

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

Received with recommendations from faculty affairs 9/5/2014 3:32 PM

Operating Procedures and Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Academic Year 2014-15

1. COMMITTEE FUNCTION, STRUCTURE, AND PROCEDURES

1.1 Function

1.1.1 The Department of Mathematics and Statistics Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating tenured and tenure-track faculty for retention, tenure and promotion. The committee shall be responsible for both Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews. This committee shall also be responsible for maintaining this document and related materials.

1.1.2 The Department RTP Committee shall not be responsible for the review of temporary faculty or for faculty appointments.

- The Department Part-Time Evaluation Committee shall be responsible for the review and evaluation of temporary faculty members. A separate document addresses the operation of the Department Part-Time Evaluation Committee.
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments shall be the responsibility of the Department Hiring Committee(s). A separate document addresses the operation of the Department Hiring Committee(s).
- The Department Chair will normally make the determination about part-time temporary faculty appointments. The Chair may choose to consult with the Department Part-Time Evaluation Committee, if time permits. A separate document addresses the operation of the Department Part-Time Evaluation Committee.
- The periodic review of tenured faculty is addressed in the document titled, "GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY."

1.2 Structure

1.2.1 The membership of the Department RTP Committee shall consist of three or five department members (FPPP 5.0.e), depending on availability of eligible faculty and committee workload in a given year, elected from the list of eligible faculty as determined in section 1.2.2. The committee shall be elected after determination of the department representative on the College Personnel Committee. The Department RTP Committee shall be elected by probationary and tenured members of the department. The election shall be in accordance with department election guidelines.

1.2.2 Faculty eligible to serve on the department RTP Committee shall consist of all full-time, tenured faculty members of the department, except for the following:

- The Department Chair when candidates are undergoing a performance review (see 1.2.3)
- Faculty members who are serving on the College Personnel Committee

- Faculty members on leave for all or any part of the academic year
- Faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FPPP 5.0.g)
- Faculty members being reviewed that academic year (FPPP 5.0.h)
- Faculty members excluded by rank/classification considerations in section 1.2.4 below.
- Faculty members who have served at any level of review during both of the two preceding review cycles.

1.2.3 The department chair shall serve as a separate level of department review except during the periodic evaluation of faculty, when the department chair shall serve on the Department RTP Committee as a full voting member (FPPP 5.0.j).

1.2.4 In promotion considerations, Department RTP Committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion (FPPP 5.0.k).

1.3 Committee Procedures

1.3.1 The Department RTP Committee shall organize and operate in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP), and this document. It follows that members of the committee must be knowledgeable of the guidelines and regulations in these documents. In the event of inconsistency between this document and either the CBA or the FPPP, the CBA or the FPPP shall take precedence.

1.3.2 Before the end of the academic year, the current department RTP Personnel committee will review and update, if necessary, this document and related materials. This may take place in consultation with the department chair. The department must approve any significant changes but this may be deferred to the start of the next academic year.

1.3.3 Early in the academic year, after the department RTP personnel committee has been elected, the committee and the department chair will meet with all candidates up for review to discuss the department's RTP Guidelines, their implementation, and the structure of the reports from the candidate, the personnel committee, and the chair. At this meeting, the candidates will be given the current "Candidate's Instructions" letter (included as an appendix to these guidelines).

1.3.4 At least two committee members and the Department Chair shall make classroom visitations for each RTP candidate. A written report on each visit shall become part of the candidate's personnel file. The College Dean may also make classroom visits.

1.3.5 The committee's report must be based only on evidence in the candidate's Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), including the Dossier. The report shall include a written evaluation of the evidence presented in the WPAF. The committee evaluation must address the evidence with respect to the requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion described in the section 8.5.b.2 of the FPPP, the definitions of evaluation ratings in section 8.5.b.1.c of the FPPP, and the criteria of this document.

1.3.6 The committee shall always take into consideration the quality, as well as the quantity and rate of accomplishment, of the candidate's performance in each of the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community (FPPP 8.5.a.16.a)

1.3.7 Prior to finalizing its report and endorsing it by a vote of the committee, the department RTP Personnel committee will meet with the department chair (if the chair is not participating as a member of the committee) to discuss and attempt to resolve, if necessary, any differences with their contemplated recommendations (FPPP 8.5.b.1.g).

1.4 Candidates' Responsibilities

1.4.1 It is the candidate's responsibility to be familiar with the procedures and criteria in this document as well as those in the CBA and FPPP.

1.4.2 Since the Department RTP Committee's report must be based entirely on evidence in the WPAF, the candidate must ensure that the WPAF includes all appropriate evidence presented in a format that facilitates review. Specifically, it is the candidate's responsibility to address the criteria in the department RTP Guidelines indicating, when appropriate, the activities or evidence, along with sufficient explanation of the significance of these activities or evidence, to justify why the candidate feels his/her performance meets the criteria or warrants a specific rating for an area of evaluation. More details can be found in the Candidate's Instruction letter (see appendix), which provides examples of how a candidate is expected to address specific rating criteria in these guidelines.

