

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

Retention, Tenure and Promotion Personnel Committee Operating Procedures and Special Criteria Approved 8-31-22 for AY 22/23

The Department of Physics strives to maintain and enhance a long tradition of collegiality, professional responsibility and mutual respect. This document is intended to promote these same goals.

I. STRUCTURE

- I. The Department of Physics Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Personnel Committee shall be constituted according to all appropriate guidelines and regulations that include but are not limited to the CBA and FPPP section 4.
- II. The membership of the committee shall consist of at least three members. A majority of members of a *Department Personnel Committee* shall come from within the Department, where possible. (FPPP 4.1.4, 4.1.9.a).
- III. For the review of joint-appointment faculty, it is natural that the membership of the committee be augmented by a faculty member from the other department in the joint appointment, and we strongly encourage this action. The selection of this fourth committee member shall be done by the departmental Personnel committee. The Personnel Committee (or its chair) should discuss the selection with the faculty member under review to ensure the most effective evaluation.
- IV. The eligible departmental faculty shall consist of all full-time, tenured faculty members (FPPP 4.1.4).
- V. FERP faculty may be elected to a *Personnel Committee* only if they will be employed during the entire portion of a faculty member's review cycle for which that committee is responsible. (FPPP 4.1.4.b.2).
- VI. Department Chairs may participate as members of the *Department Personnel Committee* when the committee is undertaking a *periodic evaluation* or a *performance review*. Such membership counts towards the committee's required size. (FPPP 4.1.10.a) No faculty member may serve on a committee if he/she is the subject of a *periodic evaluation* or a *performance review* that year. (FPPP 4.1.6).
- VII. Faculty members shall not serve on more than one committee level of peer review. (FPPP 4.1.1)
- VIII. In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion (FPPP 4.1.5)
- IX. If the Department Chair does not serve on the Personnel Committee he/she will serve as a separate level of review within the Department.
- X. The committee will be elected after the selection of the College Personnel Committee.

XI. The members of the committee shall be elected in accordance with the department election guidelines.

II. PROCEDURES

- I. The Committee will operate under and be knowledgeable of all of the appropriate guidelines and regulations which include, but are not limited to the CBA and the FPPP.
- II. Each *Personnel Committee* and subcommittee shall elect a chair and a secretary (FPPP 4.2.1).
- III. A quorum consisting of a majority must be present in order for the Committee to conduct its business.
- IV. When the Committee meets to vote on the reports and recommendations, all members must vote, either in person or by proxy. If a member abstains from voting, the member shall submit a written reason for the abstention.
- V. In matters of retention, tenure and promotion, the Committee will follow the procedures and the special criteria established by and approved for the Department of Physics. In the event of any inconsistency between this document and either the FPPP or the CBA, the FPPP and/or the CBA will take precedence.
- VI. At least one Committee member shall make a classroom visit for each faculty member under review. The Department Chair will also visit if he/she serves as an independent level of review. A written report of each visit will become a part of the personnel file of the candidate.
- VII. *Periodic evaluations* and *performance reviews* will cover the period since the faculty member's date of appointment. For summer or fall appointments, period of review will begin at the last academic day of spring semester in the academic year preceding the appointment. Spring appointments will begin on the date of appointment. All faculty members' evaluations and *performance reviews* will include work that is part of a service credit year or years and other granted credits. (FPPP 10.1.11).
- VIII. In consideration of tenure or promotion, the period of review shall be the entire *probationary* period (including years of prior service credit, if any). Consideration shall be given to the development and continuity of the candidate's total performance during the review period. Where prior credits have been granted, these credits plus performance rendered since being appointed to the faculty at California State University, Chico shall, together, constitute the data base for the review. (FPPP 10.4.4.a).
- IX. *Personnel Committees* may be divided into subcommittees, with the division of work being determined by the *Personnel Committee*. In cases where this is done, the subcommittee rather than the entire *Personnel Committee* is responsible for the complete and thorough review and evaluation of data and making *recommendations* on each candidate. Subcommittee *reports* and *recommendations* shall be submitted to the entire *Personnel Committee* for endorsement, after which the *reports* and *recommendations* are forwarded to the Department Chair or College Dean as appropriate (FPPP 4.1.3).
- X. The committee's report will include a written evaluation of the evidence contained in the WPAF. The committee's evaluation must address the evidence with respect to the requirements for retention (FPPP 10.4.3), tenure (FPPP 10.4.4), or promotion (FPPP 10.4.5) the definitions of evaluation ratings (FPPP 10.3.3) and the Special Criteria and Standards of the Physics Department. The committee will evaluate candidates based upon the quality,

