bargaining Agreement \(CBA\)](#) Title 5 regulations and the [University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures \(FPPP\)](#)² govern the SOE policies. The SOE Personnel Committee (SPC), the SOE Director, and candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and periodic evaluation must be familiar with these policies and procedures. This document sets the standards by which SOE faculty are appointed and evaluated.

1.0 SOE MISSION

1.1 Mission

We believe in the power of education to create a strong democratic and sustainable society that honors diversity and inclusivity. The mission of the SOE, in collaboration with our community partners, is to support the development of effective, reflective, and engaged educators who value the identities of all students, their families, and the communities they serve. We are committed to scholar-practitioner inquiry and responsible praxis-based pedagogies that serve as tools toward cultivating socially and ecologically just practices in classrooms, local communities, and beyond.

¹ The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositio.

² The FPPP 2020/2021 is referred to in this document

2.0 SOE PERSONNEL/SEARCH COMMITTEE

2.1 Function of the Personnel Committee

The function of the SOE Personnel Committee (SPC) shall be to review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning appointment, retention, tenure and promotion. It is also the responsibility of the SPC to review and recommend policies and procedures related to these matters. Recommended policy and practice shall be consistent with approved personnel plans and University personnel documents.

The SPC will consult with the SOE Director on the development, implementation and annual review of the personnel/faculty section of the SOE strategic plan. This discussion shall include a discussion of position allocations and proposals that affect faculty positions.

2.2 Structure of the Personnel Committee

The SPC will consist of a minimum of five elected tenured faculty members (including academic year FERP faculty), at least three of whom are at the rank of Professor. The SPC will select a chair, and a secretary, from among its membership. All members of the SPC must complete the unconscious bias training.

Service on the SPC shall be for two years. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve on the SPC more than two years within any three-year period. Elections will happen as needed to replace members in a staggered manner to maintain consistency. Faculty members who are on leave for any part of the academic year will be ineligible to serve on the SPC. Faculty members who are eligible for and elected to the SPC are required to serve and may not serve on any other college or university personnel committee.

2.3 Personnel Committee - Membership by SOE Director (see section 4.1.10 FPPP)

According to the FPPP, the Director of the SOE may participate as a member of the SPC when the committee is undertaking a periodic evaluation or a performance review. Such membership counts towards the committee's required size. If the SOE Director elects to serve as a member of the SPC, the Director must do so for all candidates either undergoing a periodic evaluation or performance review during that personnel cycle.

As per FPPP 4.1.10.c, if the Director serves on the SPC, the committee's report shall be considered an SOE report, and the Director will not be considered a subsequent separate level of review. Upon the Director's request, the SOE Personnel Committee may meet with the Director to discuss personnel matters that are not part of the normal evaluation schedule. The main purpose of these meetings is to provide counsel to the Director.

2.4 Selection of the Personnel Committee

General voting policy, including election of SPC members, will be consistent with the policy specified in the SOE Constitution. Committee elections will take place in May for the following academic year, except as specified in this document. The following procedures will be used to elect the SPC:

1. The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee.
2. All probationary, tenured and FERP faculty members having at least a .50 appointment will receive a ballot and be eligible to vote.
3. Those nominees receiving the greatest number of votes will be elected.
4. If a tie vote occurs, a run-off election will be held.

2.5 Operation of the Personnel Committee

A quorum will consist of four (4) of the elected Committee members.

The SPC Chair calls and presides at meetings and carries out other appropriate duties. The secretary keeps minutes. These minutes indicate only time, place, date of meeting, members present, and any action taken.

2.5.1 SOE Search Committee Structure

The SOE Search Committee (SSC) will normally be constituted in the spring semester preceding the year of the search process. Members of the committee will serve from the time the committee is constituted through the end of the search.

The SSC will consist of: (1) the SOE Director, (2) the coordinator of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, (3) a member of the SPC appointed by the SPC, (4) one tenured or, with the prior approval of the Provost, one tenure-track faculty elected by the faculty of the department, (5) one faculty member from the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve, and (6) optional: one faculty member from another department. The SOE Search Committee is encouraged to include at least one program in the open faculty search sessions. The student will be selected by the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will primarily serve. In years when searches are to be conducted for more than one program, additional members representing programs of primary employment will be added to the Search Committee. The SSC will select a faculty member to chair the committee, who will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the School of Education.

2.6 SOE Search Processes

- 2.6.1 The SSC will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned as an early step in writing a proposal for recruitment.
- 2.6.2 The proposal for recruitment will include selection criteria for the position that specify minimum qualifications and preferred qualifications. These selection criteria will become the basis for position advertisements and the paper screening of applicants.
- 2.6.3 Candidates for a probationary faculty position must meet SOE minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned doctorate in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.
- 2.6.4 The proposal for recruitment shall be approved by the SOE faculty³ before submission to the dean of the college and provost of the university. If recommendations for changes are made after approval by the faculty, the proposal shall be returned to the faculty and a consultation process will be conducted to arrive at an approvable search proposal.

³ The SOE faculty, in this case, consists of the SOE tenured faculty.

- 2.6.5 Once approved, advertising for all positions will occur on a timeline that permits the SSC to review the files of applicants, interview final candidates, and make recommendations to the faculty so that an offer of employment can be approved and made prior to the end of the academic year.
- 2.6.6 The SSC will conduct a screening process. This screening process will be used to determine candidates to be interviewed by phone.⁴ Following phone interviews, reference checks will be conducted, and candidates will be selected and invited for on-campus interviews. At a minimum, there will be three reference checks for the finalist offered the position.
- 2.6.7 On-campus interviews will only be conducted at times when the SSC, candidates of the program, the faculty, the program coordinator, the SOE Director, and the dean or associate dean have the availability to interview candidates. SOE faculty and others will be invited to attend an instructional presentation by each faculty candidate related to the position of primary appointment and ask questions of each candidate.⁵
- 2.6.8 The SSC will recommend candidates for employment to the tenured and tenure track faculty. The tenured and tenure track faculty will recommend the individual faculty for hire to the dean of the college after that individual receives a majority vote.
- 2.6.9 For issues not addressed in this document, the SPC will follow the university policies and procedures related to appointments.

