

**Department of Management**

**Faculty Personnel Policies and**

**Procedures**

**Adopted by Department August 2014**

**Approved by Dean and Provost September 2014**

**Effective 2015-16 AY**

# Table of Contents

1.0	Statement of Compliance.....	8
2.0	Personnel Committee Structure and Eligibility .....	8
3.0	General Responsibilities of Faculty Undergoing Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review.....	8
4.0	Standards – Instruction .....	9
5.0	Standards – Professional Growth and Achievement.....	11
6.0	Standards – Other Contributions to the University/Community (also known as Service). ..	12
7.0	Standards – Contribution to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University .....	13
8.0	Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty) ...	13
9.0	Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty.....	15
10.0	Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty .....	15
11.0	Conflict of Interest.....	15
12.0	Hiring.....	16
13.0	Range Elevation for Lecturers.....	17
13.2	If the faculty member’s work assignment includes Professional Growth and Achievement (PGA), then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as “effective.” See Section 5 above. ....	17
14.0	Effective Date .....	17

## DEFINITIONS

### CBA

Collective Bargaining Agreement, also known as MOU, Contract or Agreement. It is an agreement between the Trustees of the California State University and an exclusive representative of a unit of employees' union.

### DOSSIER

The professional file kept by each faculty member. It contains data in the possession of the faculty member that provide evidence of professional activity, which are indexed and submitted to the working personnel action file in those cycles in which the member is being formally evaluated or reviewed. After the review period is complete, the index will be placed in the PAF with the evaluative reports, maintaining the link between the dossier and the personnel file.

### EM

See "Executive Memorandum."

### EQUIVALENCY

Attainment judged by the faculty of a discipline to be equivalent to possession of the terminal degree normally required for tenure and/or promotion in that discipline.

### EVALUATION

Either a Periodic Evaluation or a Performance Review.

### EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM

A memo issued by the campus President, which creates or updates formal campus policy. The memo is the policy document. Referred to as EM or EMs (plural) for short.

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 4

### FPPP

The University's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document. The FPPP is the primary policy relating to personnel actions affecting faculty. It is available from the Faculty Affairs web site.

### INDEX

A list of those materials prepared by the faculty unit employee for periodic evaluation or performance review that is placed in the working personnel action file (WPAF). That index is permanently placed in the personnel action file (PAF) which results in materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty unit employee to be incorporated by reference to the personnel action file (the only official personnel file containing employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee).

### LECTURER

The class to which temporary faculty appointments are made, in contrast with the rank designations to which probationary and tenured faculty are appointed, such as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The Lecturer class is subdivided into ranges.

### PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The process of evaluating probationary faculty for retention, tenure, or promotion that leads to formal reports, recommendations, and notices of results.

### PERIODIC EVALUATION

The process of evaluating faculty on the basis of temporary service, probationary service in a year when retention is not an issue, and service as a tenured faculty member. Periodic evaluations stress developmental issues and focus on plans for improving a faculty member's effectiveness. The written report does not contain formal recommendations regarding retention, tenure, or promotion.

### PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Committee which makes recommendations on appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, leaves of absence, or other actions which may result in a change of employment status for an individual faculty member.

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 5

### PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (PAF)

The Personnel Action File shall be defined as the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. For each faculty unit employee, the President shall designate an office in which the Personnel Action File shall be maintained and shall designate a custodian for the Personnel Action File. It is the intent of the CSU to maintain accurate and relevant Personnel Action Files. There may be copies of materials contained in the official file in other working files for the convenience of the Employer. Only the official Personnel File may be used as the basis of personnel actions. The Dean is the custodian of the PAFs of faculty in his/her College and the PAFs are maintained in the office of the College Dean. (See also WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE.)

### PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

A technical term employed to describe any activity or participation that contributes to an instructor's development of currency in the subject matter taught and in instructional technology appropriate to the assignment of a temporary faculty member as defined by academic department standards and criteria. It is to be distinguished from "professional growth and achievement," which must also encompass research and scholarship that contributes to the knowledge base of the instructor's discipline or to the effective operation of professional organizations of scholars.