1.4.3 All department faculty members shall participate in the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) in all courses as required by the FPPP and/or the CBA.

1.4.4 In the Dossier, the candidate shall assign each piece of evidence to exactly one category - Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, or Other Contributions to the University and Community. The Department is aware that some activities might reasonably be assigned to more than one category; in such cases the candidate is often best qualified to make the judgment about which category most closely matches a particular activity. In cases of ambiguity in the assignment of a category, the candidate is encouraged to explain the rationale for including the evidence in a particular category. Moreover, the Department encourages the candidate to point out the breadth of such activities and to consider whether a particular activity should be split and considered as two separate activities. For example, mentoring a student research project could be included under Instruction, and, if that mentorship leads to a publication with the student, the publication might be included under Professional Growth and Achievement. Each individual item of evidence may only be recorded in a single category.

1.4.5 The dossier should only include material dating from appointment or most recent promotion with the principle that everything should be counted once and nothing twice. For example, work completed at CSUC after submission of the dossier that led to promotion to Associate can be included in subsequent dossiers as evidence towards promotion to Full. On the other hand, in the case of work begun elsewhere and completed after appointment, the candidate must make an estimate as to what portion of the work was completed at CSUC.

2. STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Department RTP Committee shall evaluate each candidate in each of the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community. In each area, the candidate will be assigned a summary evaluation or rating: superior (S), effective (E), adequate (A), or inadequate (I) (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c).

The defining criteria for these ratings are indicated in the specific sections for each area – sections 3.2 & 3.3 for Instruction, section 4.2 for Professional Growth & Achievement, and section 5.2 for Other Contributions to the University and Community. Note that for Professional Growth and Achievement, the criteria for the ratings as they apply for Promotion to Full Professor is separate from the criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

In the consideration of promotion, the review process shall only take into account the candidate's record of performance for all years since appointment or the last performance review for promotion, whichever is most recent.

Since the benchmarks for a particular rating give criteria for tenure & promotion at the end of a promotional period, a new candidate most likely will merit lower ratings, such as Adequate, during the first few years of the review period. This should not necessarily be interpreted in a negative way. The RTP committee should indicate in their report if they have found evidence that the candidate is making sufficient progress towards a particular rating with justification for this judgment. If the candidate is not progressing satisfactorily, the committee should offer recommendations for rectifying the situation.

As a candidate progresses through the evaluation process, it is possible for a rating to devolve. For example, if a candidate is very active during the first year of review and then produces no scholarly work for the next 3 years, the lack of continuity of effort and achievement could reduce a rating. Similar breaks in continuity can apply in the areas of Instruction and Service and could affect previous ratings in these areas.

It should be noted that reviews will be looking increasingly to continuity of performance as time of service increases.

The following table illustrates typical, minimum, ratings required for a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion.

		Teaching	PGA	Service
Using Rankings Defined for Tenure/Associate	Tenure & Promotion to Assoc.	E	E	E
	Early (both)	S	S	E
		E	S	S
Using Rankings Defined for Full	Promotion to Full	E	E	E
	Early	S	S	E
		E	S	S

Note that in the area of Instruction, a minimum rating of effective is required for tenure or promotion.

In the 2nd and 4th years, probationary tenure-track faculty typically undergo a performance review for retention. Per the FPPP, “retention shall be awarded only to those whose performance appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course.”

The following table illustrates typical, minimum, ratings required for a positive recommendation for retention.

	Instruction	PG & A	Other Contributions
2 nd year retention	E	-	-
4 th year retention	E	A	A

Note that, for retention, probationary faculty should demonstrate effective instruction (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c). However, (as stated in FPPP 8.5.b.1.c), an overall evaluation of adequate in Instruction is the minimum level of achievement consistent with retention. A committee recommending retention for a faculty member whose evaluation in Instruction is not effective must explicitly indicate in their report why they recommend retention in spite of this low evaluation and provide a concrete plan outlining how the candidate can improve his/her teaching to an effective level before the tenure decision.

It is the responsibility of the Department RTP Committee to ensure that its report contains developmental feedback in addition to ratings. The committee report should give constructive guidance that will help the candidate improve performance in each area of review.

Standards specific to Early Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor

Consideration of tenure before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year, including service credit, as specified in FPPP 8.5.b.2.d.3 shall be regarded as consideration of “early tenure.” Consideration of promotion to associate or full professor, which would occur earlier than provided for in FPPP 8.5.b.2.e, shall be regarded as consideration of “early promotion.”

Early tenure and promotion shall be initiated according to FPPP 8.5.b.3.

