



# DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION

Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Operating Procedures and Special Criteria

Approved by the Department August 18, 2010

Approved by the Provost August 25, 2010 for voluntary implementation 09-10 and required implementation 10-11

This document is approved for 11-12 by vote of the faculty on August 17, 2011

*Our mission statement asserts, "The Department of Science Education at California State University, Chico is committed to providing the North State with the highest quality science education for all learners, programs for teacher preparation and professional development, and research on teaching and learning to promote scientific appreciation and understanding." This document is intended to promote these same goals as well as a spirit of collegiality and mutual support among our faculty.*

## I. STRUCTURE

1. The Department of Science Education 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 5.
2. The Personnel Committee shall consist of at least three members (FPPP 5.0.e).
3. The eligible departmental faculty shall consist of all tenured individuals who hold "Faculty" or "Joint Appointment Faculty" status in the department, except for the following:
  - Faculty members serving on the College Personnel Committee.
  - Faculty members on the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FPPP 5.0.g).
  - Faculty members being reviewed that academic year (FPPP 5.0.h).
4. When there are an insufficient number of eligible departmental faculty other tenured faculty may serve. The order of preference for service is: "Associated Faculty," then "Affiliated Faculty," and finally other tenured faculty.
5. In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion (FPPP 5.0.k)
6. The Department Chair will serve on the Personnel Committee as a full voting member. The Department Chair may choose to issue a separate concurring or minority report (FPPP 5.0.j).
7. The Department Personnel Committee will be elected after the selection of the College Personnel Committee.
8. The members of the Personnel Committee shall be elected in accordance with the department election guidelines.
9. The Personnel Committee may, by unanimous vote, allow the Personnel Committee Chair to establish a special sub-committee for the evaluation of tenure or tenure-track faculty in accordance with the procedures set out below.

**PROCEDURES**

10. The Personnel Committee will operate under and be knowledgeable of all of the appropriate guidelines and regulations that include, but are not limited to the CBA articles 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 20 and the FPPP sections 3, 4, 5, and 8.
11. The Personnel Committee will follow the procedures and the special criteria established by and approved for the Science Education Personnel Committee. 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.
12. The Personnel Committee will meet and select a Chair and Secretary (FPPP 5.0.1). If at least one member of the Personnel Committee has tenure in the department, then the chair must have tenure in the department. If no member of the Personnel Committee has tenure in the department, but at least one member of the Personnel Committee has a joint appointment in the department, then the chair must have a joint appointment in the department.
13. A quorum consisting of a majority must be present in order for the Personnel Committee to conduct its business.
14. When the Personnel 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.
15. It is the obligation of the Personnel Committee Chair to ensure that the committee can effectively evaluate the work of a given candidate. For example, the Personnel Committee for a tenure or tenure-track faculty member holding a joint appointment with another department should have at least one member from the other department. The Personnel Committee may, by unanimous vote, allow the Personnel Committee Chair to establish a special Personnel Sub-Committee for the evaluation of such a candidate. Before selecting the Personnel Sub-Committee, the chair shall consult with the candidate regarding its composition. Members of the Personnel Sub-Committee must be tenured in the College of Natural Sciences or the College of Communication and Education. The Chair of the Personnel Committee shall make the final decision as to the make up of the Personnel Sub-Committee. A record of the consultation and the names of the members of the Personnel Sub-Committee shall be placed in the candidate's file.
16. For tenure or tenure track candidates, at least two Personnel Committee members will make classroom visitations. For other candidates, at least one Personnel Committee member will make a classroom visitation. A written report of each visit will become a part of the personnel file of the candidate. The College Dean may also make classroom visits.
17. Periodic evaluations will cover the period since the faculty member's date of hire, previous periodic evaluation, or previous performance review whichever is more recent. Performance reviews for retention will cover the period since the faculty member's date of hire or previous performance review, whichever is more recent (FPPP 8.5.a.12) Performance reviews for tenure or promotion will cover the period since appointment or since the last promotion, whichever is more recent (FPPP 8.5.b.2.d.1 or 8.5.b.2.e.1).
18. All Personnel Committee members will examine the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) of each candidate (FPPP 5.0.m). To facilitate this examination, meetings should be conducted, whenever possible, at the Dean's office.