### RANGE

The term used to designate subdivisions of the lecturer class that denote placement of temporary faculty on the salary schedule. Ranges correspond to the academic ranks of probationary and tenured faculty as follows:

- L Range (also designated as 1) corresponds to Assistant Rank
- A Range (also designated as 2) corresponds to Instructor Rank
- B Range (also designated as 3) corresponds to Assistant Professor Rank
- C Range (also designated as 4) corresponds to Associate Professor Rank
- D Range (also designated as 5) corresponds to Professor Rank

### RATING

The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all levels of evaluation in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University. Recognized ratings are "inadequate,"

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 6

"adequate," "effective," and "superior." The use of hyphenated ratings (e.g., “effective-to-superior”) is NOT permissible.

### RECOMMENDATION

The expression of the wish of a reviewer of any level as to the action being considered; an explicit indication of an action said to be justified on the basis of relevant criteria and evidence.

### REPORT

A written discussion of evidence submitted as a basis for a personnel action, including description and judgmental conclusions arising from such evidence.

### RETENTION

The decision or action to retain a probationary faculty unit employee, normally for one or two years during their probationary period following a performance review.

### REVIEW CYCLE

The sequence of events involved in an evaluation or review conducted within a particular academic year. (See RTP Deadline Calendar.)

### RTP

The retention, tenure, and promotion process, including Periodic Evaluations for temporary and probationary faculty, and Performance Reviews for probationary faculty.

### RTP DEADLINE CALENDAR

A calendar of deadlines for the submission of reports and recommendations from each Personnel Committee, Department Chair, and College Dean. It is provided by the Provost (or designee) by the beginning of each Fall semester.

## **Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 7**

### TEMPORARY FACULTY

Faculty with appointments with a specified termination date, whether full-time or part-time.

### WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF)

The personnel action file (PAF) and dossier are combined during the time of evaluation to create the WPAF. The Working Personnel Action File is the file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. It includes all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the employee (dossier) being evaluated, and information provided by faculty unit employees, students, and academic administrators. It also includes all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. Because the WPAF is part of the PAF, all regulations regarding the PAF also pertain to the WPAF.

## **1.0 Statement of Compliance**

This document is intended to comply with provisions of the CBA and the FPPP, and to provide elaboration in those areas where these documents allow for standards to be established by each Department/Unit or College. The reader is urged to consult these essential documents. If there should be any conflict between the provisions contained within this document and federal or state law, California State University policy, the CBA, and/or the FPPP, the higher level laws, regulations, or policies shall apply. For current information regarding documents and policies that may have personnel decision implications, contact the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

## **2.0 Personnel Committee Structure and Eligibility**

Personnel Committee size and membership shall be established by discussion, nomination, and election at either the first meeting of the Department of Management at the beginning of each academic year or at the last Department meeting held the prior academic year. An eligible nominee may not decline the nomination to serve. A quorum consists of at least fifty percent of the total committee membership.

## **3.0 General Responsibilities of Faculty Undergoing Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review**

- 3.1 It is the responsibility of all faculty members to understand the provisions of the FPPP and those contained within this document. Faculty members undergoing Periodic Evaluation or Performance Review should periodically consult with (and seek guidance from) the Department Chair and/or the Personnel Committee with respect to questions about the personnel process generally, or about specific expectations or requirements pertaining to the individual faculty member. Senior faculty members have the responsibility to provide guidance in this area.
- 3.2 The Department of Management cannot overstate the importance of maintaining a dossier containing a cumulative record of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments (see the FPPP and directives from the Dean's Office for additional requirements, guidance, and restrictions related to the dossier). Although unmanageable quantities of material should be avoided, capabilities, performance, accomplishments, and effectiveness must be documented affirmatively. That is, should insufficient evidence exist regarding any evaluation criterion, the reviewer(s) may not find that satisfactory performance has been achieved. Each faculty member should be familiar with the contents of his/her PAF (and WPAF), and note that materials can be



included in the WPAF via indexing in the dossier.

