

## **Guidelines and Procedures of the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences Personnel Committee 2022-23**

The Personnel Committee of the Department shall be organized and function in a manner consistent with the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) document of California State University, Chico and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### **Part I. Committee Characteristics and Charge**

- A. The Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences Personnel Committee (DPC) shall make specified periodic evaluations and performance reviews and make recommendations concerning retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP).
- *Probationary* faculty are subject to two different types of evaluations. The first, called *periodic evaluation*, focuses on providing the *probationary* faculty member with important developmental feedback, both positive and negative, with the goal of maintaining and/or improving performance. The ultimate goals of excellence and a successful tenure/promotion decision are to be kept firmly in mind by all involved with the process. The second type of evaluation is called the *performance review*, wherein a critical assessment of the faculty member's performance is conducted and the probability of a successful tenure/promotion decision is estimated. Formal *ratings* of performance in each area of review are used, and a decision is made whether or not to retain the faculty member.
  - Normally, *periodic evaluations* are done in the faculty members' first, third, and fifth years; *performance reviews* are conducted in the faculty members second, fourth, and sixth years. It is in this sixth year that the decision is made to offer tenure or to release the faculty member from employment.
- B. Operation of the DPC shall be in accordance with the University personnel calendar (FPPP Appendix III).
- C. 10.1.8 An administrative level(s) review shall be conducted by the *Appropriate Administrator*.
- D. All tenured and FERP faculty members are eligible to serve on the committee. A FERP faculty member may only participate in the evaluation process if he or she is employed during the entire portion of the review cycle for which that committee is responsible (FPPP 4.1.4.b.2). All tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on this committee unless:
1. They serve on the College Personnel Committee.
  2. They are up for periodic evaluation or a performance review by the committee in that year. However, they can serve on the DPC if they recuse themselves from their own review.
- D. The minimum size of the DPC or any subcommittee of the DPC shall be three. If the Department Chair elects to serve as a member of the Personnel Committee rather than as a separate report writer, the Department Chair will count toward achieving this minimum size. A majority of members of the Personnel Committee shall come from within the Department

of Nutrition and Food Sciences when possible. A committee considering promotion to Associate Professor shall be composed entirely of Associate Professors and/or Professors. A committee considering promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor, in which case the committee shall be composed entirely of Professors. (FPPP 4.1.5)

## **Part II. Committee Operations and Regulations**

### **A. Personnel Committee Operations**

1. Each committee shall elect a chair and a secretary.
2. Minutes shall include
  - a. Time, place, date of meeting.
  - b. Members present.
  - c. Action taken.
  - d. No discussion shall be recorded.

### **B. Committee Regulations**

1. Confidentiality is required.
2. Reports and recommendations shall be submitted only in written form.
3. Abstentions and minority votes must submit written reports for such.
4. A quorum consisting of a majority of the Committee must be present to conduct business.
5. When the Committee meets to vote on the reports and recommendations, normally all members must be present. If a member abstains from voting, the member shall submit a written reason for the abstention.

C. The approved procedures become the operating document for the Department after approval by the Dean and the Provost.

D. The Chair of the DPC shall act as liaison between faculty being reviewed and the DPC. The Chair of the DPC shall meet with the faculty member(s) as needed over the course of the review to answer questions about file preparation and committee policies and procedures. After reviewing the data and evaluations but before writing its recommendation, the DPC shall meet for an interview with each candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion on an individual basis. The purpose of this meeting shall be to answer unresolved questions on the part of any of the participants in the RTP process (FPPP 10.2.6).

E. The DPC shall prepare its written report and recommendation. Each member of the committee will vote for or against the report and recommendation and this vote will be recorded on the form provided by the Provost (FPPP 10.2.7). The DPC shall transmit the candidate's working personnel action file (WPAF) with the committee's report to the Department Chair. If the Chair is part of the DPC, then the DPC's final recommendations will be shared with the candidate upon placement in the candidate's WPAF. After the mandatory ten days have elapsed to allow the candidate to respond in writing to the report and recommendation, the DPC shall forward the report and recommendation to the Dean of College of Natural Sciences who shall make the working personnel action file (WPAF) of the candidate available to the College of Natural Sciences Personnel Committee along with any minority and concurring reports as required by the current FPPP.