19. The Personnel Committee's report can only be based on evidence in the WPAF (FPPP 3.0.p). 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 to see that all materials needed for a favorable review are in the WPAF, while it is the Personnel Committee's responsibility to see that all materials needed for a thorough evaluation are included in the WPAF (FPPP 8.1.a.5).
20. 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 CSUC will not be considered during the evaluation process.
21. The candidate should indicate in the dossier the category in which (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions) each piece of evidence should be considered. Specific pieces of evidence, e.g. published paper, may only be considered in a single category.
22. The Personnel 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 promotion (FPPP 8.5.b.2.e.5), retention (FPPP 8.5.b.2.c.3) or tenure (FPPP 8.5.b.2.d), the definitions of evaluation ratings (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c) and the Special Criteria and Standards of the Department of Science Education. The Personnel Committee will evaluate candidates based upon the quality, quantity and continuity of their performance as faculty members in pursuit of the department's mission and the mission of their other department in the case of joint appointment.
23. The Personnel Committee shall meet with each candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion after reviewing the WPAF but before writing its report (FPPP 8.5.a.18). Lecturer faculty shall be offered the opportunity to meet with the Personnel Committee.
24. All non-tenured faculty must undergo SET at least once per year. The department strongly recommends that non-tenured faculty request to have SET's twice per year as is their right under the FPPP. This biannual evaluation provides the candidate with feedback more promptly and provides the committee with a more complete record.
25. 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 8.2.b). In the review of temporary faculty the department will consider their teaching responsibilities (FPPP 6.2.d and CBA 20), professional activity (FPPP 8.4.a) and service to the department in light of the extent of their appointment.

## II. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

*All standards and criteria should be considered in the light of contributing to the pursuit of our mission. Accordingly, in what follows we state how we envision each category (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions) 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.*

### 1. Temporary Faculty (Retention and Range Elevation)

For periodic evaluation of temporary faculty all reports will contain an evaluation of teaching effectiveness and conclude with a statement as to whether the teaching performance is satisfactory (FPPP 8.2.d.5). To maintain consistency with the evaluation process for tenure and tenure track faculty the report may contain reference to the rating (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c): superior, effective, adequate or inadequate in the area of instruction. A rating of Effective or Superior is required for satisfactory performance. A rating of Superior is required for range elevation, although this is not the only factor that is considered for range elevation. Therefore, it is helpful to candidates and reviewers to specify what work constitutes the minimum necessary to achieve a given rating.

Beyond simply rating the candidate and making the appropriate retention recommendation, it is particularly important that the committee report give constructive guidance concerning areas where the candidate can grow professionally. In this same collegial spirit the department strongly recommends that, at the conclusion of the entire review process, the candidate requests to meet with the department coordinator and RTP committee to discuss and clarify any remaining issues.

In what follows the Department of Science Education has attempted to quantify certain typical minimums of activity in the area of Instruction. 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.

#### ***Instruction:***

The department values faculty who 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. 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 the science education curriculum.
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 demonstrate effective performance for retention or superior performance for range elevation.

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
- student evaluations of teaching
- reports of class visits by committee members and others, e.g. the Dean
- other evidence provided by the faculty member under review

In order to receive an effective or superior rating in area (1) the evidence should demonstrate that the candidate

- encourages student-faculty contact.
- encourages his/her students to work together.
- encourages active learning in the classroom or outside of it.
- provides prompt feedback on assignments.
- uses class time wisely.
- sets high standards and communicates them to students.
- recognizes and responds to the fact that different students learn differently.