- 3.3 Periodic Evaluations, Performance Reviews and any other personnel actions will always use the current DOM policy and current FPPP.
- 3.4 A faculty member need not excel in all areas of review in order to be retained, tenured or promoted. The more relevant question is whether the faculty member overall provides a valuable contribution to the Department, College and University. When evaluating a faculty member's contributions, the quality as well as the quantity of performance shall be considered.

#### **4.0 Standards – Instruction**

- 4.1 Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for faculty with responsibility for instruction. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation:
  - a. Knowledge of the course material
  - b. Currency in his/her field
  - c. Quality of communication
  - d. Organization of the learning experience
  - e. Level of difficulty and range of instructional materials for the course(s) being taught
  - f. Existence and quality of student-centered learning environments
  - g. Academic rigor and high expectations for student performance
  - h. Use of instructional technology

Periodic Evaluation reports may, and Performance Review reports must address all of the above criteria, but separate report sections for each criterion are not necessary.

- 4.2 The documentary evidence used to establish performance on the standards related to instruction and teaching effectiveness include (but need not be limited to) the following:
  - a. Required Elements
    - (i) classroom visitation(s) of members of the Personnel Committee, and/or the Department Chair, and/or the Department Chair's designee, and/or other qualified observers
    - (ii) course syllabi, examinations, supplementary instructional materials at least for the most recent semester of each course taught, with materials from other semesters available upon request and indexed within the dossier
    - (iii) Student evaluations of teaching (required by FPPP)

- b. Optional Elements
  - i. course grade distributions and GPA by section
  - ii. teaching portfolios, including examples of student performance and achievement, and examples of the faculty member's feedback to students
  - iii. video of teaching sessions
  - iv. written reports of colleagues based on team-teaching experiences
  - v. written reports of guest appearances in an evaluator's class
  - vi. written student evaluations of teaching that are not already part of the WPAF
  - vii. peer evaluations of significant independent study or research by students
  - viii. special student projects, informal seminars, or internships overseen by the faculty member
  - ix. honors, awards, or special recognition received for accomplishments in the classroom
  - x. results of standardized measures or examinations across multiple-section, multiple- faculty courses
  - xi. creative measures of appropriate student outcomes assessment
  - xii. examples of the effective use of instructional technology

4.3 Many faculty activities naturally reflect on multiple areas of achievement. Reviewers should include consideration of material presented regarding professional growth and achievement that contributes to the evaluation of the faculty member's instructional effectiveness and currency in the field. In evaluating a faculty member's instructional effectiveness, reviewers also should consider his/her role in course, curriculum, and program development; and special forms of contact with students, such as individual student advising and involvement with student organizations. The unique challenges and contributions associated with team teaching shall be duly weighed. In all cases, evidence of the quality of such activities must be presented.

#### 4.4 Classroom Visits

a. University policy (the FPPP) and the contract (CBA) require that there be some form of consultation between the faculty member who is to do the classroom visit and the faculty member who is to be observed. This consultation may consist of communication from the observer to the person to be observed as follows:

- Offering to meet ahead of the visit to discuss the nature of such observations and answer questions posed by the person to be observed.
- Offering to meet after the visit to provide informal feedback.

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 11

- Asking if there are any areas about which the person to be observed would like detailed feedback.

The above list is not intended to be exhaustive, and communication between the two faculty members can cover multiple purposes.

b. While the FPPP establishes a minimum of a 5-day notice be given to the faculty member being evaluated, there is no requirement to specify the exact day of the evaluation. However, in addition to providing notice of the upcoming visit, it is necessary to obtain additional information about the course schedule to make sure that the visit does not occur on a day where instruction is not the focal point (e.g., solely student presentations, an exam, technical coverage of how to do a simulation, etc.).