quantity and continuity of their performance as faculty members in pursuit of our department's mission.

- XI. The committee's report can only be based on evidence in the WPAF (FPPP 7.0.16). The committee should assist the candidate in making certain that the WPAF accurately reflects the full performance record. It is the responsibility of the candidate with the assistance of the Department to make certain that all materials needed for a favorable review are in the WPAF (FPPP 8.1.1.b.1), while it is the committee chair's responsibility to see that all materials needed for a thorough evaluation are included in the WPAF (FPPP 8.1.1.b).
- XII. 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 since closing of the WPAF for the last performance report for promotion, whichever is more recent.
- XIII. The candidate should indicate in the dossier the category in which (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community) each piece of evidence should be considered. Specific pieces of evidence, e.g. a published paper, may only be considered in a single category.
- XIV. The Committee (or sub-committee) will meet with each candidate after reviewing the WPAF but before writing its report (FPPP 10.2.6).
 - All faculty must undergo SFOT as stipulated by the CBA. Faculty may request to have SFOT's more often as is their right under the FPPP. RTP candidates should be aware that more frequent evaluation provides the candidate with feedback more promptly and provides the committee with a more complete record.
 - Evidence of scholarship activities, including the status of publications and participation in professional meetings must be included in the WPAF. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide this evidence. Professional activities entirely completed prior to employment at California State University, Chico will not be considered during the evaluation process, except for an RTP candidate who has been granted service credit (FPPP 10.1.11).
 - The same procedures listed above will also apply in the evaluation of temporary faculty. However, the criteria and standards will focus predominantly upon instruction (FPPP 9.1.2). In the review of temporary faculty the department will consider their teaching responsibilities (FPPP 5.2.5 and CBA 20), professional activity (FPPP 12.1.2.d) and service to the department in light of the extent of their appointment.

III. CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION.

The mission of the Department of Physics is to “provide the highest quality undergraduate education in physics.” All standards and criteria should be considered as contributing to our pursuit of this mission. Accordingly, in what follows we state how we envision each category (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community) contributing to our mission. This statement is followed by a list of typical activities that a faculty member undertakes, in whole or in part to help fulfill our mission.

In each area of review (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community) all performance review reports conclude with a single-word summary evaluation, or *rating* (FPPP 10.3.3): Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet Expectations. Therefore, it is helpful to candidates and reviewers to specify a) what ratings are typically required to produce a recommendation for tenure or promotion and b) what work is necessary to achieve a given rating.

Probationary, tenure-track faculty undergo a *retention* performance review every two years (typically these occur in the 2nd, 4th and 6th years) (FPPP 10.1.5). The record of candidates undergoing a performance review for the purposes of retention should demonstrate that they have a reasonable chance of obtaining tenure in due course (FPPP 10.4.3). The following table provides a guide (for both the candidate and evaluators) for rating of “Meets Expectations” during performance reviews at the different levels of retention, tenure, and promotion. A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” should only be assigned at any level of review if the candidate meets the criteria for Exceeds Expectations for promotion to Associate or Full. A complete discussion of the criteria for Tenure and Promotion can be found in the appropriate sections. At the Performance Reviews, the committee should consider the overall trajectory of the candidate.