### **Part III. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

#### **A. The Personnel Action File (PAF), the Dossier, and the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).**

The Personnel Action File (PAF) shall be defined as the one official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. The Dean is the custodian of the PAFs of faculty. The PAFs are maintained in the College of Natural Sciences office. A Dossier is the professional file kept by each faculty member. It is a cumulative record of a faculty's professional career since appointment, tenure, or promotion, whichever occurred last. The College of Natural Sciences will provide the faculty member with a one-inch binder for the Dossier. The Dossier is supplemented with support materials (in separate larger binders) that provide evidence of professional activity, which are indexed in the Dossier. *The Dossier, with its supplemental support material, and the PAF make up the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The WPAF shall be defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle.*

1. Candidates are expected to follow the outline for a Faculty Dossier as provided by the College of Natural Sciences and outlined in FPPP (Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures) 8.1.3. The Dossier (one-inch binder) shall contain the following material.
  - I. Include a copy of the Department Guidelines (Evaluation Criteria). The Department Guidelines must be made available to faculty unit employees no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. In the case of a change in Department Guidelines, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure may choose to be evaluated under the current version or a version that is not more than three years old.
  - II. Include an up-to-date curriculum vitae; this is used to summarize and evaluate your career.
  - III. Compose a narrative, including: a reflective statement on teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives and how these have impacted your teaching. The reflective statement should include feedback from students based on the SET scores and the written comments as well as peer evaluations. A reflective statement on your professional development service should also be included
  - IV. Submit a detailed index or list of support materials (see section 2 below) at the beginning of the cycle. The list should be comprehensive and provide evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Instruction a-d; perhaps including tables that provide the SFOT,s results at a glance); Professional Growth and Achievement (a-f); and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community (a-f) (consider adding a statement that guides reviewers to the

evidence in the Dossier which relates to strategic plans and goals). Support materials, as described below, submitted by candidates for evaluation shall be deemed incorporated by reference in the Personnel Action File (PAF), but need not be physically placed in the PAF. The index or list of support materials is a permanent addition to the PAF, and should be continually updated to reflect any materials added to the file during an evaluation cycle. Indexed support materials shall be returned to faculty as described by the CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement), section 15.9

The candidate may wish to include additional brief annotations and comments throughout the Dossier.

## 2. Support Material for Dossier

Support for items listed in the dossier should be included in binders separate from the Dossier (one-inch binder described above) as the candidate deems necessary to reflect his or her career, and to substantiate and explain the significance of achievements mentioned in the one-inch binder. These materials should be organized in the same order of the Dossier and as follows: a. Instruction; b. Professional Growth and Achievement; and c. Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community. Materials other than those required in the dossier can be submitted in a separate appendix.

## B. General Requirements

1. The preferred qualification for appointment to a tenure track position in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science is a doctoral degree in Nutrition or a related field.
2. Appointment to a tenure track position of a faculty member lacking a doctoral degree may be considered if the candidate has either of the following credentials (considered “equivalency” as defined in Title 5, Section 42711):
  - a. A Master’s degree in Nutrition and Food Science (or related field) and a Registered Dietitian Nutritionist (RDN) credential, or
  - b. A Master’s degree in Nutrition and Food Science (or related field) and three years professional experience in the field.
3. Note that the highest rank available to tenure track faculty without a doctoral degree is Associate Professor. Faculty hired without a doctoral degree will be facilitated in attaining the doctorate while in tenure track positions.
4. In all tenure/promotion decisions, a minimum rating of “meets expectations” in teaching and related activities is required.
5. In 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.
6. Faculty members will only be recommended for promotion on consideration of merit, with a higher degree of excellence and involvement expected at each successive rank. The concept of time is not interpreted to mean that individuals will be rewarded a promotion nor tenure on the basis of length of service.
7. Three ~~Four~~ areas of evaluation will be considered in making recommendations on retention, tenure and promotion: Teaching (Instruction); Professional Growth and Achievement; and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community (FPPP 10.1.2). Specific Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences’ Criteria for evaluations are outlined below. These criteria are consistent with those of the College and University level review procedures and policies.