### 5.0 Standards – Professional Growth and Achievement

- 5.1 All forms of scholarship—teaching and learning, discovery, integration of knowledge, and application—should be considered when evaluating professional growth and achievement. The common attribute among these manifestations of scholarship is the creation of something that did not exist before, and which is validated by, and communicated to, others.
- 5.2 Faculty members must provide evidence of active and on-going scholarly inquiry and a record of published research. The department expects candidates for promotion or tenure to have published multiple refereed journal articles in academic, practitioner, or pedagogical journals since the candidate's last promotion or since hire.
- 5.3 Additional documentary evidence that could be used to establish performance on the standards related to Professional Growth and Achievement may include (but need not be limited to) the following:
  - academic books (authorship, editorship)
  - published case studies
  - chapters in academic books
  - proceedings published for regional, national, or international conferences
  - presentations made at regional, national or international conferences
  - funded grant proposals and contracts
  - software that has been published or is generally in use
  - awards or other recognition for professional activities
  - editorial review of manuscripts for possible publication in academic/professional journals or for presentation at academic/professional conferences

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 12

- service as the Editor, or as a member of the Editorial Board, of an academic/professional journal
- manuscripts in progress

Faculty members should note that outside reviews may be helpful in assessing their work, as would reviewers' and/or editors' comments on work that has been submitted for publication or presentation consideration. Significant and high quality service to one's profession can be considered in evaluating professional growth and achievement, but it will not weigh nearly as much in the evaluation as publications. Faculty members should provide reviewers with any relevant evidence regarding works in progress.

### **6.0 Standards – Other Contributions to the University/Community (also known as Service)**

- 6.1 There are many ways by which a faculty member can contribute to the success of the Department, College, University, and the surrounding community. Faculty members should find appropriate means of documenting any such contributions. While the Department of Management does not particularly value any one form of contribution over another, reviewers should consider the impact and quality of these efforts/outcomes as they relate to facilitating the achievement of University/College/Department strategic plans and goals.
- 6.2 Each faculty member must provide evidence regarding his/her service on committees, task forces, and other service-related activities. For each committee, task force, or other group activity, the faculty member should identify: (1) the service group's name, (2) the faculty member's role (e.g., Chair, member), (3) the duration of service, (4) a contact person for verification of the faculty member's contributions, and (5) the ways in which the faculty member effectively contributed to the group's tasks and outcomes. In all cases, evidence of the quality of such activities should be presented. An example of sufficient documentation is a brief statement from the chair of the committee on which one served.
- 6.3 "Working collaboratively and productively with colleagues" is defined by the CBA as a professional responsibility of faculty, and this activity should be included in the evaluation of "Other Contributions." It is the responsibility of the faculty member to include evidence that s/he works well with others (i.e., is considered to be a "good colleague"). For example, such evidence might include written confirmation by others in the discipline that the faculty member works collaboratively and productively with his/her colleagues. Team-developed courses, co-taught classes, and co-authored articles may also demonstrate the effectiveness of a faculty member's ability to work harmoniously with his/her co-workers. Evidence presented under the sections of "Instruction" and "Professional Growth and Achievement" may also

demonstrate the effectiveness of the faculty member’s ability to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues. The Narrative contained within one’s dossier provides an important opportunity to describe these contributions.

**7.0 Standards – Contribution to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University**

The faculty member should include in his/her dossier information regarding how his/her instructional, professional, and service activities have contributed to the implementation of the University, College, and Department strategic plans, and how the faculty member’s performance generally facilitated the University’s, College’s, and Department’s abilities to meet their respective strategic goals. The Narrative contained within one’s dossier provides an important opportunity to describe these contributions.

**8.0 Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)**

The FPPP requires that each department/unit specify the standards by which it will evaluate performance for retention, tenure, and promotion. The department shall adhere to the definitions of *Superior*, *Effective*, *Adequate*, and *Inadequate* specified in the FPPP. The table below outlines the department’s requirements for RTP. (This section draws from FPPP section 8.0 on Evaluation of Faculty.)