2.7 Lecturer Faculty Hiring Process (.50 or greater)

- 2.7.1 Lecturer faculty hired for less than a .50 appointment for instruction are hired at the discretion of SOE Director, in consultation with the appropriate program coordinator and faculty. Lecturer faculty hired for any amount of supervision will be reviewed by the SOE Lecturer Faculty Search Committee. If a lecturer faculty's load is scheduled to increase to .50 or greater (thus becoming a voting member of the SOE, as per the SOE Constitution, Article IV.1), s/he must apply through the SOE lecturer faculty hiring process.
- 2.7.2 Candidates for a lecturer faculty position must meet SOE minimum qualifications that include: (1) an earned master's degree in education or a related field, and (2) relevant experience related to the position they are seeking. For positions primarily in basic credential programs, candidates must have an additional minimum of three years of full-time K-12 teaching experience; for positions primarily in advanced credential programs, candidates must have a minimum of three years of full-time experience in a position that would normally be authorized by the credential.
- 2.7.3 The Lecturer Faculty Search Committee will consult with the faculty of the program in which the new faculty member will be primarily assigned. The search committee will consist of the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director, the program coordinator(s) or designee in which the lecturer faculty will be primarily assigned, and, upon prior approval of the Provost, one tenured/tenure track faculty representing another program (a minimum of three faculty). Recommendations will be made to the SOE Director. Lecturer Faculty Search Committee is an ad hoc committee appointed by the SOE Director and/or Assistant Director.

⁴ See Appendix G for sample phone interview questions.

⁵ See Appendix H for a sample interview day agenda. OAPL site.

2.7.4 For Expectations of Lecturers in each Range, refer to FPPP 5.2.5: University Appointment Standards for Lecturer Ranges.

2.8 SOE Personnel Committee for Post-Tenured and Lecturer Faculty Reviews

In order to conduct university required faculty evaluations according to established timelines, the SPC will determine the need for committees at the beginning of the fall semester, as follows:

2.8.1 Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will be responsible for collecting data for the periodic evaluation of lecturer faculty and reporting findings to the SPC (procedures for reviews are addressed in Section 7.0 of this document and Section 9.0 of the FPPP). In years when the number of lecturer faculty to be evaluated warrants it, the SPC will call for the election of a Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee of at least three members⁶. All tenured SOE faculty members who are not serving on the SPC or College Personnel Committee shall be eligible to serve on the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee and, if elected, are required to serve, barring an approved University absence or leave. Normally, no faculty member shall be required to serve more than two years within any three-year period on the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee. The name of each faculty member eligible to serve will be listed on a ballot as a nominee.

2.8.2 Post Tenure Review Committee

The Post Tenure Review Committee will conduct periodic evaluations of tenured faculty (see Section 7.0 of this document and Section 11.0 of the FPPP). Tenured faculty members are evaluated at intervals no greater than five years. In the fall semester, the SPC will call a meeting of faculty at the rank of Professor. SOE Professors will produce a slate of review teams to conduct the evaluations scheduled for that year. Two or more Professors will be selected to conduct each periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member. The slate of review teams will be brought to the SOE faculty for vote and approval. Faculty members assigned to conduct a periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty member are eligible to concurrently serve on the SPC or College Personnel Committee.

3.0 REVISION

At the beginning of each academic year, all members of the SPC shall read the current SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures (SPPP) document and the current University Faculty Personnel Policies Procedures (FPPP) document, revise (if necessary) the SOE document so that it reflects any changes in the University document effective for the current Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle, and notify the faculty of the changes.

The SPC shall review the SOE PPP document and SOE faculty evaluation forms and make suggestions for revision to the faculty.

The faculty shall vote to approve an official SOE PPP, supervision forms, and any other appropriate evaluation forms. If approved at all university levels, all changes become effective the following academic year.

4.0 DIVERSITY

There will be a systematic effort to encourage recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates of

⁶ The number of members elected to the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee should be related to the number of evaluations to be conducted. A ratio of four reviews per committee member per semester is suggested

members of underrepresented groups with the goal of obtaining an employee composition that reflects our diverse student body.

5.0 APPOINTMENTS

- 5.1 The normal appointment of a full-time faculty member will be to probationary status. For those seeking a position related to teaching instructional strategies, K-14 teaching experience is required. For other positions, K-14 teaching experience is desirable. Normally, no one with less than an educationally related M.A. degree or equivalent shall be hired to teach or supervise teacher candidates.
- 5.2 If any candidate for appointment is to be offered an initial rank higher than Assistant Professor, the SPC's review of this candidate must use the same rigorous procedure and standards for substantiation specified for on-campus promotions to the proposed rank.
- 5.3 The SOE will seek a sufficient number of probationary/tenure-track appointments to ensure continuity in program development, sustain the identity of the unit, and maintain a stable core of committed, qualified, and informed faculty. At the beginning of each academic year, the SOE Director and the SPC shall review, and update as necessary, the personnel portion of the SOE strategic hiring plan (SHP), determining needs for new tenure track positions and the needed areas of expertise.
- 5.4 In an effort to ensure adequate faculty input into SOE hiring needs and plans, early in each fall semester, the SOE Director and program coordinators will consult with the SPC regarding utilization of current faculty positions and projected program faculty needs. A summary of this consultation will be provided to the SOE.
- 5.5 Should the annual consultation on faculty utilization (described in step 5.4, above) indicate a potential need for additional probationary faculty, the SPC will describe to the SOE in a general meeting the faculty needed and recommend that a request to hire probationary faculty be made. The decision to request hires will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty per SOE Constitution, Article IV.1. When the request is approved, the decision to constitute a Search Committee(s) will be determined through a majority vote of eligible faculty.
- 5.6 Advertising for all positions, probationary and temporary, will occur on a timeline that permits the SPC to review the files of applicants and interview final candidates prior to the end of the academic year.

6.0 ACCELERATED TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Consideration for accelerated tenure or promotion may be requested by any faculty member wishing to be so considered. The request must be made in writing to the SPC Chair, with copies to the Dean and SOE Director by the fall semester census date (the closing date for the current Performance Review cycle). The SPC may also initiate accelerated tenure or promotion consideration. See FPPP 10.5.4.

According to FPPP 10.5.2, consideration of tenure before the beginning of the sixth consecutive fulltime probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of "accelerated tenure or promotion." It should be noted that meeting the minimum requirements for tenure in a shorter timeline than the

usual minimum (6 years) is not itself adequate for an award of accelerated tenure. A decision on tenure before the sixth year is necessarily based on less evidence of performance within rank than tenure granted on a normal timeline. For this reason, decisions for accelerated tenure will require that faculty meet a higher standard than they would for tenure granted on a normal timeline. This higher standard is defined in 10.5.3, and is the definition of an “exceptional record” for accelerated tenure.