## C. Specific Requirements for Periodic and Performance Reviews

### 1. **Retention**

A rating of at least ‘meets expectations: for teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service with demonstrable progress towards “exceeds expectations” in all the rated areas of evaluation and evidence of contributions to the strategic plans of the Department, College, and University are the minimum requirements to warrant a recommendation for retention.

## 2. Tenure

Successful candidates must: 1) achieve ratings of at least “meets expectations” in teaching, professional growth achievement, and service; (see Table); and, 2) demonstrate contributions to the strategic plan of the Department, College, and University as well as the Community. To receive tenure, the candidate must publish in a peer-reviewed journal and/or present at a professional meeting based on research conducted while at CSU Chico with either an undergraduate or graduate student. Candidates receiving a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in any of the three areas will not be eligible for tenure.

## 3. Promotion

### *Associate Professor*

Successful candidates must: 1) achieve ratings of at least “meets expectations” in all three areas of teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service as indicated in the Table; and 2) demonstrate contributions to the strategic plan of the Department, College, and University.

### *Professor*

Successful candidates must achieve an “exceeds expectations” rating in two of the rated categories and a rating of at least “meets expectations” in the third rated category as indicated in the Table. Also, the evidence must demonstrate contributions to the strategic plan of the Department, College, and University. Candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2) and have an earned doctorate in nutrition or a related field.

The following table presents those ratings typically required for a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion.

	Teaching	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Tenure	M	M	M
Prom. to Associate	M	M	M
Prom. to Full	E	E	M
	E	M	E
	M	E	E
Early Tenure	E	E	E
Early Promotion	E	E	E

D = does not meet expectations

M = meets expectations

E = exceeds expectations

Listed below are the activities, materials, and evidence that will be examined by the DPC in the process of performance evaluation.

#### **D. Evaluation in area of “Teaching”**

Effective instruction is the first minimum and indispensable requirement for promotion. The evaluation of instruction is based on the courses taught during the regular fall and spring sessions; in addition, special session and extension courses may also be evaluated. Inclusion will be determined by the Department Chair and the Chair of the DPC or special request of the faculty member. The DPC will focus on the extent to which the candidate engages in the seven practices of good teaching as described in *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* (Chickering and Gamson, 1987). For its deliberations the Committee will review the following:

- a. Instruction
  - i. Self-evaluation (using the *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*)
    - Encourages student-faculty contact
    - Encourages cooperation among students
    - Encourages active learning
    - Gives prompt feedback
    - Emphasizes time on task
    - Communicates high expectations
    - Respects diverse talents and ways of knowing
  - ii. Written course material
  - iii. Peer evaluations (see evaluation criteria below)
  - iv. Student evaluations (see evaluation criteria below)
  - v. Written input from individuals or organizations
  - vi. Contribution to K-14 and general education
  - vii. Coordination and/or collaboration on course development and/or delivery
  - viii. Other

The candidate's dossier establishes the context for the evaluation of teaching. This document will address teaching philosophy, goals, methods, strengths and weaknesses in the practice of teaching and in the knowledge of the professional discipline as it relates to the candidate's teaching assignments. The document should also include strategies for implementing inclusive pedagogy. Strategies include designing an inclusive syllabus, addressing accessibility for all students, creating a supportive climate, helping students reflect on their learning, and supporting international students during remote instruction.

Written course material will include course requirements, lecture and laboratory outlines, examination material, text selections and reading lists, handouts, and various exercises and assignments. Course materials should show organization, relevant learning experiences, and evaluation procedures. Samples of written comments on student work may be included.