	Instruction Area 1	Instruction Areas 2-4	Professional Growth	Service
Performance Review for Retention 1st - 2nd year	M	-	-	-
Performance Review for Retention 3rd - 5th year	M	1 Tier 2 accomplishment	1 Tier 2 accomplishment	1 Tier 2 activity
Tenure	M	1 Tier 1 accomplishment	2 Tier 1 accomplishments	1 Tier 1 activity
Promotion to Associate	M	1 Tier 1 accomplishment	3 Tier 1 accomplishments	2 Tier 1 activities
Promotion to Full	M	1 Tier 1 accomplishment*	3 Tier 1 accomplishments*	2 Tier 1 activities*

*Cannot duplicate those used for promotion to Associate.

Note that the candidate may focus their efforts in various ways to be recommended for tenure or promotion, *however a candidate rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations” in any area will not be recommended for tenure or promotion.*

A recommendation by the Committee for early tenure “must address in its reports whether the candidate’s file meets the definition of exceptional record” (FPPP 10.5.5). Such “exceptional record” justification must be determined, *ipso facto*, on an individual case basis.

A recommendation by the Committee for early promotion only occurs if a candidate is judged to be “exceptional”. To qualify the candidate must: (1) be rated Exceeds Expectations in all three categories of evaluation; *and* (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; *and* (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department’s typical full time assignment. (FPPP 10.5.3)

Beyond simply rating the candidate and making the appropriate retention recommendation, it is particularly important that the committee report give constructive guidance concerning the candidate’s trajectory toward tenure and promotion. In this same collegial spirit the department strongly recommends that at the conclusion of the entire review process the retention candidate requests to meet with the department chair and Personnel committee to discuss and clarify issues regarding tenure and promotion.

In what follows the Department of Physics has attempted to quantify certain *typical* minimums of activity in the three areas of activity: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community. We strongly emphasize that these quantified minimums are a *typical* set of achievements that a candidate *could* pursue, but that other achievements of equivalent value may stand in place of these quantified minimums.

The purpose of the minimums stated below is not to restrict the candidate's range of work, but to aid both the candidate and the personnel committee by providing *an example set* of achievements that would merit a positive recommendation for personnel action.

IV. INSTRUCTION:

The department values faculty that demonstrate a commitment to student learning by the energy, time, and care that they devote to the creation and support of innovative, high-quality, student-centered learning environments. This commitment may be demonstrated in any or all of the three areas: general education, service courses, and physics degree programs. Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in one of the following four areas:

1. Establishing and maintaining academically rigorous and effective classroom instruction
2. Developing or implementing innovation in undergraduate physics education.
3. Creating new courses or programs that help the department fulfill its mission.
4. Mentoring students outside of the classroom

Since area (1) is so central to the department's mission, *all* faculty members under review must meet or exceed expectations in this area to be recommended for tenure or promotion. For area (1) the committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for rigor and effectiveness in classroom instruction:

- syllabi, assignments, exams and other course materials created by the instructor
- samples of student work
- reports of class visits by committee members and others, e.g. chair and dean
- student feedback on teaching and learning (SFOTs)
- reflection on SFOTs and classroom visits
- other evidence provided by the faculty member under review, such as pre/post test results or other relevant metrics.

In order to meet or exceed expectations in area (1) the evidence should demonstrate that the candidate

- focuses on student learning.
- implements formative assessment.
- fosters a classroom learning community.
- implements inclusive pedagogical practices.
- sets high standards and communicates them to students.

These criteria are further elaborated and explained in Appendix A.

The Department of Physics expects the candidate to engage in teaching activities beyond area (1). Therefore candidates must demonstrate work in at least one of the remaining areas (2-4) to meet or exceed expectations for the category of Instruction.

The following activities constitute *typical* minimums of expectation for tenure and promotion to associate professor or full professor:

Meets expectations rating for Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full:

- Meets Expectations in Area 1 *and*
- One Tier 1 accomplishment** related to the areas 2 - 4 of instruction

Exceeds expectations rating:

- Meets the same requirements as “Meets Expectations” plus one additional Tier 1 accomplishment** related to areas 2 - 4 of instruction.

***These Tier 1 accomplishments may individually be replaced by two Tier 2 accomplishments*

Tier 1 accomplishments include activities such as

- Receiving teaching grants and awards external to the CSU system
- Publishing peer-reviewed works such as but not limited to a peer reviewed book or book chapter, a refereed journal publication, a refereed conference proceedings paper.
- Development of new courses
- Mentoring resulting in student publications and/or recognition such as students awards received through nomination by the candidate, external student fellowships obtained by the candidate, or similar
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.