8.1 Department of Management Tenure and Promotion Standards.

Area	Retention*	Tenure	Promotion from Assistant to Associate	Promotion from Associate to Full
Instruction	Adequate	Effective	Effective	Effective
Professional Growth and Achievement	Adequate	Effective	Effective	Effective
Service	Adequate	Effective	Effective	Effective

\*Retention shall be awarded only to those whose performance appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining). (see current FPPP section on Conducting Performance Reviews), and meet the College’s standards to be Academically Qualified.

Note in the table above that **a candidate rated as *inadequate* in any area will not be recommended for retention, tenure or promotion.** Also note that a minimum rating of *effective* in instruction is required for tenure or promotion. The record of candidates undergoing a performance review for the purposes of retention

should demonstrate that there is a reasonable chance of the candidate obtaining tenure in due course. Therefore, the rating of retention candidates should be based on their progress toward the achievements necessary for recommendation for tenure or promotion. Also note that candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.

8.2 Department of Management Standard for “Early” Tenure: The FPPP requires that a recommendation of “early” tenure (i.e., prior to the beginning of the sixth consecutive probationary year) be accompanied by its justification as a “special case.” The candidate’s record must at least meet the above stated standards for “normal” tenure. Beyond this requirement, evaluators shall determine whether the candidate is a “special case” by considering the following. Given the commitment the Department, College, and University make with the awarding of tenure, the candidate’s record must reflect that he/she is a valuable colleague. One way of demonstrating this value is by having a Service record evaluated as *Effective* or higher. Most importantly, the candidate’s accomplishments must be particularly strong in Instruction and/or Professional Growth and Achievement. It is not sufficient that these extraordinary accomplishments be done within a short amount of time. The record must demonstrate that the candidate’s performance is likely to continue its trajectory of excellence.

8.3 Department of Management Standard for “Early” Promotion: The FPPP requires that a candidate seeking “early” promotion must be “exceptional” and demonstrate “exceptional merit.” To be granted an early promotion in the Department of Management, the candidate’s record must at least meet the above stated standards for “normal” promotion. In addition, the determination as to whether the candidate’s case is “exceptional,” the following criteria apply. The candidate’s accomplishments must be particularly strong in Instruction and/or Professional Growth and Achievement. It is not sufficient that these extraordinary accomplishments be done within a short amount of time. The record must demonstrate that the candidate’s performance is likely to continue its trajectory of excellence. The candidate’s performance must reflect the level of experience and maturity normally associated with faculty holding the rank being sought. Additionally, reflecting his/her value as a colleague, the candidate’s Service contributions must at least be *Effective* for someone with the current number of years of service (including any years of service credit). For example, if the candidate has been at CSUC for four years, then his/her Service contributions must be of the caliber normally associated with a rating of *Effective* for one who has been here for four years. If a candidate has been at CSUC for two years, but comes in with an additional two years of service credit, then his/her Service contributions must be of the caliber normally associated with a rating of *Effective* for one who has been here for four years.

## **9.0 Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty**

- 9.1 The CBA specifies that the periodic evaluation of full-time temporary faculty will follow the periodic evaluation procedures for probationary, tenure-track faculty, and is intended to be developmental. The periodic evaluation will result in a performance report, but no recommendation regarding future employment will be made.
- 9.2 The periodic evaluation of part-time temporary faculty shall follow the policies and procedures in the FPPP and the CBA including:
  - a. At least one classroom visit is conducted each academic year. Classroom visitations may be conducted by probationary and tenured faculty, the Department Chair or designee, and others deemed qualified by the Personnel Committee. Visitation reports will be submitted on the College's designated form.
  - b. A File Closure Form must be signed by the Chair of the Personnel Committee and a candidate by the deadline in the RTP calendar.
- 9.3 All temporary faculty members' dossiers must document performance related to each appropriate criterion for evaluation as specified in the FPPP.
- 9.4 Temporary faculty must maintain AACSB qualification status, as determined by the College Dean.
- 9.5 Temporary faculty appointed to Range A or Range B are required to demonstrate "professional activity" appropriate to the instructional assignment. Temporary faculty appointed to Range C or Range D are required to demonstrate Professional Growth and Achievement commensurate with the corresponding rank and work assignment. Consult the FPPP for details.