Peer evaluations of instruction will include committee deliberations and reports of findings of classroom visitations. There will be a minimum of two classroom visitations; one will be by a member of the DPC and one by the Department Chair. Peer evaluations by colleagues who are not on the personnel review committees are encouraged. If possible, peer evaluation reports should include whether the candidate encourages student-faculty contact and students to work

together, promotes active learning both in and out of the classroom, provides prompt feedback on assignments, or uses class time wisely. The peer evaluation should also use applicable attributes in the *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* as a guide to their evaluation. Peer evaluators must provide the faculty member being observed a notice of at least five days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es).

Written or electronic student evaluation of teaching (SFOT's) shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall have SFOTs unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes (CBA 15.15). Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) 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 their field. The candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence, beyond SFOTs, of teaching performance (FPPP 10.2.5a).

The candidate may submit letters of commendation from individuals or organizations for evaluation. The letters must include the name and the signature of the individual submitting the letter.

b. Innovation in instruction (in general order of significance)

- i. Teaching recognition
- ii. New courses or syllabi developed
- iii. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through a variety of in-class pedagogical means, e.g., cooperative learning, case study presentation, debate, etc.
- iv. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through the introduction and use of various instructional technologies
- v. Efforts to enhance student learning through the development and use of devices/techniques that assess student outcomes

Examples of the above include:

- Participation in course and curriculum development and implementation
- Development of new courses or teaching techniques to enhance students' learning process
- Accepts new teaching assignments
- Introduction of web-based technology into teaching
- Use/development of surveys, essays, pre- and post-course exams, etc., that are designed to assess student learning outcomes

c. Support of student learning (in addition to teaching assignment)

- i. Supervision of student externships
- ii. Academic advising
- iii. Mentoring students in research and other scholarly activities
- iv. Mentoring in other capacities

Examples of the above include:

- Evidence of effective academic and career advising (e.g., student, alumni, employer testimonials)
- Support of student projects (e.g., professional paper) on a one-to-one basis;
- Service on professional paper committees



- Development and supervision of student externships
- Adviser to student organizations
- Contribution to the development of student leadership

d. Other

The DPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other instructional and related activities not mentioned above.

**Performance Standards for Teaching**

Does Not Meet Expectations – The evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA.

Meets Expectations – The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA. Evidence includes above average commitment to high quality teaching and advising as demonstrated by effectively participating in some or all of the activities listed in “instruction” and “innovation in instruction”. An evaluation of “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and promotion.

Exceeds Expectations - The evidence demonstrates the candidate’s consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA. “Exceeds Expectations” is the same as “Meets Expectations” plus a record of outstanding accomplishment recognized by peer and student evaluations; a consistent demonstration of commitment to excellence and innovation in teaching and advising as demonstrated by substantive accomplishments in some or all of the activities in “instruction,” “innovation in instruction,” and “support of student learning”.

**E. Evaluation in area of “Professional Growth and Achievement” (a-f are listed in general order of significance)**

The Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences requires that faculty demonstrate an ongoing commitment to professional growth and achievement. Professional growth and achievement may encompass ongoing professional development and academic scholarship. The Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences values collaborative efforts in all professional development and scholarly activities including grant writing, publication, professional meetings, and presentations. Each author in collaborative or coauthored activities needs, however, to document their level of participation in the activity. These activities enhance excellence in teaching and the student-centered learning environment. Evaluation in this area will assess the quality, continuity, and the level of effort associated with a candidate’s scholarship. It is the responsibility of the candidate to group achievements to their significance and required effort, making clear distinctions between achievements that are substantive (e.g. primary author on a peer-reviewed book or published paper) or less substantive (e.g., co-author on a paper where one was not the primary author). Several achievements that are considered less substantive can be combined to

count for one substantive achievement based on effort. The DPC will consider the candidate's self-evaluation of professional growth and achievement (which must include a discussion of the quality, continuity, and level of effort associated with their scholarship) to establish the context for its deliberations. It is also important that the candidate avoid double-counting of significant achievements (e.g., PI on major grant and annual report for same grant). Evidence of professional growth and achievement is demonstrated by activities listed below.