See the previous table for typical minimum ratings required for early tenure and early promotion. As indicated in this table, the department has coupled early tenure and promotion to associate professor, using the same criterion for both. Hence, normally, they will be granted together. A candidate who meets these standards is a special case in the sense of FPPP 8.5.b.3.a.3 pertaining to tenure and meets the criteria for “exceptional” in the sense of FPPP 8.5.b.3.c pertaining to promotion to associate professor. Similarly, this “exceptional” criterion is fulfilled by meeting the standards in the table for promotion to full professor.

It should be noted that a pattern of commitment is essential to Instruction, Professional Growth & Achievement, and Service. This pattern of commitment is especially important for evaluating early tenure & promotion and we wish to emphasize that it is a difficult standard to meet. It would be a rare situation for someone to meet this pattern very early, such as, more than one year early.

3. AREA OF EVALUATION - Instruction

3.1 Overall Structure

Teaching is the primary mission of the Department and the University. Effective teaching is a minimum and necessary requirement for retention, tenure and promotion. As such, the university’s strategic priority, “to develop high quality learning environments in and outside the classroom,” lays the foundation for the department’s goal in instruction. Central to this priority is the ability of faculty to establish and maintain a high-quality, student-centered learning environment in the classroom, promote academically rigorous standards, and provide the support necessary for students to meet these standards. There are, however, many facets to the instructional mission of the department and university, which may involve a variety of activities both inside and outside of the classroom.

The evaluation of a candidate’s performance in Instruction will be based on evidence that lies in two major areas.

Area 1: Establishing and maintaining a high-quality, academically rigorous learning environment in the classroom

Area 2: Additional instructionally related activities

- a. Curriculum and program development
- b. Mentoring students outside of the classroom
- c. Involvement in activities that contribute to the (instructional) Mission and Strategic Plans of the Department, College, and University
- d. Contributions to the department’s student outcomes assessment program

Area 1 is the department’s central priority for instruction, as such, the candidate’s rating in Instruction shall be heavily weighted by the rating in this sub-area. The evaluation of a

candidate's performance in this area shall be based on activities and evidence directly impacting instruction in the classroom. The department's rating criteria for this evidence is given in section 3.2.

The Department of Mathematics & Statistics expects the candidate to engage in teaching activities beyond Area 1. Area 2 represents additional activities that, at least indirectly, inform instruction. This area has been broken up into sub-areas intended to be suggestive, but not exhaustive, of those suitable for instruction. The RTP committee shall evaluate the candidate's performance in this area based on the quality, as well as quantity and continuity of commitment, of activities using the criteria given in section 3.3.

The RTP committee shall determine a separate rating for each of **Area 1** and **Area 2**. These separate ratings shall be combined using the table below to determine an overall rating for Instruction. The table gives typical, minimum, ratings required to receive an overall rating in Instruction of effective or superior.

Overall Rating for Instruction	Area 1 Rating	Area 2 Rating
Effective	E	A
	A to E	E to S
Superior	S	E
	E to S	S

As previously discussed, Area 1 is the central priority for instruction and, as the table above indicates, essentially an effective rating in this area, with only minimal additional activities in Area 2 – corresponding to an adequate rating - is required to receive an overall rating of effective for Instruction. However, the department values the potential impact on instruction that can come from a candidate's involvement in Area 2, so the table allows for a slightly less than effective rating in Area 1, as indicated by the split rating "A to E", to be compensated with the higher split rating "E to S" in Area 2. Similar split ratings are allowed to receive an overall rating of Superior.

Note, while split ratings are allowed in this table, the overall rating in Instruction will not be a split rating in accordance with FPPP 8.5.b.1.c.

3.2 Evidence and specific rating criteria for Area 1

The RTP committee shall evaluate a candidate's performance in this area based on the following evidence.

- Written peer evaluations of teaching performance based upon classroom visitations by faculty, including at least one visitation by a member of the Department RTP Personnel Committee and the Department Chair. The Dean may provide evaluative feedback; additional visits may be requested by the candidate to provide further evaluative feedback. In addition, written evaluations of teaching performance by the Department RTP Personnel and College Personnel Committees may be used (e.g. from previous review cycles), which may be based upon any evidence of teaching effectiveness supplied by the candidate in the dossier or WPAF.

- Student evaluations of teaching (SET). Per the FPPP, all faculty members shall be evaluated in all courses as required by the FPPP and/or the CBA.
- Written course materials (syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc.) submitted by the candidate and the candidate's reflections on these materials. The candidate is encouraged to provide more than a collection of course materials. The candidate's reflections of the material are an important component of the review process.
- Other evidence provided by the candidate under review that is relevant to this area.

Rating criteria specific to Area 1 The rating for this area shall be based on the following guidelines. First, a baseline description of a typical "adequate" instructor is given to convey a general understanding of this rating and for comparative purposes in determining other ratings.

The candidate carries out the basic duties of teaching assignments in a professional manner, is available to students outside of class meeting times, prepares and presents course materials consistent with discipline expectations, expectations – appropriate to the material and the course – are clearly conveyed to the students, and grading based on these expectations is fair and consistent. Evidence (listed above) indicates the candidate's competence in performing basic teaching duties.