According to FPPP 10.5.4, to qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) be rated Superior (at year 6 of SOE PPP performance descriptors) in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community; and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full time assignment. The evidence to support such recognition must be provided by the applicant. The School of Education defines a typical full time assignment as 12 units per semester, with a minimum of 6 units per semester dedicated to instruction. See also the details of evaluation in Section 7 of the SOE PPP.

7.0 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR ALL REVIEWS

The SPC shall be responsible for making a recommendation regarding each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. SPC members will review the data and evaluations. Data and evaluations are to be found in the Personal Professional Data Sheet; faculty member’s dossier; student, colleague and administrative evaluations; and the faculty personnel file. Unless expressly excluded in documents governing the RTP process, all responsibilities that comprise faculty workload are eligible for inclusion and consideration in the review process. This is not subject to change while faculty members are undergoing review.

After reviewing all available data, but before writing its final recommendation, the SPC shall meet individually with each candidate being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. The purpose of this meeting will be to answer unresolved questions related to the retention, tenure, or promotion process. The faculty member must be afforded an opportunity to respond to these questions and to receive answers to inquiries about the retention, tenure or promotion process. The interview process will also be an opportunity for the SPC to discuss with the candidate future aspirations as a member of SOE and to suggest ways to meet personal/professional goals. The SOE Director, if not a member of the SPC, shall be present at this meeting and may participate in the discussion. The secretary shall keep minutes. These minutes shall indicate time, place, and date of meetings; members present; and any action(s) taken. The report and recommendation relative to each candidate shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement.

In relation to recommendations on tenure and promotion, the committee should follow the guidelines of FPPP section 10.0. All performance reviews shall be written in an evaluative manner using the following rating adjectives: “superior, effective, adequate, or inadequate.” The overall evaluation must average ‘effective’ across all categories for tenure and promotion. Evaluation ratings may be a combination of adequate, effective and superior the mean of which is effective overall. The following combinations of ratings are equivalent to an overall mean of effective:

- Three ratings of effective;
- One superior, one adequate, and one effective (Instruction must be at least effective); or
- Two superiors, one adequate (Instruction must be at least effective).

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member's capability to be a contributing scholar in education or a related field. SOE values collaborative professional achievement efforts (e.g. writing components of grant proposals or sections of publications), however, each individual contribution must be verified.

For promotion to Professor, as per FPPP Section 10.4.5.e. "Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should 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. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement."

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion (probationary faculty), reappointment and range elevation (lecturer faculty) are reviewed and evaluated in accordance with policies, procedures, and criteria as described in the FPPP 2018-19. Probationary and tenured faculty should consult both the SOEPPP (especially Section 10) and the FPPP (especially FPPP 3.0, 10.0, and Appendix I) to obtain information on the documents included in their University personnel file, and to help determine the supporting materials they should provide in the dossier they are responsible for submitting.

The College office is the central collection point for all types of probationary faculty evaluation materials. The Dean will establish designated areas for faculty to organize and view/examine their personnel files. Procedures for collecting data shall ensure that only authorized personnel have access to faculty evaluations and files. (Authorized personnel are those identified in the FPPP.)

Lecturer faculty will be provided with information about documents included in their Personnel Action File (PAF) and the supporting materials they are responsible for submitting in the Lecturer Faculty Dossier at the beginning of the semester for which they are scheduled for evaluation. The SOE office will be the collection point for evaluation materials of lecturer faculty.

- 7.1 Procedures for Classroom Observations (for course instructors, face-to-face or online)** A classroom observation will be conducted for each review cycle. A SPC member, as assigned by the SPC chair, will make a formal observation. The SOE Director may also make an observation. Members of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Post Tenure Review Committee may make an observation as appropriate. Procedures for observations follow:
- 7.1.1 A time for the observation will be determined through consultation between the observer and the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and observer do not agree to a time, the chair of the SPC will determine the time and date for the observation. There will be a five-day notice, as per CBA 15.14. For online courses an interview between the faculty member and the observer with access to the online course will substitute for the classroom observation.
 - 7.1.2 The faculty member should inform the observer of the objectives of the lesson and provide a course syllabus and other materials that will enable an informed observation. The observer shall prepare a descriptive and evaluative commentary using the Classroom Observation of Faculty Form (see Appendix B). The observer should not solicit comments from students. The observer and faculty member should conduct a post-lesson conference, at which time the observer shares the observation report (Appendix B) and the candidate signs. A report of the observation, aligned with standards,

based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as set forth in SOEPPP 10.1, will be placed in the faculty member's University personnel action file. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a written rebuttal to this material per (FPPP 10.2.8).

- 7.1.3 The reviewing committee member and the SOE Director will typically not observe the faculty member at the same time. Exceptions will be made with approval of the faculty member. Subsequent to the review, additional classroom visitations may be conducted as needed.

7.2 Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning

All teaching faculty (tenure, tenure-track, and lecturer) will be given feedback by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 3.0 and 8.1.4. Results are filed in the Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in the Office of the Dean. The Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning⁷ section notes that all teaching faculty will be evaluated by students as defined in the FPPP Sections 3.0 and 8.1.4., which states, "Written or electronic student evaluations of teaching shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student evaluations. See CBA 15.15." (FPPP 8.1.4.a.2)

7.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Supervision

Forms designed for assessing the quality of supervision will be distributed online by the SOE to credential candidates and to cooperating teachers in fall and spring semesters. Forms completed after the closing date of a personnel cycle will be held out of the file until the next cycle. (See Appendix A) For faculty members whose appointment is primarily supervision of candidates, an interview shall be conducted.

8.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TEMPORARY FACULTY

- 8.0.1 Definition of a Lecturer faculty as noted in the FPPP (Definitions section). The procedures for recruitment and appointment of lecturer faculty with a time base of .50 or greater shall conform to Section 2.6 of this document and CBA Article 12.
- 8.0.2 The SPC and the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee are responsible for evaluation of lecturer faculty. The primary criterion for the evaluation of lecturer faculty is teaching effectiveness⁸ as described in SPPP Section 10.1 and FPPP 9.0.

8.1 Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty

- 8.1.1 Each lecturer faculty will undergo an annual review. This requirement may be waived for lecturer faculty who are in their first semester of employment as described in CBA article 15.25. Members of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will conduct data gathering for evaluations. 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. (See FPPP Section 9.14)
- 8.1.2 By the end of the first week of each fall and spring semester, the SOE administrative support coordinator shall provide the SPC with a list of lecturer faculty scheduled for review that semester.

⁷ See Appendix I for SOE Items on the Student Feedback of Teaching and Learning

⁸ FPPP Section 8.2.b.