- a. Authorship (in general order of significance)
  - i. Peer reviewed book
  - ii. Peer reviewed manuscript in a professional publication
    - Full articles
    - Research briefs
  - iii. Peer reviewed book chapter
  - iv. Non-printed medium or computer software
  - v. Development of a new technology or patent
  - vi. Non-refereed book
  - vii. Non-refereed manuscript in a professional publication
  - viii. Non-refereed book chapter
  - ix. Consultancy reports and funded research reports
- b. Research and grants (in general order of significance)
  - i. PI or Co-PI of major grants and contracts ( $\geq$ \$40,000)
  - ii. PI or Co-PI of minor grants ( $<$  \$40,000)
  - iii. Submitted, but not funded major grant
  - iv. Co-operator on a grant or contract
  - v. Submitted, but not funded, grants and/or contracts
- c. Scholarly activities within one's profession (in general order of significance)
  - i. Presentation of research at a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
    - International
    - National/Regional
    - State
    - Local
  - ii. Organization of a professional meeting, workshop, or symposium
  - iii. Editor of a professional publication
  - iv. Reviewer/referee of a professional publication
  - v. Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, or symposia
- d. Professional awards and honors
  - i. International
  - ii. National
  - iii. Regional
  - iv. State
  - v. Local
  - vi. Honorary appointment (e.g., visiting, or adjunct professor)
- e. Consultancy/Certification
  - i. Professional consultant dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's areas of expertise.
  - ii. Specialty Certification

- ii. Service as a non-paid consultant or member of an advisory board or council, dealing with issues specifically related to the candidate's area of expertise.
- f. Progress towards completion of a doctoral degree  
Progress towards completion or completion of a doctoral degree may be afforded consideration as a significant achievement. Note that lack of progress towards a doctoral degree must not be penalized in consideration of professional growth & achievement of a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
- g. Other  
The DPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other professional activities not mentioned above.

### **Performance Standards for Professional Growth and Achievement**

Does Not Meet Expectations – The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA).

Meets Expectations – The evidence demonstrates appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA). In addition, the candidate is recognized beyond the campus of professional competence in areas of the assigned discipline.-At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of four substantive contributions from “a,” “b,” and/or “c” with at least one in “a” and one in “b.”

Exceeds Expectations – The evidence demonstrates the candidate's significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA). Same as “Meets Expectations” plus demonstrated leadership within areas of assigned discipline. At a minimum, the candidate has a combination of six or more substantive contributions from “a,” “b,” and/or “c” with at least two in “a” and one in “b.”

### **Evaluation in area of Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community (a-f are listed in general order of significance)**

In addition to teaching and related activities, and professional growth and achievement, faculty are expected to contribute towards the vision and mission of the University and the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences and the College of Natural Sciences. Activities that contribute to increasing the number of majors through recruitment and retention, improve the image of the Department or College, improve internal communication and teamwork, and help to increase private support of our programs are encouraged.

The Department recognizes that all service activities are not equivalent when it comes to workload, and that all committee members do not accomplish the same amount of work.

The Committee must consider the quality, continuity and level of effort associated with

each service activity. It is in the candidate's interest to document heavy workload service activities and/or document special responsibilities assumed. 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 strategic goals.

- a. Service to professional organizations (in general order of significance)
  - i. Service as an elected/appointed official of a professional organization
  - ii. Service as a committee member of a professional organization
  - iii. Member of professional organization within discipline
- b. Service to the Department, College, and University (in general order of significance)
  - i. Serve as Chair of an Academic Senate subcommittee
  - ii. Serve as member of an Academic Senate subcommittee
  - iii. Serve as member of the Academic Senate
  - iv. Serve as Chair of a Department, Center, College, or University committee
  - v. Serve as member of a Department, Center, College or University committee
- c. Perform outreach/recruiting/extension activities
- d. Guest lectures and other public presentations
  - i. Presentations at public forums, meetings, field days/tours, and other events where specific knowledge possessed by the candidate is shared with the campus community and/or general public
  - ii. Off-campus lectures in person or through electronic delivery systems
  - iii. Guest lectures in courses on campus
- e. Contributions to the educational, cultural, and economic needs of Northern California as related to one's professional competency.
- f. Other

The DPC invites candidates to submit for consideration other types of service not mentioned above.