In addition to this general description, the RTP committee shall base their evaluation on the criteria for effective teaching set forth by Chickering and Gamson (1987) in "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" in determining the degree to which the evidence demonstrates that the candidate,

- Encourages student-faculty contact.
- Encourages her students to work together.
- Encourages active learning in the classroom or outside of it.
- Provides prompt feedback on assignments.
- Uses class time wisely.
- Sets high standards and communicates them to students.
- Recognizes and responds to the fact that different students learn differently.

The following items pertain specifically to how the RTP committee is to weigh the required components of peer evaluations and SET.

- SET shall count for approximately 25% of the rating in Area 1. As indicated above with the 4 bulleted items that typically will provide the evidence for determining a rating in Area 1, SET's shall be weighted at approximately 25% with the other three items, peer evaluations, written course materials, and other relevant evidence, providing approximately 75% of the weight in arriving at the rating for Area 1. The intent of this criterion is to provide more clarity for the candidate and the RTP committee concerning the language in FPPP 8.5.a.17.a, "Student Evaluations of Faculty data ... will not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation ..."
- A minimum rating of adequate is required in the peer evaluation and SET components of this area (however, the committee is not required to break the rating for this area into individual components but shall indicate the overall rating for this area).

The following is intended to give some examples of evidence that could result in a higher rating than the baseline adequate descriptor indicated above. We emphasize that quality of evidence is

the overriding measure and that these are just possible examples, but evidence of an equivalent performance value may stand in place.

- Course materials and the candidate's discussion of these materials indicates that the candidate expands (or consistently expands) on the material in the text in a manner that enhances learning
- Course materials (e.g. syllabi), written student comments, or written peer evaluations indicate the candidate consistently or regularly schedules additional study sessions, above and beyond expected office hours (e.g. evening help sessions before exams, regularly scheduled upper-level study sessions, or regular Blackboard Learn or other online support/office hours)
- Course materials, written student comments, or written peer evaluations indicate the candidate expands (or consistently expands) on classroom assessment and evaluation in a manner that enhances learning (e.g. by incorporating additional assessment in the classroom or, for an upper-level course with significant written assignments, grading is done via a series of drafts).

3.3 Evidence and specific rating criteria for Area 2

This section is intended to convey departmental expectations beyond **Area 1** and give criteria and typical standards for performance ratings of activities in **Area 2**. The following is a list of sample activities for the various sub-areas of **Area 2** that a candidate may wish to provide evidence of. The list is intended to be suggestive of some of the types of activities that are suitable for each sub-area, but not exhaustive. Activities are not restricted to just these areas (provided there is justification for including them in instruction).

This list can provide a way for the candidate to organize and present his/her work as a teacher, but the candidate should present more than a list. The Committee encourages the candidate to develop and employ the reflective practices necessary to develop and document effective teaching. In addition to providing documentation of participation in teaching activities, the candidate might also provide a rationale for participating in such activities and their potential impact on student learning.

Area 2 a: Curriculum and Program Development

(Note that some of these items could instead be included under PG&A provided the activity involves a significant professional development component.)

- Creating new courses needed by the department.
- Course revisions such as updating content or introducing innovative teaching methods or materials.
- Creating Blackboard Learn or other online components to supplement a course
- Creating or enhancing general education courses.
- Program development.
- Coordinating multi-section courses
- Developing or participating in team teaching

Area 2 b: Mentoring Students Outside of the Classroom

- Advising – majors, Liberal Studies students, minors or students pursuing a Supplementary Authorization in Foundational Mathematics
- Serving as a faculty advisor to the Chico State Math Club or other student organization
- Promoting and mentoring internship experiences for undergraduates.

- Supervision of teaching interns
- Mentoring student research experiences
- Serving on master's committees
- Statistical consulting with master's students

Area 2 c: Involvement in activities that contribute to the instructionally related Mission and Strategic Plans of the Department, College, and University.

- Involvement with K-14 mathematics education, or mathematics related education (for example, presentations to K-14 students).
- Enhancement of educational technology.
- Enhancement of student-centered learning (for example, presentations to University students at forums such as the Math Club Seminar).

Area 2 d: Contributions to the Department's Student Outcomes Assessment program.

- Developing ways to more effectively assess student learning.
- Participating in course and program assessment projects, such as General Education assessment and the Program Review.

Area 2 e: Scholarship of Instruction,

- Writing or developing a textbook.
- Publications related to instruction.
- Presentations that inform instruction at professional meetings.
- On-going research in mathematics education, education, or a related field.

Rating criteria specific to Area 2 The following criteria give definitions that shall apply for rating the candidate's additional activities in this area. The RTP committee is to take into account the quality, as well as the quantity and continuity, of the candidate's performance in these activities, as based on the materials in the candidate's dossier and WPAF.