- 8.1.3 The SPC will provide each lecturer faculty member scheduled for evaluation with information about the evaluation criteria, procedures, and documentation (see Appendix C). Lecturer faculty members are responsible for reviewing materials in their personnel action files (in the Dean's Office) and providing supplementary materials for their evaluations in the supplemental evidence. The dossier must be submitted to the SOE Office by the designated fall or spring date as determined by the RTP Deadline Calendar (FPPP, Section Appendix 3)
- 8.1.4 The chair of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will assign a committee member to conduct the classroom observation or supervision interview and draft the initial report of findings. Each member of the Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee shall read the personnel file and dossier of each faculty member being evaluated.
- 8.1.5 The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet to finalize reports of findings for each lecturer faculty member evaluated. (See Appendix C for procedures and materials for evaluation of lecturer faculty.)
- 8.1.6 The Lecturer Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward reports of findings and classroom observation reports, if applicable, to the chair of the SPC prior to the deadline listed in the RTP Deadline Calendar. These time frames will change based on new RTP timelines.
- 8.1.7 Results of the evaluation, including a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation report, if applicable, will be shared with the lecturer faculty member by the SPC chair.
- 8.1.8 Results will be reported to the SOE Director for review. The SOE Director will forward a copy of the report of findings and classroom observation to the Office of the Dean for review and inclusion in the PAF.

8.2 Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (See FPPP Section 12.0 – CBA Article 12.16-20)

9.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

- 9.1 Faculty members will have opportunities to update personnel files and submit other materials for review as specified in the FPPP and according to the University RTP calendar. (See FPPP Section 8.0 and 10.0)
- 9.2 The SPC shall follow these procedures in conducting reviews:
 - 9.2.1 The chair of the SPC will assign a member of the SPC to draft the initial periodic evaluation or performance review report. Each member of the SPC shall read the PAF and dossier of the faculty member under review. After reviewing all available data, the SPC shall interview the faculty member.
 - 9.2.2 At the time of the interview the following statement of purpose and procedure will be shared with the faculty member being interviewed.
 - “The purpose of the personnel interview is to answer any unresolved questions by committee members about the evidence in the record, or by the candidate about the review process or the committee’s understanding of the evidence. For Periodic reviews, the purpose of the interview is also to provide the probationary faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of

maintaining and/or improving performance. The SOE Director may be present at the interview but may not act as a member of the committee.”

- 9.2.3 The report and recommendation relative to each faculty member shall be submitted to the entire SPC for its endorsement. Endorsement is arrived at by majority vote of the SPC. If a member abstains from voting, that member shall submit a written reason for the abstention. Written abstention reasons shall be attached to the report.

10.0 EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The SOE Mission addresses the collaborative nature of work in the SOE, the democratic foundations of our programs, the goals that we as an organization aspire to, and professional ethics and conduct. The SOE mission affects each area of evaluation for faculty members. For Performance Reviews and Periodic Evaluations, faculty members are evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community (See FPPP 10.1.2).

10.1 Evaluation Categories and Standards

The SOE has established descriptions of evaluation categories, categorical standards and elements, and a rubric for each category of evaluation. The standards and elements under each category provide the foundation and context for interpreting the rubric. These standards, based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, are intended to guide the candidate in preparing for evaluation and evaluators in conducting an evaluation.¹⁴ The elements under each standard are examples of how each standard can be demonstrated in teaching practice. The evaluator uses the rubric to guide judgments about to what degree the evidence aligns with the elements under each standard. The use of rubrics in conjunction with standards is a best practice for authentic assessment in the field of education.

Within each of the three categories of Instruction, Professional Growth, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community, the candidate submits a narrative illustrating how the evidence aligns with each *standard*, but not necessarily each *element* (see table of suggested types of evidence). Included in this narrative is an instructional growth plan (a description of your plan for growth in each area, including goals, action steps and a timeline that responds to evidence from multiple sources).

The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the [National Board for Professional Teaching Standards](#).

INSTRUCTION

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty. The area of Instruction seeks evidence of the faculty member's professionalism and skill as an educator with respect to methodology, materials, learning activities and SOE standards. Models of effective teaching are complex and diversified. While the following areas related to instruction may not be exhaustive, it suggests the complexity of teaching roles. All activities that are a part of a candidate's instructional assignment must be considered in the evaluation process.

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's ability to:

- a. Treat students equitably.
- b. Recognize individual differences.
- c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
- d. Develop students' cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
- e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's ability to:

- a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
- b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
- c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
- d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
- e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
- f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
- g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
- h. Create multiple paths for learning.
- i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's ability to

- a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.
- b. Make effective use of time.
- c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
- d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
- e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
- f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.
- g. Employ multiple methods for assessing and evaluating student growth and performance.

Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's ability to

- a. Model the professional dispositions and to inspire these dispositions in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
- b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).

- c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.
- d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The faculty member's narrative for Instruction should explain how the submitted evidence meets each standard. All required evidence elements must be included. Elements listed as Additional Evidence are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion.

Required Evidence
Course syllabi
Formal evaluations of teaching by Personnel Committee
Representative sample(s) of student work, including assignment description, evaluative criteria, and instructor feedback.
Reflection upon Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning*
Reflection on evaluations of supervision when part of your teaching load.

Additional Evidence
Assignment descriptions, instructional units and/or online modules
Curriculum development, including creating new courses, substantial course revision, applying distance education or technology to facilitate instruction, collegial involvement or program cohesion
Modification of curriculum to further encourage civic engagement and inclusion of diverse experiences
Evidence of enriching student learning by partnering with other educators or community members (e.g. team teaching or guest presentations)
Reflections on peer observations (conducted by either university colleagues or K-12 personnel)
Evidence of using data to inform instructional practices (e.g., student outcome data)
Evidence of student growth in response to faculty feedback on an assignment
Letters from students (unsolicited) and/or public-school personnel (for supervisors of credential candidates) that address strengths not otherwise addressed in the evidence
Short audio or video footage of instruction, with reflective commentary

*Student evaluations of faculty data shall be used, but will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of instructional effectiveness, and shall not be used when determining a candidate's knowledge of the field. The candidate should provide a summary of data from the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning surveys that includes calculation of averages.⁹

⁹ FPPP Section 9.1.2.c.1

Rubric for Category I. Instruction

For the duration of the appointment, instructional performance will be assessed using the following criteria:

Inadequate	Adequate	Effective	Superior
<p>No or minimal evidence that the faculty member has met all four standards. Some or all of the <i>required</i> evidence is missing.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all four standards at a satisfactory level, but the evidence is limited in quality and/or representation across standards. All four of the <i>required</i> types of evidence are included.</p>	<p>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at a satisfactory level and one or more approaching an exemplary level. Representation across standards is substantiated by all four of the <i>required</i> types of evidence and some <i>additional</i> types of evidence.</p>	<p>Clear and substantial evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has met all standards at an exemplary level. Representation across standards is comprehensive and substantiated by all four of the <i>required</i> types of evidence and some <i>additional</i> types of evidence.</p>

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

The area of Professional Growth and Achievement seeks evidence of the faculty member's professional development through scholarly activity, including independent scholarship and scholarship undertaken in collaboration with professional colleagues and students, related to professional contributions to students, the discipline of education and the professional community, in accordance with the SOE mission. Research agendas that benefit from collaborative and interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and recognized accordingly in the evaluation process.