Tier 2 accomplishments include activities such as

- A presentation, invited or contributed, at a professional conference
- A significant re-design of an existing course to improve student outcomes including but not limited to the incorporation of inclusive pedagogy or significant efforts to improve equity gaps
- Receiving a College, University, or CSU System wide grant to make a significant course improvement
- Conducting a significant amount of mentoring or advising such as but not limited to, Single Subject Credential advising, Society of Physics Students advising, Summer Research Advising, and internship facilitating
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.

For each accomplishment the effort and impact, should be documented, and evidenced by the candidate. As previously stated these quantitative minimums are *examples* of the minimum level of achievement associated with a particular rating. The committee must *always consider the quality, continuity, and level of effort* associated with any activity documented by the candidate. For example, a ranking of “Exceeds Expectations” in instruction is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill" (FPPP 10.3.3), while a ranking of "Meets Expectations" is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's professionalism and competence" (FPPP 10.3.3). The committee shall also carefully consider the value of documented activities that have yet to yield publications or presentations, e.g. book in progress.

V. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT:

The department values faculty that demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and achievement. The Department's Mission defines professional growth and achievement as not only that which deepens a faculty member's scientific knowledge, "but also that which is designed to improve their pedagogic skills." Scientific scholarship has intrinsic merit, but scholarship that enhances the student-centered learning experience directly advances the Mission of the Department and shall be considered of special value. Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in:

- Physics or Applied Physics
- Physics Education or Science Education
- Astronomy and Astrophysics
- Interdisciplinary Work

The following sets of activities constitute *typical* minimums of expectation in professional growth and achievement:

Meets Expectations for Tenure:

- One Tier 1 accomplishment and,
- One Tier 1 accomplishment**

Meets Expectations for Promotion to Associate or Promotion to Full:

- Meets the same requirements as "Meets Expectations for Tenure" plus one additional Tier 1 accomplishment**.

Exceeds Expectations:

- Meets the same requirements as "Meets Expectations for Promotion to Associate" or "Meets Expectations for Promotion to Full" plus one additional Tier 1 accomplishment**.

**These Tier 1 accomplishments may individually be replaced by two Tier 2 accomplishments.

Tier 1 accomplishments include activities such as

- PI or co-PI on grants and awards external to the CSU system
- Publishing peer-reviewed works such as but not limited to a peer reviewed book or book chapter, a refereed journal publication, a refereed conference proceedings paper etc.
- Mentoring resulting in student publication and/or recognition
- PI or co-PI on a successful proposal for a significant amount of time awarded on a competitive basis at a nationally funded institution such as a telescope or national lab
- Non-printed media, computer software or other non-traditional work
- Development of new technology or patent
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.

Tier 2 accomplishments include activities such as

- A research presentation, invited or contributed, at a professional conference
- Mentoring resulting in student presentations at a professional conference
- Receiving a University or CSU System wide grant
- A submitted, reviewed, and unfunded grant proposal external to the CSU system.
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.

For each accomplishment the effort and impact, should be documented, and evidenced by the candidate. As previously stated these quantitative minimums are *examples* of the minimum level of achievement associated with a particular rating. The committee must *always consider the quality, continuity and level of effort* associated with any activity documented by the candidate. For example, ranking of "Exceeds Expectations" is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community" (FPPP 10.3.3), while a ranking of "Meets Expectations" is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's appreciable scholarly and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community" (FPPP 10.3.3). The committee shall consider the fact that a single publication of significant quality, or representing substantial and/or long term effort, may well constitute an achievement equal to or greater than that of two lesser publications. The committee shall also carefully consider the value of documented activities that have yet to yield publications or presentations, e.g. book in progress.

The department highly values mentoring that leads to student publications and/or presentations, and such student work may contribute to the publication and presentation record of the candidate. However, publications and presentations counted in the area of instruction cannot also be counted in the area of professional growth and achievement.