### **Contribution to Strategic Plan and Goals of the Program, College, and University**

- a. Contributions to K-14 through the development/presentation/examination of new instructional technologies, methods, or materials
- b. Contributions to creating high quality learning environments through the development/presentation/ examination of new instructional technologies, methods, or materials
- c. Integration of new technologies to improve student learning both in and out of the classroom
- d. Volunteer for or accept and complete assignments which further one or more of the goals of the College or University (see the five University Strategic Priorities)
- e. Volunteer for or accept and complete assignments that contribute towards the realization of the objectives specified in the Department or College of Natural Sciences Five Year Review Implementation Plan.

**This category is rated.** While the material submitted to the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the candidate will address much of a candidate's performance relative to strategic plans and goals, the candidate should make sure that any additional evidence regarding performance towards these goals is included in the Dossier. The candidate may wish to consider adding a statement that guides reviewers to the evidence in the Dossier which relates to strategic plans and goals.

### **Performance Standards for Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and the University as well as the Community**

Does Not Meet Expectations – The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA.

“Does not meet expectations” performance is evidenced by a lack of the candidate's lack of assumption 1) assuming of roles on committees, 2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or 3) facilitating activities as well as demonstrating limited contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or the community.

Meets Expectations – The evidence demonstrates the candidate's on-going involvement in activities listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA, participating on committees and/or in the community. “Meets Expectations” performance is evidenced by 1) occasionally assuming roles on significant committees, 2) involvement in the community or the profession, and/or 3) facilitating activities, as well as demonstrating on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community. More specifically, the candidate demonstrates significant service on appropriate Department and College committees, is a member of professional organizations within the assigned discipline, and either serves professionally within the community or serves on at least one university committee.

Exceeds Expectations – The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed in the Department standards, the FPPP, and the CBA. “Exceeds Expectations” performance is evidenced by 1) assuming key roles on significant committees, 2) high level of involvement in the community or profession, and/or 3) facilitating significant activities as well as demonstrating consistent on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community. More specifically, the candidate demonstrates significant service on, and at times provides a leadership role on appropriate department, college, and university committees; candidate demonstrates leadership in professional organizations or provides significant professional contributions to the community.

### **H. Early Tenure/Promotion**

Tenure and Promotion to *Associate Professor* may be conferred earlier than the normal sixth year of employment.

- a. Consideration of tenure/promotion before the beginning of the sixth consecutive full-time probationary year shall be regarded as consideration of “early tenure/promotion.”
- b. Any faculty member wishing consideration of early tenure/promotion must request it in writing. They should only do so if they believe their record of accomplishment is exceptional and warrants special consideration. The DPC may initiate early

tenure/promotion consideration at the Department level if, after careful examination of the candidate's file, it determines that the candidate's record is exceptional and warrants special consideration.

- c. Inasmuch as consideration of early tenure/promotion is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for early tenure/promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional case that warrants special consideration. To be considered for early tenure, it must be accompanied by its justification as a special case. To be considered for early promotion a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceptional." The Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences defines exceptional as a candidate who is rated as "exceeds expectations" in all three rated categories (or have the reasonable expectation of "exceeds expectations" ratings in all three categories based on past reviews) and significantly exceeds the minimum qualifications for the rating of "exceeds expectations" in one of them. To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: 1) have been rated "Exceeds Expectations" in a Performance Review as defined in FPPP 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluations: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community; and 2) demonstrate the likelihood that 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.

Promotion to *Full Professor* may be conferred earlier than the normal fifth year of employment at the Associate Professor level.