For the duration of the appointment, Professional Growth and Achievement will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence. The items in Area A and C list specific examples of achievement in each category (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), not necessarily in order of importance. Some of the examples represent a range of significance to the field. In those cases, the examples in Area A are considered to have a greater weight than in Area C. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to write a narrative explaining the impact of Area A and C. For areas A and C, multiple accomplishments of the same item are acceptable.

Area A: High Quality/Impact - Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable.

- Author or co-author of a published book in a peer-review press (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- Author or co-author of a published article in a refereed journal (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- Author or co-author of a published book chapter (make the case of a significant contribution to material)
- Edited or co-edited a book or special issue of a journal
- Secured a substantial external grant (approximately \$50,000 or more)
- Invited presentations at a conference, campus event, symposium, workshop, or community event (not guest lectures in a class- see Area C)
- Juried exhibits, installations, or creative works at community, regional, national/international conferences or other venues.
- Evidence of significant impact of previously published work/scholarly activity/juried exhibits, installations, or creative works.
- This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

Area B: Research Agenda Narrative

- Evidence of an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress. Narrative could include the following:
 - Purpose and audience of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative work in general (suggestion: listed as objectives);
 - Scholarship objectives and related accomplishments toward objectives met and unmet;
 - Potential funding sources, if applicable, contextualized to content area/discipline;
 - Likely/target venues for publications and presentations (including but not limited to conferences, workshops, and professional development venues);
 - Likely time line for the aforementioned outcomes.

Area C: Multiple accomplishments from the same bullet point are acceptable.

- Scholarship and collaboration that results in presentation(s)/workshop(s) at peer-reviewed national or international conferences
- Acceptance or publication of at least 5 education-related articles/op-eds in a newspaper or magazine

- Disseminated education-related research results/new ideas in a peer-review electronic venue
- Acceptance or publication of an encyclopedia or reference book entry of 2+ pages, or at least 3 shorter entries
- Acceptance or publication of a research report
- Acceptance or publication in an education-review anthology, journal, or other peer-review (inter)national method of dissemination
- Acceptance of education-related art into a juried exhibition outside of the university
- Acceptance or publication in a peer-reviewed journal (above the required) or as minor contributing author
- Acceptance or publication of a chapter in a book (above the required) or as minor contributing author
- Acceptance or publication of computer software/manual/workbook
- Scholarly collaboration with students such as joint research and publications/presentations
- Participation at state, national or international levels of accreditation
- Serve on a MA/PhD/Ed committee for a student outside of Chico State.
- Submission of work for consideration in one of the above-listed categories (only one submission may count toward the required number of instances)
- Work in progress: manuscripts or ongoing data collection (for article or book-length peer-review publication) (only one work in progress may count toward the required number of instances)
- Accepted or presented a peer-reviewed paper at a national or international conference
- Accepted or presented two papers at a local/regional conference or meeting
- Accepted or presented at two poster sessions
- Submitted an external grant proposal (unfunded)
- Secured an external grant (above the required)
- Reviewed 2 articles or books for a publisher or journal (if not listed under service)
- Member of a journal editorial board (if not listed under service)
- Member of an editorial board for an academic or literary press (if not listed under service)
- Secured an internal grant (other than travel grants)
- Developed a film or other non-print media that is peer-reviewed or nationally recognized
- Grant writing for an education-related organization related to an area of professional interest
- At least 5 education-related lectures to campus/community groups
- Year-long participation and/or leadership in active coalitions or substantive collaborative work with other faculty, focusing on education-related issues
- Grassroots organizing with underserved communities, such as co-organizing a campaign with community leaders
- Organizing and coordinating advocacy coalition activities
- Holding an appointment or being an officer in an education-related organization outside of the university
- Extraordinary support of retention of underserved students (not counting in the service area), such as establishing and administering a new and effective program
- Published curriculum materials (peer-reviewed lesson plans, units, course design).
- This is not an exhaustive list of acceptable evidence; the candidate can make an argument for inclusion of other discipline specific accomplishments.

Rubric for Category II. Professional Growth and Achievement (PG&A)

For the duration of the appointment, performance in PG&A will be assessed using the following criteria:

Performance Review	Inadequate	Adequate	Effective	Superior
<p>2nd Year Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>No or minimal evidence of listed criteria.</p> <p><i>An Inadequate rating is insufficient for the renewal of the contract.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area C</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area A in progress toward publication</p>
<p>4th Year Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area C</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area A</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A as a lead author AND at least 3 in Area C</p>
<p>6th Year Retention and Promotion Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area A AND at least 2 in Area C</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A AND at least 3 in Area C</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 2 in Area A (1 as a lead author) AND at least 5 in Area C</p>
<p>Full Professor Review</p> <p>(5 Years - during the review period)</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND Evidence in Area A AND at least 2 in Area C</p> <p><i>An Adequate rating is insufficient for promotion.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 1 Area A AND at least 3 in Area C</p>	<p>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in Area B AND at least 2 in Area A (1 as a lead author) AND at least 5 in Area C</p>

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

The area of Service evaluates the faculty member's service to the department, college, university and community, especially in regard to active participation as a team member in the department (which may include mentoring of incoming faculty), and service in governance on department, college and university committees. The SOE encourages civic engagement and values mutually beneficial partnerships that align the teaching and research agenda of the university and the self-identified interests of the communities of its region. In each written performance review report, the evaluator(s) shall state whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to conform to University, College and Department/Unit plans, and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department's/Unit's abilities to meet their standards and strategic goals. Candidates and evaluators should refer to the University Strategic Plan and the SOE Mission, Vision and Conceptual Framework.