Also included are examples of *typical* minimum sets of activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other activities of equivalent performance value could be substituted. The purpose of these examples is not to restrict the candidate's range of work but to aid the candidate and the RTP committee by providing an example set of achievements that would merit specific performance ratings. We emphasize that quality and continuity are the main criteria for evaluating performance - any quantification implied in these examples is relative to these overriding measures.

The department anticipates that a candidate's standing in Area 2 will grow with time. Since the Effective and Superior rankings emphasize a **pattern** of commitment, in general, it will be difficult for candidates to meet this standard early in their careers.

Adequate The candidate demonstrates a commitment in both time and quality to educational activities such as those listed in **Area 2**.

A *typical* minimum level of performance is that the candidate is involved in at least 2 activities. For example,

- The candidate 1) is involved with advising majors, e.g. reaching a normal load by the end of a probationary period, and 2) has revised, updated, or created new materials for 2 or more courses, or
- Same advising as above and the candidate has been involved in mentoring projects, such as, serving on a masters committee.

Effective The candidate demonstrates a *pattern* of commitment in both time and quality to educational activities such as those listed in **Area 2**.

A *typical* minimum level of performance is that the candidate is involved in 2 or more activities with a significant level of commitment in time and quality. For example,

- The candidate routinely advises a normal or above normal load and has created a new (or essentially new) course needed by the department (as documented by, for example, a letter from the chair), or
- Same advising as above and the candidate is routinely (i.e. demonstrates a pattern of) involved in mentoring of students, such as, chairing a masters committee, conducting special topics or readings courses (beyond their normal load) or directing an undergraduate research project of significant scope and duration.

Superior The candidate demonstrates a *strong, consistent pattern* of commitment in both time and quality to educational activities such as those listed in **Area 2**.

A *typical* minimum level of performance is that the candidate is involved in significant activities as measured by a time commitment, e.g. 3 or more activities that have a year-long commitment (or a lesser number with multiple-year commitments). An example of a major activity could be the candidate takes on a leadership role in a significant assessment project, which is disseminated regionally.

4. AREA OF EVALUATION - Professional Growth and Achievement

4.1 Evidence

All faculty must demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and achievement by engaging in scholarly activities that foster intellectual growth and professional development. Scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the missions of the Department, College and University. The Department RTP Committee shall consider the quality, along with the quantity, level of effort, and overall pattern of involvement of the candidate's scholarly activities. To the extent possible, quality is to be the overriding factor in measuring a candidate's performance. While scholarly activity has intrinsic merits, the candidate should strive to disseminate new ideas to the larger mathematics or statistics community. Activities with a peer-reviewed component will typically be considered more significant. It is the candidate's responsibility to help the committee judge performance value by documenting activities and explaining the significance of the activities with respect to the candidate's professional development.

The following is a list of sample activities with professional growth and achievement merit (not in any order of performance value). The list is intended to be suggestive of the types of activities a candidate may wish to provide evidence of, but is not exhaustive.

4.1.1 Authorship and Research

- a. Publications, both peer-reviewed and not
- b. Presentation at professional meetings
- c. On-going research in mathematics, mathematics education, statistics, or a related field (documented by, for example, submitted papers or drafts of current work in progress.)

4.1.2 Professional Achievements furthering the missions of the Department, College or University

- a. Involvement in renewal and development (e.g., substantial professional development or achievement during leave of absence, sabbatical, or assigned time; attendance at professional meetings, attendance at workshops for faculty development not covered above).
- b. Seeking internal or external funding for research, activities, or projects.
- c. Obtaining internal or external funding for research, activities, or projects.
- d. Collaboration with area schools and members of the K-14 mathematics education community (for example, providing professional development opportunities for teachers).

4.1.3 Other scholarly contributions to the profession

- a. Professional consulting in their discipline (documented by hours and a description of work done)
- b. Serving as a referee for a journal (documented by work done and hours)
- c. Serving as an editor (documented by work done and hours)
- d. Serving as a reviewer (documented by work done and hours)
- e. Participation in professional societies (for example, holding office, organizing meetings, workshops, symposia, etc.) (documented by details of duties and time involved)

Evidence and measures of performance value of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer and administrative review of material submitted in the dossier
- Self-evaluation of material submitted in the dossier (to be included in the dossier)
- External reviews of work
- Citations of work
- External recognition of professional work (such as invitations to present)
- Extent, frequency, and quality of professional activity
- Awards or honors

4.2 Rating Criteria

The rating criteria for measuring a candidate's performance in professional growth and achievement shall be based on the following items. First, a brief description is given for the various ratings of adequate, effective and superior. These are further defined by giving examples of *typical* minimum levels of achievement with sample activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other achievements of equivalent performance value may be substituted. The purpose of these examples is not to restrict the candidate's range of work but to aid the candidate and the

RTP committee by providing an example set of achievements that would merit specific performance ratings. Since evaluations are to be based, to the extent possible, on the quality of an achievement and since typical minimum benchmarks sometimes involve an accounting of significant achievements, some special notes on “quality” and “significance” are given below.