VI. SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, AND TO THE COMMUNITY:

The department values faculty that demonstrate a commitment to serving the department, college, university and larger communities. The Department's Mission states, "the well rounded students we seek to educate should develop a strong sense of the value of service to others." Our faculty should set a high standard for students to emulate. Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in one of the following four areas:

- **Participation in governance at the departmental, college or university level**
- **Performance of departmental, college or university service**
- **Participation in professional or community service organizations**
- **K-12 outreach and other community service**

A candidate's service is particularly vital at the departmental level, since active participation of its faculty is necessary for the health of the Department. Therefore, *all faculty* should (a) demonstrate a willingness and ability to cooperate and work effectively with faculty and staff members of the department; and (b) show a genuine interest in departmental activities and problems.

In addition to demonstrating this overall ability to work productively with departmental faculty and staff, a candidate's service should include specific service activities. The following are examples of tier 1 and tier 2 activities:

Meets Expectations for Tenure:

- One Tier 1 Activity**

Meets Expectations for Promotion to Associate or Full:

- Meets the same requirements as "Meets Expectations for Tenure" plus one Tier 1 activity** at the College or University Level.

Exceeds Expectations:

- Meets the same requirements as "Meets Expectations" plus one additional Tier 1 activity**

***These Tier 1 activities may individually be replaced by two Tier 2 activities*

Examples of Tier 1 Activities:

- Chairing 1 university committee for a length of an Academic year
- Chairing 1 college committee for a length of an Academic year
- Chairing 2 departmental committees for a length of an Academic year
- Chairing the Physics Department

Examples of Tier 2 Activities:

- Serving on 1 university committee
- Serving on 1 college committee
- Serving on 2 departmental committees
- Contributing in a significant manner to the scientific community at large, examples of such may include, but are not limited to:
 - Peer reviewing a significant number of scientific papers or grants
 - Assuming a key role in organizing a professional conference
- Participating in a significant amount of service to the scientific community at large, significance to be demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.
- Assuming a significant role in the organization of, creation of, and/or continued participation in regularly scheduled community engagement events: significance to be demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.

- Organizing a major community engagement event, examples of such may include, but are not limited to:
 - Having a key role in organizing poster competitions at the K-12 Level
 - Assuming a key role in organizing new regularly occurring community engagement programs at the public or K-12 levels.
- Participating in a significant amount of service to the community, college, university, and/or the scientific community at large, significance to be demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as demonstrated, documented, and evidenced by the candidate.
- Serving as the faculty advisor for the CSU Chico chapter of the Society of Physics Students for an academic year

For each activity the effort and impact, should be documented, and evidenced by the candidate. The department recognizes that all committees 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 any committee activity.* For example, a ranking of "Exceeds Expectations" is evidenced by "assuming key roles on significant committees" (FPPP 10.3.3), while a ranking of "Meets Expectations" is evidenced by "occasionally assuming roles on significant committees" (FPPP 10.3.3). It is in the candidate's interest for them to document heavy workload committees and/or document special responsibilities assumed, e.g. serving as committee chair, and/or time and effort spent engaged in committee service

The department recognizes that a candidate may make significant service contributions to the university outside of a committee setting, for example: university senator, departmental chair, SPS advisor, or liberal studies advisor.

The department recognizes that a candidate may make significant service contributions that, while formally outside of the university, do promote the department, college, or university mission. Typically this work is within the community or a professional society. However, the candidate must still demonstrate service at the departmental *and* college levels.

The department recognizes that CSU Chico's Strategic Plan includes service to the surrounding community, and as such significant community engagement may contribute toward the service area for retention and promotion. The significance of engagement will be decided by the RTP committee upon receiving evidence.

The department recognizes that joint-appointment faculty have service commitments to two departments. Given this fact, it is entirely appropriate for the Personnel Committee to consider

the candidate's departmental, college, and university service work done as a member of the second department.