Standard 1. The faculty member engages collaboratively, creatively and productively in the work of the department, college, and university that contributes to the University Strategic Plan and the SOE Mission, Vision and Conceptual Framework. Reviewers will assess quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's contributions in one or more of the following areas:

- a. Provide service to the institution through committee work;
- b. Provide service to the institution through advising;
- c. Provide service to the institution through department, college or university leadership;
- d. Provide service to the institution through active participation in institutional, state and national accreditation and program reviews.

Standard 2. The faculty member contributes to the learning community and/or area of professional expertise through outreach and services that contributes to the University Strategic Plan and the SOE Mission, Vision and Conceptual Framework. Reviewers will assess quality, quantity, and relevance of these activities.

Elements. The data provide evidence of the candidate's contributions in one or more of the following areas:

- a. Provide significant service through professional development, program development, or clinical services to schools or other educational agencies/organizations;
- b. Making contributions in community development, such as participation in community outreach activities, educational efforts, including educational equity, and fundraising and program promotion;
- c. Consulting, providing technical assistance, and/or providing services to public and/or private organizations:
 - Significant contributions/service on national organization boards;
 - Peer-reviews/Editor (if not listed under PG&A);
- d. Mass media contributions (such as op-eds, letters to the editor not listed under PG&A).

For the duration of the appointment, other contributions to the university and community will be assessed using the following types and sources of evidence (not listed in order of importance or weight). Elements are suggested items that may or may not be included, at faculty discretion:

Suggested Types of Evidence
Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on department, college and university committees. Narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework.
Elected or appointed leadership role (committee or subcommittee chair) or membership on community-based committees or boards. Narrative describes key accomplishments and/or contributions to University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework.
Other leadership roles could include but not limited to intellectual, organizational, policy, community based, cultural, social justice, and ecological justice leadership roles.
Documentation of participation in the teamwork of SOE programs and projects, especially as they relate to the University Strategic Plan and/or SOE Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework (e.g., accreditation review, program revisions, data driven improvement, significant SOE event planning (e.g., Recognition Ceremony, Partners in Education, CORE Rubric Training).
Letter of support from program coordinator, committee chair, or other supervisor-type person with written comments of participation and contribution on committees, programs, and projects.
Advising of credential candidates and/or Master's students.
Informal advising of students, particularly those from under-represented populations
Chairing MA thesis or project
Service on MA advisory committees
Documentation of teaching, collaboration, and service in- and outside the SOE
Participation in activities with K-12 schools and the community at large, including work that promotes democratic education principles and practices
Preparation of accreditation materials for national and state reviews

Rubric for Category III. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)

For the duration of the appointment, performance in Service will be assessed using the following criteria:

Performance Review	Inadequate	Adequate	Effective	Superior
<p>2nd Year Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>No or minimal evidence of listed criteria.</p> <p><i>An Inadequate rating is insufficient for the renewal of the contract.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of developing active participation in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of active participation in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>
<p>4th Year Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of active participation in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of service in standard 1 AND evidence of service in standard 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership.</p>
<p>6th Year Retention and Promotion Review</p> <p>Since the time of hire or contract negotiated date.</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2.</p>	<p>Evidence of service in standard 1 AND evidence of service in standard 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership.</p>	<p>Evidence of sustained active participation in both standards AND evidence of sustained, ongoing leadership and/or substantive responsibility in both standards.</p>
<p>Full Professor Review</p> <p>(5 Years - during the review period)</p>	<p>Has not demonstrated adequate progress since the last performance review.</p>	<p>Evidence of developing leadership or substantial contribution in standards 1 or 2, or multiple service areas in standards 1 or 2.</p> <p><i>An Adequate rating is insufficient for promotion.</i></p>	<p>Evidence of service in standard 1 AND evidence of service in standard 2 AND in one of the areas presented, evidence of substantial contributions or leadership</p>	<p>Evidence of sustained active participation in both standards AND evidence of sustained, ongoing leadership and/or substantive responsibility in both standards.</p>

11.0 RATINGS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

- 11.1 As per FPPP Section 10.2.5.a. “Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure or promotion of teaching faculty.” In the area of Instruction, “an evaluation of ‘effective’ is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.”
- 11.2 As per FPPP Section 10.4.5.e, Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation. All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements, which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.

12.0 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

- 12.1 The Post Tenure Review Committee contacts each faculty member to be evaluated in writing during the fall semester with procedures for the evaluation, a list of materials requested by the committee, and the assignment of a committee member to make a classroom observation.
- 12.2 Faculty members submit, to the chair of their review committee, a brief summary of academic activities aligned with evaluation areas in Section 10 of this document, a current professional vita, syllabi of current courses, and descriptions of student assignments and assessments.
- 12.3 A member of the Post Tenure Review Committee makes a classroom observation of the faculty member following procedures in Section 7 of this document.
- 12.4 The Post Tenure Review Committee examines materials submitted by the faculty member and the Working Personnel Action File, meets with the faculty member, and writes a report as described in FPPP Section 11.2 The committee report is forwarded to the college dean.
- 12.5 For policies and procedures regarding a faculty member’s right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response to any level of review, see FPPP 10.2.8.

13.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NOT ADDRESSED

For policies and procedures not addressed in this document the SOE will apply policies and procedures in the FPPP.

SOE PPP Appendices

Appendix A	Review of University Supervisors Letter
Appendix B	University Supervisor Evaluation Form
Appendix C	Classroom Observations of SOE Faculty
Appendix D	Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty
Appendix E	The Lecturer Faculty Dossier for Periodic Evaluation
Appendix F	Range Elevation
Appendix G	Sample Phone Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process
Appendix H	Sample Interview Day Agenda
Appendix I	Students Evaluation of Teaching: School of Education

Appendix A: Review of Supervisors

School of Education
California State University, Chico
Chico, CA 95929-0222
530-898-6421

DATE:

TO: Credential Candidate
 Cooperating Teachers/Mentor Teachers/Local Support Provider

FROM: Personnel Committee
 School of Education

SUBJECT: Evaluation of University Supervisor

The CSU, Chico supervisor(s) assigned to your school this semester is evaluated periodically as part of our personnel process, which includes decisions relative to tenure, retention, promotions, and awards. A personnel file is maintained for each SOE faculty member to accumulate material until that individual is scheduled for a performance review.

Your participation in the evaluation process is important in assessing the supervisor's effectiveness in the supervisory role. An evaluation form is on the reverse for your response, or you may respond by letter or memo if you prefer.