4.2.1 “Quality” and “significance”

As a comprehensive university, our department values scholarship in the area of Professional Growth and Achievement in the broadest sense. With the university’s emphasis on our instructional mission and the heavy teaching loads in our department, the department recognizes the inherent difficulty in staying professionally active - a perspective that influences our interpretation of quality or significance of activities, such as, publications or grants.

- Collaboration is highly valued and encouraged, whether it is presentations, publications, grants, or other collaborative work. A statement should be provided by the candidate describing his/her role and the significance of the contribution to any joint work.
- In terms of publications, it is not the department’s intent to get into a journal rating game. The primary criterion for a quality publication is that it be peer-reviewed in a reputable journal.

It should be noted that “peer” in this context would typically require the editorial process to include reviewers with Ph.D.’s but not necessarily restricted to mathematics or a mathematics related field. For example, since interdisciplinary collaboration is valued, other science areas or engineering would be acceptable. Also, the department recognizes the importance that the publisher be reputable and has a stringent review process.

The candidate is required to give details about the journal if the journal is not well known and established, or if the committee is unfamiliar with the journal. (See example 1 in the Appendix). The Candidate may be required to provide information on the review, such as, details of the review board, the review process, publication fees, or the publication acceptance rate, if available. If the Impact Factor is available, that number could help validate the quality of the journal. If the journal is reviewed by MathSciNet, the candidate could give the Math Citation Quotient (MCQ) value for the journal. The RTP Personnel Committee may request additional information at any time after the candidate’s dossier has been submitted (or at the time of the interview).

The department also recognizes that a single publication could be “exceptional” and may constitute an achievement that should count as equal to two (or more) typical peer-reviewed publications. It is expected that such a determination should be rare and limited to articles representing substantial and/or long-term effort with a correspondingly high degree of recognition, such as, publication in one of the top journals in all of mathematics or a related field.

For similar reasons, the department wishes to take a broad perspective on the evaluation of grants. However, there is no single defining criterion as with publications.

- The evaluation of significance of grants should be based on a combination of things, like, the candidate’s role on the grant (e.g. PI or co-PI), scope and reputation of the funding agency, level of competition and review, scope of the outcomes proposed, and, to a lesser degree,

dollar amount. The candidate must describe their role in detail (what percentage of the grant they wrote, what outcomes they are responsible for, when those outcomes will be achieved).

4.2.2 Descriptions and Typical Minimum Levels – for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Adequate The candidate demonstrates a minimal level of commitment to professional growth and achievement as evidenced by engagement in scholarly activities, such as those listed in section 4.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and a larger number may be necessary for some conferences of a local/regional scope).

Effective The candidate demonstrates a *pattern* of commitment to professional growth and achievement as evidenced by engagement in scholarly activities, such as those listed in section 4.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- One achievement of similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope) and
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

Superior The candidate demonstrates a *strong, consistent pattern* of commitment to professional growth and achievement as evidenced by engagement in scholarly activities, such as those listed in section 4.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of a similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences, at least one of which, is a major conference of national scope (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope).
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

4.2.3 Descriptions and Typical Minimum Levels – for Promotion to Full Professor

The basic descriptions stay the same but each rating (Adequate, Effective, and Superior) now requires an additional significant achievement of similar performance value as a peer-reviewed publication (as described below in section 4.2.4). Specifically, the typical benchmarks change as follows.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for a rating of Adequate is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- One achievement of similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and a larger number may be necessary for some conferences of a local/regional scope).

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for a rating of Effective is:

- One peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope) and
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for a rating of Superior is:

- Two peer reviewed publications related to the area of activity and
- Two achievements of a similar performance value as described in section 4.2.4 and
- Two presentations at professional conferences, at least one of which, is a major conference of national scope (the presentations should involve different scholarly activities and more than two may be necessary for conferences of a local/regional scope).
- Multiple activities or achievements indicating an on-going professional commitment, for example, student talks, colloquia presentations at other departments, internal grants (these may be of much lesser significance than the achievements required in the items above and those achievements count toward the evaluation of this item).

4.2.4 “Similar performance value”

The benchmarks above refer to achievements of similar performance value as compared to a publication that meets the department’s standard for quality (as described in section 4.2.1). This section is intended to give some clarification of what Similar Performance Value means. The department recognizes there may be activities or accomplishments that constitute professional growth & achievement but do not necessarily result in publications. These less common activities may be of similar performance value depending on the documented level of achievement. The most common example is with grants that meet the department’s standard for significance as described at the beginning of this section. The overriding issues for evaluating the performance value are the same type of measures as applied to publications and grants, namely, documentation of peer review and documented academic achievement. The candidate must describe his/her role in the activity and the competitive nature of the activity if it applies. Other than grants, which are already covered in terms of measuring quality and significance, it is

the candidate's responsibility to promote an activity or achievement as being of similar performance value and provide the evidence and documentation to justify this position.