## **10.0 Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty**

The periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall follow the procedures in the FPPP.

## **11.0 Conflict of Interest**

Presently, the FPPP requires that, "Department/Unit and College constitutions and bylaws (or other guidelines) regarding Department/Unit and College Personnel Committees shall establish standards of conflict of interest regarding eligibility, beyond the "conflict of interest" rules stated elsewhere in this

## Department of Management Personnel Policies – page 16

document, as the appropriate academic unit deems necessary.” The Department of Management deems that no further standards are necessary.

### 12.0 Hiring

- 12.1 Upon notification of an authorization to hire a new faculty member, the department chair will initiate the process to form a hiring committee, following the CSU Chico Faculty Recruitment Manual. The Department of Management considers hiring to be one of the most important functions of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and thus expects all eligible department faculty to participate in the process. In the case when the hiring process extends over two semesters, faculty can only participate if they are available for the duration of the entire hiring process. Temporary faculty may be invited to meet with tenure-track candidates, and provide feedback to the hiring committee on their observations.
- 12.2 The procedure for recommending new tenure-track faculty to the dean shall be conducted through a vote of all of the Department’s tenured & tenure-track faculty who hold voting rights for that semester, as described in the most current COB & Department policies.
- 12.3 Participation in the hiring process is expected of every eligible voting member. The idea behind participating in these events is to become familiar enough with the records – such as available from the Hiring Committee – of each candidate to make an informed vote at any point in the hiring process. This participation may be in the form of:
  - Providing assistance to the Hiring Committee as part of the initial screening process (e.g., determining whether the applicants meet the minimum criteria for being valid candidates).
  - Providing assistance to the Hiring Committee as part of the later screening process (e.g., ranking qualified candidates, performing phone interviews, performing reference checks).
  - Attending at least one of the “professional” interaction opportunities (e.g., the candidate’s job talk, teaching session) for candidates who make a campus visit
  - Getting to know each candidate in a less formal way (e.g., coffee during a break during the campus visit, a meal, a reception, in-office discussion) for candidates who make a campus visit
- 12.4 Faculty who have not had the opportunity to become familiar enough with the candidates to make an informed judgment before voting are expected to recuse themselves from the vote (and not participate via proxy). However, all faculty may participate in pre-vote discussions in order to share what information



he/she may have and to learn more from other faculty.

- 12.5 Appointment Standards for Lecturers. The FPPP requires that Department personnel policies include certain minimum standards for the appointment of lecturers. In order to maintain consistency within the college and across the BADM degree program, the Department of Management uses those standards established by the College of Business and published in the Policies and Procedures Manual. As those standards may occasionally change, they are incorporated into this document via this reference.

### **13.0 Range Elevation for Lecturers**

FPPP 8.4 states: “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. 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.” Criteria for range elevation must be appropriate to the faculty member’s work assignments. (See again Section 9.5 above).

- 13.1 If the faculty member’s work assignment includes Instruction, then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as “superior,” and includes accomplishments recognized beyond the department and college. Instruction shall be evaluated in the same manner as described in Section 4 above. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered “teaching excellence” sufficient for range elevation.
- 13.2 If the faculty member’s work assignment includes Professional Growth and Achievement (PGA), then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as “effective.” See Section 5 above.
- 13.3. If the faculty member’s work assignment includes Service, then the candidate for range elevation must demonstrate a level of performance in that area at least equivalent to what is defined by the FPPP as “effective.” See Section 6 above.

### **14.0 Effective Date**

Upon ratification by the faculty and approval by the Dean and Provost by October 1, 2014, these policies and procedures become effective with the 2014-2015 academic year.