Please mail your response in the enclosed envelope. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Comments (from reverse side):

Appendix B: University Supervisor Evaluation

The CSU, Chico supervisor(s) assigned to your school this semester is evaluated periodically as part of our personnel process, which includes decisions relative to tenure, retention, promotions, and awards. A personnel file is maintained for each School of Education faculty member to accumulate material until that individual is scheduled for a performance review.

Your participation in the evaluation process is important in assessing the supervisor's effectiveness in the supervisory role. Please complete and submit this survey within the next week. The information we obtain from this survey is anonymous. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the School of Education Assessment Coordinator, Pamela Dunlap, at (530) 898-4472. Thank you.

1. You are responding to this survey as a:
Cooperating Teacher/ Mentor Teacher Credential Candidate
2. Please select the program you are currently in if you are a credential candidate or the program your credential candidate is in if you are a Cooperating Teacher or Mentor Teacher:
Provide drop-down menu of pathways
3. Name of the University Supervisor with whom you worked:
Drop Down of supervisor names

We are interested in your feedback, whether it is positive or negative. Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following questions. We also welcome your comments and suggestions, and really appreciate your feedback.

4. The University Supervisor communicates expectations of the candidate's placement requirements.
strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
5. The University Supervisor evaluates candidate's classroom practice using the Core Rubric, Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and/or Education Specialist Standards.
strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
6. The University Supervisor provides specific feedback focused on growth in teaching skills.
strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
7. The University Supervisor conducts conferences (e.g., initial meeting, mid-way, final 3-way) according to program guidelines.
strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
8. The University Supervisor communicates effectively (e.g., clear, prompt).
strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree
Comment:
9. The University Supervisor exhibits knowledge of current practices in teaching.

strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree

Comment:

10. The University Supervisor assists the candidate in meeting the needs of all students.

strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree

Comment:

11. The University Supervisor supports the candidate's development of the School of Education professional dispositions.

strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree

Comment:

12. The University Supervisor supports cooperating teacher in mentoring the candidate (e.g. setting goals, developing improvement plans, etc.).

strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree n/a

Comment:

13. The University Supervisor demonstrates professionalism (e.g. organization, dependability, and promptness)

strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree

Comment:

14. Use this space for additional comments

Appendix C: Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty

Faculty Name: _____

Observer Name: _____

Required Observation _____

OR

Elective Observation _____

Course: _____

Room: _____

Time: _____ Date: _____

Overview of lesson:

Describe examples of any of the elements of each standard that were demonstrated in this teaching episode. (See end of Appendix B for a complete list of SOE standards and elements in the area of Instruction.)

Standard 1. The candidate is committed to students and their learning.

Standard 2. The candidate knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

Standard 3. The candidate is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

Standard 4: The candidate thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.
(Observer: Include any examples of elements from this standard that were demonstrated during the post-observation conference with the faculty member.)

Summary of the Observation:

Observer's signature: _____

Date: _____

debriefed the observation with the observer, and I have received a copy of this report. Observed faculty member's (or instructor's) signature: _____ Date: _____

Classroom Observations of School of Education Faculty (Continued)

These are the standards and elements as they are listed in the SOE Personnel Policies and Procedures.¹⁰

Standard 1. The faculty member is committed to students and their learning.

- a. Treat students equitably.
- b. Recognize individual differences.
- c. Adjust practice based upon observation and knowledge of adult learners.
- d. Develop students' cognitive capacity and respect for learning.
- e. Adapt instruction in response to context and culture.

Standard 2. The faculty member knows the content and how to teach the content to adult learners.

- a. Demonstrate how knowledge in the field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
- b. Apply knowledge to real-world settings.
- c. Develop critical and analytical capacities of students.
- d. Command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal content to students.
- e. Recognize preconceptions and background knowledge of adult learners.
- f. Employ strategies and instructional materials that support learning.
- g. Anticipate where difficulties are likely to arise and modify practice accordingly.
- h. Create multiple paths for learning.
- i. Teach students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Standard 3. The faculty member is responsible for managing and monitoring adult learning.

- a. Create, maintain, and modify instructional settings to capture and sustain student interest and motivation.
- b. Make effective use of time.
- c. Engage adult learners to enhance their own learning.
- d. Command a range of effective instructional techniques.
- e. Make optimal use of a variety of effective instructional technology.
 - f. Organize instruction to meet program goals.
- g. Employ multiple methods for assessing and evaluating student growth and performance.

Standard 4. The faculty member thinks systematically about teaching practice and learns from experience.

- a. Model the professional dispositions and to inspire these dispositions in students (e.g., curiosity, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity, and appreciation of cultural differences).
- b. Model the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual and professional growth (e.g., the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation).
- c. Make principled judgments about practice based upon knowledge of adult learning, content, and instruction.

¹⁰ The format that includes standards and elements for categories of evaluation was drawn from work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards <https://www.nbpts.org/standards-five-core-propositions/>

d. Critically examine practice, expand repertoire, deepen knowledge, sharpen judgment, and adapt teaching to new findings, ideas, and theories.

Appendix D: Procedures for Review of Lecturer Faculty

DATE:

TO: Lecturer Faculty Review Committee:

FROM: School of Education Personnel Committee:

SUBJECT: **Review of Lecturer Faculty**

The Lecturer Faculty Review Committee will use the procedures that follow for the review of lecturer faculty in this annual cycle.

1. Use the evaluation criteria in Article 9 of the FPPP.
2. Review the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF) maintained in the Dean's Office. All members of the committee must review the PAF and sign it.
3. Review the dossier provided by the faculty member. (FPPP Section 8.1.3) The preparation of the dossier is the first step of the periodic evaluation process. (FPPP Section 9.0)
4. The reviewees may be an instructor and/or supervisor.
 - a. If an instructor, conduct a classroom observation by one member of the committee. We recommend a one-hour period for the observation and a follow-up debriefing.
 - b. If a supervisor, review materials that provide evidence of effectiveness.
5. Draft an individual report (not to exceed two pages) for each faculty member under review based on the observation and other documents. The report should contain a statement commenting on the faculty member's teaching effectiveness and other areas of evaluation if appropriate. As a guide for the observation and report use the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, underlined sections.
6. Meet as a committee to finalize reports.
7. Submit reports to the School Personnel Committee and the Director in accordance with the current RTP schedule established by the Provost and Office of Faculty Affairs.
8. The department chair will transmit the report to the faculty member and to the dean for review and placement in the PAF (see FPPP 9.1.3.a).