5. AREA OF EVALUATION – Other Contributions to the University and Community

In addition to teaching and related activities and professional growth and achievement, all faculty are expected to contribute and support the missions of the Department, College and University, and to serve our profession externally to the University, through activities not covered in the previous sections. The purpose of this area of evaluation is not to encourage candidates to accumulate a list of accomplishments; rather, it is to recognize that it takes work to make a Department, College, University or Profession run smoothly and, to acknowledge the contributions of individuals for sharing the workload. Service is an ongoing commitment, and all ratings will be based on a continuous pattern of contributions. Activities such as, but not restricted to those listed below, have value in this area of evaluation:

5.1 Evidence

- a. Service on committees at the Department, College, or University level.
- b. Service on regional, state, or federal boards or committees.
- c. Service as a program, department, or university administrator.
- d. Outreach and service to the K-14 mathematics education community (for example, service on local, state, or national committees, commissions, or boards).
- e. Mentoring of master's students.
- f. Credential advising.
- g. Service to the mathematics community not covered above (such as service on local, state, or national committees, commissions, or boards).
- h. Work with advisory boards, or corporations.
- i. Outreach to students, potential students, and alumni (for example, work on the Department newsletter or webpage)
- j. Participation in fundraising or development activities.
- k. Participation in recruiting-related activities.
- l. Organizing or participating in events that promote public awareness of the discipline.
- m. In general, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues (including colleagues from other institutions).

Service contributions can be documented by, but not limited to:

- Including in the dossier peer and/or administrative review of service
- Self-evaluation submitted to the dossier
- Letters from committee or Department Chair describing extent, frequency, or quality of committee and other service (to be included in the dossier)
- Statements in the dossier describing leadership roles in committee work or other service
- Written opinions of faculty and staff colleagues, or community collaborators and the public regarding the Candidate's service (to be included in the dossier)
- Evidence of awards or honors

5.2 Rating Criteria

Service at the department level is particularly vital to maintain a healthy and functional department. All faculty should demonstrate a willingness and ability to cooperate and work effectively with other faculty and staff on issues of governance and service at the Department, College, and University levels. The RTP committee shall consider the quality, continuity, and level of effort associated with any service activity, with the main criteria for evaluating performance being *quality of service*. Any quantification implied in the examples is relative to this overriding measure. The following descriptions and typical minimum levels of expectation shall apply.

Adequate The candidate demonstrates a minimal level of commitment to other contributions as evidenced by engagement in activities such as those listed in section 5.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is that the candidate serves on 2 or 3 departmental committees each academic year (the minimum number of committees that all faculty are requested to serve on may vary from year to year based on eligible faculty and committee needs, e.g. due to hiring committees, etc.) The work load also varies from committee to committee, and can vary from year to year. The candidate should briefly indicate his/her role on the committee (member, chair) and the level of workload during the period of service (low, average, high) A letter from the committee Chair or Department Chair should document unusual workload, or special responsibilities, especially for activities or committees that may not be familiar to an RTP committee. Advising is an important activity and candidates are expected to share the advising workload. Attendance at department meetings and participation in graduation ceremonies is also expected.

Candidates are advised to look at the examples in the Appendix: Candidate's Instruction Letter.

Effective The candidate demonstrates a commitment to service beyond minimal service on departmental committees, as evidenced by engagement in activities such as those listed in section 5.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is that the candidate's service on departmental committees is at the Adequate level given above and, in addition, the candidate has

- Served outside the Department at least once if candidate is untenured, and at least twice if candidate is tenured (for example, on minor College or University level committees, or on a community advisory board)

and

- Taken on a leadership role in service (e.g. Chaired a committee with a significant workload at any level, or had a leadership role in a service activity other than committee service) or taken on a substantial advising load as documented by a time sheet or by a letter from the Chair.

Superior The candidate demonstrates a strong and consistent commitment to other contributions, beyond service on departmental committees, as evidenced by engagement in activities such as those listed in section 5.1.

A *typical* minimum level of achievement for this rating is that the candidate's service on departmental committees exceeds the Effective level given above and, in addition, the candidate

- Regularly assumes a leadership role in service both in and outside the Department
- Makes contributions in service to the Department, College, University, or Community other than standard committee service.

We emphasize these are *typical* minimum levels of achievement with sample activities that a candidate *could* pursue, but other achievements of equivalent performance value may be substituted. For example, the department recognizes that a candidate may make significant service contributions to the department, college, or university that are outside of a committee setting, e.g. work with advisory boards or other service on a non-campus regional, state, or national board, faculty senate, or participation in recruitment activities. Depending on the documented level of effort or achievement, the RTP committee (whether requested by the candidate or not) may substitute these activities for an appropriate level of committee work.

The candidate is encouraged to document heavy workload committees and/or special responsibilities assumed, especially for activities or committees that are not well known.