(this list is based on: *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*, 1987, A.W. Chickering and Z.F. Gamson)

The Department of Science Education expects that candidates for range elevation to engage in teaching activities beyond area (1). Therefore candidates for range elevation must demonstrate work in at least one of the remaining areas (2-4) to merit an overall Instructional rating of Superior. In addition to a rating of Superior (defined below), the candidate for range elevation must meet the requirements for range elevation of FPPP 8.4. The following activities constitute typical minimums of expectation for a Superior rating:

- Superior rating in area 1 and
- Tangible evidence of sustained contributions in at least one of areas 2, 3 or 4

As previously stated these quantitative minimums are an example of the minimum level of achievement associated with a Superior 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 "Superior" in instruction is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill" (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c). The department recognizes the benefits to our mission that can arise from other forms of professionalism that demonstrate the candidate's commitment to excellence and innovation in science education. These may take the form of peer reviewed publications, professional conference presentations, substantial participation in teacher professional development efforts, science education grant development, or other efforts that support the department's mission. Depending on the documented level of effort the candidate may request the committee to substitute such activity for evidence of contributions in areas 2, 3, and 4.

## 2. Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)

In each area of review (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community) all reports conclude with a single-word summary evaluation, or rating (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c): superior, effective, adequate or inadequate. 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 constitutes the minimum necessary to achieve a given rating.

The following table presents those ratings that are typically required for a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion.

	Teaching	Prof. Dev.	Service
Tenure	E	E	A
	E	A	E
	S	A	A
Promotion To Associate	S	E	E
	E	S	E
	E	E	S
	S	S	A
	S	A	S
Promotion To Full	S	S	E
	S	E	S
	E	S	S

(S = superior, E = effective, A = adequate)

Note that the candidate may focus her/his efforts in various ways to be recommended for tenure or promotion, however a candidate rated as ***inadequate in any area will not be recommended for tenure or promotion***. Also note that a minimum rating of effective in teaching is required for tenure or promotion (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c).

Probationary, tenure-track faculty undergo a retention performance review semi-annually (typically these occur in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years) (FPPP 8.5.a.6). 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 8.5.b.2.c.2). The following table presents those ratings that are typically required for a positive recommendation for retention for a given review year.

	Teaching	Prof. Dev.	Service
1st & 2nd year	E*	---	---
3rd year	E	A	---
	E	---	A
4th & 5th year	E	A	A

(\* - For 1st and 2nd year review the candidate is only required to be effective in Area (1) in Instruction (see below).)

A recommendation by the Committee for early tenure “must be accompanied by its justification as a special case” (FPPP 8.5.b.3.a.3). Such “special case” 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” (FPPP 8.5.b.3.c). The Department of Science Education criteria for such “exceptional” candidates are that they: a) meet all requirements for promotion in a time period shorter than normal, and b) clearly exceed the typical minimums for promotion (see below).

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 RTP committee to discuss and clarify issues regarding tenure and promotion.

In what follows the Department of Science Education has attempted to quantify certain typical minimums of activity in the three areas of activity: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and 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.

***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. Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in the following four areas:

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

Since areas 1 and 2 are so central to the department's mission, all faculty members under review must demonstrate effective or superior performance in these areas to be recommended for tenure or promotion. The committee shall consider and evaluate the following evidence for contributions in all four areas:

- syllabi, assignments, exams and other course materials created by the instructor
- samples of student work
- student evaluations of teaching
- reports of class visits by committee members and others, e.g. chair and dean
- funded grants that support the instruction of CSU students, e.g. CELT grant

- peer-reviewed publications
- professional activities by or with mentored students
- other evidence provided by the faculty member under review

In order to receive an effective or superior rating in area (1) the evidence should demonstrate that the candidate

- encourages student-faculty contact.
- encourages their students to work together.
- encourages active learning in the classroom or outside of it.
- provides prompt feedback on assignments.
- uses class time wisely.
- sets high standards and communicates them to students.
- recognizes and responds to the fact that different students learn differently.

(this list is based on: *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*, 1987, A.W. Chickering and Z.F. Gamson)

The Department of Science Education expects the candidate to engage in teaching activities beyond area (1). Therefore candidates must demonstrate work in the remaining areas (2-4) to merit an overall Instructional rating of Effective or Superior.