VII. PERIODIC EVALUATION OF LECTURER FACULTY

As stated in FPPP section 9.1, lecturer faculty will undergo an annual evaluation of teaching effectiveness for the initial two personnel cycles of their appointment, followed thereafter by biennial reviews¹. The criteria for periodic evaluation are the same as are laid out in section IV, Instruction area 1, *Establishing and maintaining academically rigorous and effective classroom instruction*.

Each personnel committee report shall conclude with a single-word summary evaluation, or **rating**: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations. The committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for effectiveness in classroom instruction:

- syllabi, assignments, exams and other course materials created by the instructor
- samples of student work
- reports of class visits by committee members and others, e.g. chair and dean
- student feedback on teaching and learning (SFOTs)
- reflection on SFOTs and classroom visits
- other evidence provided by the faculty member under review, such as pre/post test results or other relevant metrics.

While a member of the personnel committee or other designee will conduct a minimum of one classroom visit, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit additional evidence of their teaching effectiveness such as those listed above.

In order to meet or exceed expectations in area (1) the evidence should demonstrate that the candidate

- focuses on student learning.
- implements formative assessment.
- fosters a classroom learning community.
- implements inclusive pedagogical practices.
- sets high standards and communicates them to students.

These criteria are further elaborated and explained in Appendix A.

¹ There are a number of cases where the frequency of review may be altered at the discretion of the lecturer, the personnel committee, and/or the department chair, dean etc. More details on this may be found in the FPPP.

Periodic evaluations that demonstrate the candidate meets or exceeds expectations may be used as evidence if and when a lecturer faculty pursues range elevation, see section VIII below.

VIII. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR RANGE ELEVATION

Since lecturer and tenured/tenure track faculty are colleagues, the criteria for Range Elevation (RE) should resemble those for tenure and promotion. It is equally true that the RE criteria must reflect the clear *differences* in work assignments for lecturer and tenure/tenure track faculty.

The Department of Physics appoints lecturer faculty for purposes of classroom instruction, therefore they are evaluated exclusively on their instructional performance. The dossier of a RE candidate should present evidence from courses in which the lecturer is the primary instructor of record and is primarily responsible for the course structure and content.

Typical minima in each area of review are as defined in section IV. As with that section, quantified minima are a *typical* set of achievements that a candidate *could* pursue, and other achievements of equivalent value may stand in place of these minima.

Meets expectations rating for range elevation from A to B:

- Meets Expectations in Area 1

Meets expectations rating for range elevation from B to C:

- Meets Expectations in Area 1 *and*
- One Tier 1** accomplishment in areas 2 - 4 of instruction or professional growth or service or a combination thereof

Meets expectations rating for range elevation from C to D:

- Meets Expectations in Area 1 *and*
- Two Tier 1** accomplishments in areas 2 - 4 of instruction or professional growth or service or a combination thereof

***These Tier 1 accomplishments may be replaced by two Tier 2 accomplishments*

Tier 1 and Tier 2 accomplishments are defined above in the section titled “**IV. INSTRUCTION**”.

Nothing in the above criteria and standards is intended to conflict with the FPPP *or* CBA; should there be a conflict, the FPPP and/or CBA shall take precedence. All FPPP references refer to the 2022/2023 FPPP. Should the FPPP be updated, refer to the appropriate updated sections.

Appendix A: The criteria for establishing and maintaining academically rigorous and effective classroom instruction

We have considered multiple sources of education research in articulating the key features of effective instruction. The interested candidate might want to read the following three papers to further understand the criteria:

- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39, 3-7.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139-148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200119>
- Etkina, E., Gitomer, D., Iaconangelo, C., Phelps, G., Seeley, L., & Vokos, S. (2018). Design of an assessment to probe teachers' content knowledge for teaching: An example from energy in high school physics. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 14(1), 010127. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.14.010127>

Focuses on student learning.

An instructor who focuses on and understands student learning,

1. Understands and demonstrates through design of activities and instruction that learning takes time and energy. The instructor demonstrates an awareness of both the pace and trajectory of student learning. Instructor supports productive struggle in the classroom, therefore allocating appropriate time to key tasks, discussions, or explanations.
2. Classroom instruction & activities are designed around identifiable learning goals and involve key science ideas, key experiments, and mathematical models relevant to the development of ideas and practices.
3. Instruction & activities demonstrate that the instructor anticipates patterns in student thinking. Instructor understands and recognizes challenges students are likely to confront in developing an understanding of key science concepts and mathematical models.
4. The instructor understands where the students are at and meets them at their pace and capabilities.