Appendix: Candidate's Instruction Letter

Notes about Instruction

Documentation similar to the examples given below for Professional Growth and Achievement also apply to Instruction. It is the candidate's responsibility to focus the review on any significant teaching related activities, with sufficient explanation to justify their significance and justify a specific rating in the area.

For example, a candidate may reflect in narrative form on his/her SET's for Area 1 in Instruction.

In particular, candidates are encouraged to document Area 2 activities with explanations, time sheets or letters of support.

For example, the guidelines for Instruction mention the value of developing course materials. Rather than simply listing materials, the candidate is encouraged to reflect on these materials and give guidance as to which materials are new or original. If the candidate has developed a "new course needed by the department," the candidate should document how this course is needed (e.g., by including a letter of support from colleagues or the chair).

Notes about PG&A

As indicated in section 1.4.2 of the Department of Mathematics & Statistics RTP guidelines, the candidate should include a document in their WPAF that specifically addresses the criteria in the guidelines. For each criterion, where it is appropriate, the candidate should indicate the achievements or activities that they wish to promote as meeting a specific rating for that criterion. In some cases, additional information or explanation may be needed to justify the stated accomplishments as being "significant" or of "quality" (see the comments at the beginning of section 4.2 in the RTP guidelines).

The purpose of having it be the candidate's responsibility to address the criteria in the guidelines is because he/she knows best how to match accomplishments, activities, and other evidence with the criteria and how to make the case for their significance. For many typical achievements, little, if any, additional information or justification may be needed. But, the candidate should be especially alert to achievements that might be perceived as marginally meeting the department's standard for quality or significance.

Given below are a couple of examples of how the candidate might address specific criteria and ratings.

Example 1

The department's RTP guidelines in the area for PG&A lists the following items in a typical minimum benchmark for a rating of effective: (1) one peer-reviewed publication, (2) one achievement of similar performance value, (3) two presentations at professional conferences, and (4) multiple activities indicating an on-going professional commitment. I have successfully met this benchmark with the following:

- (1) Candidate, A. (2005). Math Article Title. *Respected Math Journal*, vol. 1 (no. 2), 30- 40.

This is a well-known refereed journal requiring no additional justification for meeting the department's standard for quality. The acceptance letter and full article can be found in _____.

- (2) Candidate, A. (Co-PI). Grant Title. *National Funding Agency*, \$75,000 (2005)

The acceptance letter and the full proposal can be found in _____. (As an external grant from a reputable national funding agency and of a high dollar amount, it is likely this is an example that would not require further justification of its significance. The candidate should document his/her level of involvement in writing and conducting the grant, and describe outcomes of the grant. The example below illustrates a case where additional information may be needed.)

- (3) I gave presentations at the following meetings.

- Conference Title (Date). This was a 15-minute contributed talk. An acceptance letter and paper this was based on can be found in _____.
- Conference Title (Date). I was a co-presenter for this 30-minute invited presentation. An acceptance letter and PowerPoint slides can be found in _____.

- (4) The following activities, in addition to the achievements listed above, clearly illustrates a continuous pattern of performance: an additional presentation at a national professional meeting (Date), 3 presentations at colloquia or regional conferences (Dates), one internal grant (e.g. a CELT award for \cong \$2K in (Date)), and one student talk each year for the past 4 years.

Example 2

(This example is intended only to illustrate a variation to item (2) in the benchmark used for Example 1 above.)

- (2) Candidate, A. (Co-PI). Grant Title. "*CSU System-wide Program*, \$30,000 (2005)

While this is not external to the CSU system and not of national scope, it is a very competitive program. Last year only 9 awards were made out of 56 submissions, an acceptance rate which indicates a level of competitiveness at least equal to typical national funding agencies. In addition, the scope of this proposal is significant ... (very briefly summarize the time period and proposed outcomes).

Example 3

(This example is intended to illustrate an activity of equivalent performance value to a "presentation at a professional conference")

- (3A) I gave a presentation at the following meeting.

- Conference Title (Date). This was a 15-minute contributed talk. An acceptance letter and paper this was based on can be found in _____.

(3B) I supported the research of faculty in the Department of Biology with statistical consulting. This is documented by the following.

- Bio Faculty, A. and Bio Faculty, B. (2005) Bio Paper Title, *Respected Bio Journal*, (vol. 1) (no.2), 30-40. This paper includes an acknowledgement of my contribution and can be found in _____.
- A time sheet showing five hours of consulting related to this project can be found in _____.

Notes about Service

Both the Effective and Superior ratings in the department RTP guidelines for service require a “leadership” role on a “significant” committee. If this is satisfied by the candidate serving as the chair of a committee, the candidate should obtain evidence of this by requesting a letter from the Chair of the Department and, if necessary, indicating why this committee qualifies as being significant; if the candidate performs particularly significant service in a leadership capacity on a committee, then the candidate should request a letter from the chair of the committee detailing the contributions made by the candidate. If the candidate wishes to argue that he/she has taken on a significant advising load, this should also be documented with time sheets or letters of support from colleagues or advisees.