Lecturer faculty under review are responsible for checking their personnel action file (in the Dean's Office) for accuracy and providing the following to the SOE office: Copies of syllabi for course taught (instructors only),

- Current assessment system(s) including associated rubrics or scoring criteria,
- Additional materials that provide evidence of teaching and/or supervision effectiveness and student assessment, and
- Evidence documenting, *Developing as a Professional Educator*. (Standard 6)

Appendix E: The Lecturer Faculty Dossier for Periodic Evaluation

Lecturer faculty have a responsibility to review materials in their personnel action files (in the Dean's Office) and provide supplementary materials for their evaluations in the Lecturer Faculty Dossier. The dossier must be submitted to the SOE Office by the designated fall or spring census date, as defined by the RTP Calendar, FPPP, Appendix III.

The Lecturer Faculty Dossier should contain:

- A faculty curriculum vita/resume
- A statement of the faculty member's philosophy of teaching,
- Summaries of results from Student Feedback of Teaching and Learning and/or University Supervisor Evaluation results,
- Copies of current syllabi for courses taught (instructors only) and descriptions of student assignments and assessments,
- Additional materials that provide evidence of teaching and/or supervision effectiveness, and
- (Optional) a brief summary of other activities that show support for the mission and goals of the department. (These may include activities related to evaluation categories in SPPP Section 10.)

Procedures for conducting classroom observations can be found in SPPP Section 7.1. Information about Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning is in SPPP Section 7.2; information about the Evaluation of Supervision is in SPPP Section 7.3.

University Supervisor Interview Sample Questions

1. Tell me about your observation process. Do you have a specific process for preparing candidates for observation?
2. What observation strategies do you use during the lesson?
3. How do you structure the post observation conference?
4. Please share an example of site problem solving situation in which you felt success and one in which you felt challenged.
5. How do you learn about the strengths and needs of your supervisees? How do you use this information to assist your students outside the formal observation process?
6. How do you develop a working professional relationship with cooperating teachers?
7. Can we organize the supervision experience differently?

Appendix F: Range Elevation

Criteria for RANGE elevation for lecturer faculty (excluding coaches) shall be appropriate to lecturer work assignments [CBA 12.19]. For elevation to the RANGE of Lecturer B or above, the individual must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last RANGE elevation, whichever is more recent. (FPPP 12.0)

Professional growth and development for lecturer RANGE elevation eligibility is defined as *teaching excellence* and *maintaining currency in the field*, unless the faculty member's work assignment includes duties in addition to teaching.

Teaching excellence is indicated in the standards under Instruction in SOEPPP 10.1.

Suggested evidence for maintaining currency in the field may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, nor prescribed by, the following list:

- Increased mastery of the discipline evidenced by additional relevant education or an additional degree
- Effectively using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field
- Contributing to and planning professional development activities on campus
- Presenting original work at professional meetings and conferences
- Collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the community
- Publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- Research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- Editing professional publications
- External fundraising and resource development related to the mission of the University
- Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University

Appendix G: Sample Interview Questions for Tenure/Tenure Track Hiring Process

The following descriptive interview sample questions are designed to allow candidates to provide pertinent information about their qualifications for the position, based on actual experiences. The SOE Director should introduce the members of the search committee and briefly describe the position under consideration before asking the first question. The candidate should always be asked if there is other job-related information to add that the committee did not cover.

1. Why did you apply to CSU, Chico for this position? What attracted you to this position and place?
2. One of the requirements for this position is that you have at least three years of K-12 teaching-related experience. Briefly describe one of your K-12/SPED experiences that you believe uniquely qualifies you for this position and explain why.
3. What knowledge or experiences have you had that will contribute to our need to prepare educators for successful work with learners from diverse populations including English learners?
4. Please briefly describe the range of your supervision experiences and the ways you go about supervising teacher candidates.
5. Provide an example of a grant development, research project and/or teaching experience in which you have worked collaboratively with others to accomplish a professional goal.
6. Please describe your scholarship agenda and your plans for scholarly work in the future.
7. Given the following scenario, describe the methods and approach you might use to provide effective instruction for this content [Committee provides position specific examples of content addressed in a course.]
8. Other position-specific question(s) added by the search committee.
9. Do you have questions for us?

Appendix H: Sample Interview Day Agenda



California State University, Chico

School of Education
On-Campus Interview, *Date*

Applicant for Position
Candidate Name *University*
Degree

Date

8:30 – 9:00	Breakfast with Search Committee Host
9:00 – 9:30	Visit - Diversity Office, Kendall Hall 110
9:30 – 10:30	Teaching Demonstration, Tehama 105
10:30 – 11:00	Meet with Search and Hiring Committee, Tehama 105
11:15 – 11:45	Meet with SOE Director
11:45 – 1:00	Lunch with faculty and any invited teacher candidates
1:00 – 2:00	Research Presentation, Tehama 105
2:15 – 2:45	Meet with Dean, Tehama 203
3:30 – 4:00	Visit –Research and Sponsored Programs, 25 Main, Room 103
4:00 – 4:30	Faculty / Staff Reception, Tehama 105
4:30	Leave for hotel or opportunity to explore the university/community

Appendix I: Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning, School of Education

General Information

1. You are a: (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate)
2. Is this course: (Required, Elective)
3. Expected Grade: (A, A or B, B, B or C, C, C or D, D or F, F)

This evaluation form will be used by the instructor of this class to help improve teaching effectiveness and by the University in retention and promotion decisions. You are asked to evaluate the instructor of this class on teaching ability, not on the course content. There will be a section for you to add comments at the end of the survey.

Part A

1. How well are you keeping up with the assignments and readings for this course? Give a percentage estimate. (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%).

Part B

Response Code:

(SD) Strongly Disagree, (D) Disagree, (N) Neither Disagree or Agree, (A) Agree, (SA) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor presents the material in an understandable way.
2. The instructor communicates high expectations.
3. The instructor has command of the course content.
4. The instructor is prepared for each class session.
5. The instructor provides appropriate feedback.
6. The instructor is helpful and responsive to students.
7. The instructor is willing to listen to student questions and opinions.
8. The instructor actively encourages equitable participation of students.
9. The overall instruction in this course contributes to learning.
10. The syllabus explains the course requirements.
11. The assignments contribute to learning.
12. The instructor prepares students to work with diverse populations.
13. What did your instructor do to make this class a good learning experience for you? (Text Box)
14. What could your instructor do in the future to make this a better class? (Text Box)
15. How do you rate the overall quality of teaching in this class? (Superior, Very Good, Minimally Acceptable, Unacceptable)
16. Important: Please give at least one reason to justify your rating. (Text Box)