The following activities constitute typical minimums of expectation in Instruction:

Superior rating:

- Superior rating in area 1
- Tangible evidence of Strong contributions in area 2
- Tangible evidence of modest contributions in areas 3 and/or 4

Effective rating:

- Effective rating in area 1
- Tangible evidence of modest contributions in area 2
- Tangible Evidence of minor contributions in areas 3 or 4

Adequate rating:

- Adequate rating in area 1
- Tangible Evidence of minor contributions in areas 2, 3 or 4

As previously stated these quantitative minimums are an example 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 "Superior" in instruction is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and exceptional skill"(FPPP 8.5.b.1.c), while a ranking of "Effective" is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's substantial professionalism and competence" (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c).

### ***Professional Growth and Achievement:***

The department values faculty that demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and achievement. The Department's Mission statement defines professional growth and achievement as "research on teaching and learning to promote scientific appreciation and



understanding.” This is to include the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching as described by E.L . Boyer (Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990). Evidence of this commitment is demonstrated by activities that lie in one or more of the following areas:

1. peer reviewed publications (ie., journal papers, chapters, books)
2. conference presentations
3. funded research grant activity
4. collaboration in any of the above areas

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

Superior rating:

- two peer reviewed publications related to the area of activity and
- one presentation at a professional conference or one funded research grant

Effective rating:

- one peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity and
- one presentation at a professional conference or one funded research grant

Adequate rating:

- one peer reviewed publication related to the area of activity or one funded research grant.

The department values collaborations between faculty and recognizes that individuals will have different areas of expertise and professional interest. Therefore collaborative, publications, presentations, and grant activity are especially encouraged.

As previously stated these quantitative minimums are an example 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 “Superior” is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly achievement”(FPPP 8.5.b.1.c), while a ranking of "Effective" is based on evidence that "demonstrates the candidate's substantial significant scholarly achievement" (FPPP 8.5.b.1.c). 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

### ***Other Contributions to the University and Community:***

The department values faculty who serve the department, college, university and larger communities, especially the K-12 science education community. The Department’s Mission states that we are, “committed to providing the North State with the highest quality science education for all learners, programs for teacher preparation and professional development...” Thus, K-12 outreach activities and professional development efforts are a core component of our responsibilities. Evidence of contributions to the University and community is demonstrated by activities that lie in the following four areas:

1. K-12 outreach and teacher professional development
2. Leadership in governance at the departmental, college or university level
3. Performance of departmental, college or university service
4. Participation in professional or community service organizations

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 sets of activities constitute typical minimums of expectation in service:

Superior rating:

- lead, develop, and implement superior K-12 outreach or teacher professional development efforts modeled on current best practices and/or
- highly active service including leadership roles, on college and university committees

Effective rating:

- implement effective K-12 outreach or professional development efforts and/or
- active service including at least one leadership role on departmental, college, or university committees

Adequate rating:

- participate in K-12 outreach or professional development efforts and/or
- demonstrated service on departmental, college, and university committees

The department recognizes the benefits to our mission that can arise from faculty obtaining grants and contracts in areas unrelated to Instruction and Professional Growth and Achievement. Therefore, the committee will consider funded grants in K-12 outreach, teacher professional development, informal education, or similar topics of benefit to the community as strong evidence of leadership and commitment to these areas.

The department recognizes that some faculty will have professional commitments and interests that lie outside the field of K-12 outreach and/or science teacher education yet promote the mission of the department, college, or university. Typically this work is within the community, informal science education settings, governmental educational agencies, or professional societies. Depending on the documented level of effort, the candidate may request the committee to substitute these activities for a similar level of commitment to K-12 outreach and/or teacher professional development responsibilities.

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 "Superior" is based on evidence that demonstrates "the candidate's assumption of key roles on significant University-, College-, and/or Department-level committees"(FPPP 18.3), while a ranking of "Effective" is based on evidence that demonstrates "the candidate's occasional assumption of key roles on significant University-, College-, and/or Department-level committees"(FPPP 8.5.b.1.c). It is in the candidate's interest for him/her to

document heavy workload committees and/or document special responsibilities assumed, e.g. serving as committee chair.

The department recognizes that a candidate may make significant service contributions to the university that are outside of a committee setting, for example: university senator, departmental chair, NSTA Science Teacher Club advisor or liberal studies advisor. Depending on the documented level of effort, the candidate may request the committee to substitute these activities for an appropriate amount of committee service work.

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.