- a. Consideration of promotion before the beginning of the fifth consecutive year at the level of Associate Professor shall be regarded as consideration of "early promotion."
- b. Any faculty member at the Associate Professor level wishing consideration of early promotion to Full Professor must request it in writing. They should only do so if they believe their record of accomplishment is exceptional and warrants special consideration. The DPC may initiate early promotion consideration at the Department level if, after careful examination of the candidate's file, it determines that the candidate's record is exceptional and warrants special consideration.
- c. Inasmuch as consideration of early promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for early promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional case that warrants special consideration. To be considered for early promotion a candidate must meet the criteria for "exceptional." The Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences defines exceptional as a candidate who has demonstrated significant continuity in professional growth and achievement, service and teaching quality at the level of Associate Professor and must be rated as "Exceeds Expectations" in all three rated categories (or have the reasonable expectation of superior ratings in all three categories based on past reviews). To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: 1) be ranked as "Exceeds Expectations" in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; and 2) demonstrate the likelihood that the exceptional performance will continue, and 3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself. Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review.

#### **Part IV. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty**

The DPC, or a subcommittee thereof, will serve as the evaluation committee which in this case shall consist of tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. The committee shall consist of at least three members, one of whom is the Chair of the Department. Members of the committee who are undergoing a fifth-year evaluation cannot participate in their own evaluation. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator.

##### **A. Data for Evaluation**

The candidate shall collect all data that are pertinent to the evaluation of the quality of instructional performance, professional currency, and service and include these in their personnel file. These data shall be representative of the faculty member's responsibilities and activities during the five-year period immediately prior to the evaluation. Data shall include those described under Part III with the exception of requiring only one peer evaluation of teaching.

##### **B. Evaluation Process**

1. The evaluation committee shall analyze the data collected and prepare a report of its findings. Before writing the report, the committee shall meet with the faculty member to provide an opportunity to clarify any unresolved questions.
2. The evaluation report will address in detail the committee's findings on the quality and effectiveness of instructional performance, level of professional currency, scholarship and service to the University. Faculty whose performance does not include assignments in all of the relevant areas identified in Article 20 shall be evaluated on the basis of their performance in the specific areas of their assignment. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the evaluation report which may include Recommendations for improvement, which shall state in writing the reasons for the Recommendations. The faculty member shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing/or request an opportunity to discuss the Recommendations from each level of review no later than ten calendar days following the receipt of the evaluation report (see FPPP 10.2.8).
3. The evaluation report will be submitted to the College Dean who may meet with the faculty member and the Department Chair to discuss the report's findings. If areas for improvement are identified in the report, the Dean, if requested by the faculty, will discuss these and advise the faculty member of assistance available within the College or University. The five-year review does not include an interview with the DPC subcommittee.
4. Upon completion of the evaluation process all data that are not normally kept in the College personnel file will be returned to the faculty member.

#### **Part V. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty**

- A. Temporary faculty unit employees appointed for two or more semesters, regardless of a break in service, must be evaluated in accordance with the periodic evaluation procedure. This evaluation shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties and peer review by the DPC and evaluations by the Dean. A temporary faculty unit

employee appointed for one semester or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair or the Dean.

- B. Temporary faculty holding three-year appointments shall be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of the employee or the President. Temporary faculty holding a three-year appointment pursuant to provision 12.13 shall be evaluated in the third year of the appointment. This periodic evaluation shall consider the faculty unit employee's cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period for the three-year appointment. A three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty is determined by the Dean to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position. The determination of the Dean shall be based on the contents of the PAF and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the Dean determines that a temporary faculty has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be documented in writing and placed in the PAF.
- C. Temporary faculty employed during the prior academic year and possessing six (6) or more years of prior consecutive service on campus shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment following a periodic evaluation. This periodic evaluation shall consider the faculty unit employee's cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period. If the part-time faculty is determined by the Dean to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position then a three-year appointment shall be issued. The determination of the Dean shall be based on the contents of the PAF and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the Dean determines that a part-time faculty has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be documented in writing and placed in the PAF.
- D. Evaluation
  1. It is the responsibility of the temporary faculty member to update his/her Working Personnel files (WPAFs) annually.
  2. The DPC will submit a report of its findings to the temporary faculty member, the Chair of the Department, and the Dean. Upon receipt of the evaluation report, the faculty member may request a meeting with the committee to discuss it, may file a written reply, or may accept the report as written. Any revision of the report shall be left to the discretion of the DPC and the Chair of the Department.
  3. Data used by the DPC are described in Part III. Although the criteria and standards of the Department review of temporary faculty will focus predominantly on instruction, professional activities and service related to their teaching appointment or other positive assistance to the Department will be considered.
  4. In evaluating teaching effectiveness the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation: 1) Organization, 2) Scholarship; knowledge in the field, and 3) Effective communication. At least one classroom visit shall take place at least once each academic year for the purpose of assessing the faculty member's teaching performance. The temporary faculty shall be provided a written notice of at least five business days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the temporary faculty being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class.