Implements formative assessment.

Formative assessment is defined in the Black and Wiliam (1998) reference above. Simply put, formative assessment is a dynamic process that occurs both inside and outside the classroom, by which instructors monitor student learning, provide timely feedback that allows students to improve their work and advance their understanding, and is used by the instructor to adapt their instruction to evolving student understanding and comprehension of the material. This process can happen over a period of a minute as an instructor adapts their instruction to a "polleverywhere" question that reveals a student difficulty. Or it can happen over a period of days or a week as an instructor becomes aware of students' difficulties with a particular homework problem, provides timely feedback to students and adapts their instruction to help students understand the key ideas related to that problem. Specifically:

1. The instructor monitors and responds to challenges and difficulties students experience in developing an understanding of key science concepts; understanding and applying mathematical models and manipulating equations; designing and conducting experiments, etc.
2. Monitoring is evident in classroom work, talk, actions, and interactions throughout the course of instruction so that specific learning needs or patterns are revealed and responded to appropriately.
3. The instructor also recognizes productive developing ideas and problem solutions and knows how to leverage these to advance learning.
4. The instructor engages in an ongoing and multifaceted process of assessment, using a variety of tools and methods. They draw on their understanding of learners and learning trajectories to accurately interpret and productively respond to their students' developing understanding.

Fosters a classroom learning community.

Learning happens best when students are actively engaged in the learning process and work collaboratively with each other and the instructor to negotiate meaning and further their understanding. For this to happen effectively the classroom needs to become a learning community. In summary, productive classroom learning environments are community-centered.

1. Instructors engage all students as full and active classroom participants.
2. Ideas are developed both individually and collectively in groups or as a whole class, emphasizing consensus through the practices of science and scientific argumentation.
3. The instructor clearly articulates and reinforced the values of the learning community.
4. The values of the classroom community include evidence-based reasoning, the pursuit of multiple or alternative approaches or solutions, and the respectful challenging of ideas.

Implements inclusive pedagogical practices.

Classrooms are microcosms of society at large. The challenges that students face because of their history, background, preparation, gender identity, socio-economic status (but to name a few examples) can lead to unequal access to learning opportunities *within* the classroom. Therefore, the instructor needs to be aware of these hidden challenges that students face, and foster a classroom learning environment that is an open and welcoming, place where:

1. Students of all backgrounds are able and willing to ask questions and express their ideas,
2. The instructor welcomes and hears students' questions and ideas. The instructor leverages students' ideas and questions to advance learning.
3. Instructor shows awareness that some students are afraid to speak up and/or take risks and creates a safe environment for traditionally marginalized students to participate in the learning community.

Sets high standards and communicates them to students.

Students come to our classrooms with different backgrounds and levels of preparation. Some may be unwilling to exert themselves to the best of their abilities. Clearly articulating high expectations to students through the syllabus and through constant verbal encouragement, the instructor tries their best to encourage students to learn and perform to the best of their abilities and bring all of their attention and focus to the challenging task of learning.






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:		Date:	Sep 2, 2022
Dean:	David M. Hassenzahl	Date:	Sep 2, 2022
OAPL:		Date:	Sep 2, 2022
Provost:		Date:	Sep 4, 2022



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2022

TO: Eric Ayars, Department Chair

CC: David Hassenzahl, Dean

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

SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of PHYS 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:

- Document is missing information on periodic reviews of tenured faculty.
- II.VII on period of review is outdated. XII is incorrect interpretation of period of review for promotion.
- Update SFOT frequency language.
- Resolve temporary faculty ratings language to be consistent to FPPP. Using TT/T definitions that are not appropriate. Same problem with range elevation section.
- Missing criteria for accelerated to full professor.
- Be clear on the criteria definition for does not meet.
- 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.