5. The evaluation shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties, peer review by the DPC and evaluation by the Dean. The evaluation shall rate the temporary faculty either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Satisfactory ratings may include narrative comments including constructive suggestions for development.

### **Performance Standard for Teaching**

“Meets Expectations” — manages teaching assignment, office hours; course materials are consistent with the state of the discipline; and courses are taught in a manner appropriate to the material. The candidate has achieved a satisfactory level of professionalism and competence as an educator. In general, the candidate has demonstrated competency in a majority of the evaluative items listed below.

The DPC will focus on the extent to which the part-time faculty engages in the seven practices of good teaching as described in *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* (Chickering and Gamson, 1987). For its deliberations the Committee will review the following:

- a. Instruction
  - i. Uses the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education
    - Encourages student-faculty contact
    - Encourages cooperation among students
    - Encourages active learning
    - Gives prompt feedback
    - Emphasizes time on task
    - Communicates high expectations
    - Respects diverse talents and ways of knowing
  - ii. Written course material
  - iii. Classroom Observations
  - iv. Student evaluations
- b. Innovation in instruction
  - i. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through a variety of in-class pedagogical means, e.g., cooperative learning, case study presentation, debate, etc.
  - ii. Efforts to enhance instruction and learning through the introduction and use of various instructional technologies
  - iii. Efforts to enhance student learning through the development and use of devices/techniques that assess student outcomes

### **Part VI. Range Elevation of Temporary Faculty**

Those eligible for lecturer range elevation shall be limited to lecturers who have no more eligibility for salary increases pursuant to provision 12.16 or FPPP 12.1.1 in their current range, and have served five years in their current range.

The individual must have achieved substantial Professional Growth and Development as defined as teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field since the initial appointment or last range elevation. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered sufficient for appointment at a higher level.

Teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field may be demonstrated by the temporary faculty member providing evidence of Professional Growth and Development activities. These are examples of activities that may provide such evidence but activities are not limited to this list.

- Authorship
- Research and grants
- Presentations at professional meeting
- Service to professional organizations
- Service to the department, college or university
  - Teaching excellence in upper division junior and senior level undergraduate majors' courses
  - Providing leadership to the Department (e.g. General Education Coordinator, Internship/Externship Supervisor)
- Special recognition of teaching



## Department Standards Approval Sheet

---

Process:

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

---

**Approvals:**

Chair/Director: <u>Joan Giampaoli</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Dean: <u>David M. Hassenzahl</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
OAPL: <u>Mahalley D. Allen</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>
Provost: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>Sep 2, 2022</u>



---

# MEMORANDUM

---

DATE: August 31, 2022

TO: Joan Giampaoli, Department Chair

CC: David Hassenzahl, Dean

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

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of NFSC Department RTP Standards

---

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

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

- Since the FPPP supersedes the department standards, reference to the use of older standards must reflect the caveat that such ratings will be translated to meet, exceeds, or does not meet.
- Update language on period of review to be consistent with the FPPP.
- C.1. remove reference to making progress towards exceeds expectation as that rating is not required by the FPPP for T and/or P.
- C.2. Clarify the question on the number of journal or presentations needed for tenure.
- C.3. Expectations for Promotion to Professor that requires two Exceeds is out of compliance with the new FPPP.
- Performance standards for Teaching (should be called Instruction) relies on ill-defined adjectives such as adequate, above average and outstanding. Provide specifications.
- Miscellaneous comments are provided to improve the document.

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

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the

likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

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

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

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