



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2022
TO: The Academic Campus Community
FROM: Mahalley Allen
Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
SUBJECT: Changes to the FPPP 2022-2023

After a careful review of the 2021-2022 FPPP by the FASP Committee, the recommendation of the Academic Senate, and the approval of the President, the following revisions have been made to the FPPP for 2022-2023. Also included is a section that was approved last year for the 2022-2023 FPPP. Items removed are ~~struck out~~, and items added are in **color**. The document can be found in its entirety at <http://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/fppp/index.shtml>.

FPPP EVALUATION CHANGES APPROVED IN 2020-2021 EFFECTIVE 2022-2023

DEFINITIONS

RATING

The outcome of the process by which candidates for promotion are graded at all *levels of evaluation* in the categories of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, University, and to the Community. Recognized *ratings* are **Superior** “Exceeds expectations”, **Effective** “Meets expectations”, and “Does not meet expectations”. ~~“inadequate,” “adequate,” “effective,” and “superior.”~~ **The use of hyphenated ratings (e.g., “effective-to- superior”) is NOT permissible.**

10.3.3 In each written *performance review report*, the reviews of Instruction,

Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community will each conclude with a summary evaluation. These evaluations are defined in the remainder of this section **and supersede discipline-specific nomenclature as outlined in the Unit's department standards. Here, expectations are defined by the criteria specified in the Unit's department standards. The use of hyphenated ratings (e.g., "effective to superior") is NOT permissible.**

Exceeds expectations Superior

The candidate has clearly achieved excellence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record unambiguously supports the claim that the candidate is a model of academic/professional contribution and achievement in the area being evaluated. **Exceeds Expectations shall be concluded only for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.**

Meets expectations Effective

The candidate has **demonstrated** ~~achieved~~ competence in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a continual, ~~impressive~~, and valued contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated. **An evaluation of "Meets expectations" performance is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Meets Expectations shall be concluded only for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course (i.e., given the number of probationary years remaining).**

Adequate

~~The candidate has achieved satisfactory and acceptable (but not remarkable) levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. With certain exceptions, the evidentiary record generally supports the claim that the candidate is making a satisfactory contribution to the academic community in the area being evaluated.~~

Does not meet expectations Inadequate

The candidate has achieved less-than-satisfactory levels of performance in the specific area of evaluation. The evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making **the minimum** ~~at least adequate~~ contributions **with regard to the department's criteria** ~~to the academic community~~ in the area being evaluated. **"Inadequate" performance is an impermissible level of professionalism, and The significant deficiencies identified** require immediate attention and correction.

More specifically, as applies to each area of performance:

INSTRUCTION

Exceeds Expectations Superior

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/Unit standards*, other sections of this document (FPPP), and the CBA.

Meets expectations Effective

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's substantial professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. An evaluation of “Meets expectations”-“effective” performance is normally the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.

Adequate

~~The evidence suggests the candidate has achieved a satisfactory level of professionalism and competence as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. An overall evaluation of “adequate” performance is the minimum level of achievement consistent with *retention*, but it is insufficient to justify the awarding of tenure and/or promotion.~~

Does not meet expectations Inadequate

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/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Exceeds expectations Superior

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly and professional activities that contribute achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed the *Department/Unit standards*, in other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Meets expectations Effective

The evidence demonstrates substantial appreciable significant scholarly achievement with respect to professional contributions and professional activities that contribute to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the

Department/Unit standards, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

Adequate

The evidence demonstrates some scholarly achievement on the part of the candidate, with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA)

Does not meet expectations Inadequate

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly and professional activities that contribute achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community (representative activities are listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA).

SERVICE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STRATEGIC PLANS AND GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY (SERVICE)

As stated above, the third area of evaluation is Service that contributes to shared governance, to the Strategic Plans, priorities, and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University and to the Community. 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, priorities, and goals and whether the candidate's performance generally facilitates the University's, College's and Department's/Unit's abilities to meet their strategic plans, priorities, and goals

Exceeds expectations Superior

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. Where this area of evaluation refers to participation participating on committees and/or in the community, or facilitating activities. "Superior" "Exceeds expectations" performance is evidenced by (1) assuming the candidate's assumption of key roles on significant committees, (2) high levels of involvement and/or in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating significant activities as well as the demonstrating on of consistent, on-going contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community such activities.

Meets expectations Effective

The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistent, on-going

involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. ~~Where this area of evaluation refers to participation~~ **participating** on committees and/or in the community, ~~or facilitating activities.~~ **“Effective “Meets expectations”** performance is evidenced by (1) ~~the candidate's occasionally~~ **assuming** of key roles on significant committees, (2) **involvement** and/or in the community **or profession**, and/or (3) **facilitating activities**, as well as ~~the demonstrating~~ **ion of consistent**, on-going contributions to **the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community** such activities.

Adequate

~~The evidence demonstrates occasional involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on~~ committees and/or in the community, **“adequate”** performance is evidenced by the candidate's infrequent ~~assumption of key roles on~~ committees and/or in the community while, nevertheless, maintaining regular participation in activities at these levels.

Does not meet expectations Inadequate

The evidence does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in activities listed in the *Department/Unit standards*, other sections of this FPPP, and the CBA. ~~Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees and/or in the community,~~ **or facilitating activities.** **“Inadequate” “Does not meet expectations”** performance is evidenced by **a lack of the candidate's lack of assumption** (1) **assuming** of key roles on committees, (2) **involvement** and/or in the community **or profession**, and/or (3) **facilitating activities** and as well as **only** limited participation in activities at these levels ~~demonstrating limited contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.~~

- 10.5.3 To qualify for accelerated tenure or promotion the candidate must: (1) ~~be~~ **have been** rated ~~Superior~~ **Exceeds Expectations in a *Performance Review*** as defined in 10.3.3 in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community; *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.

- 11.1.3 To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor the candidate must: (1) be ranked ~~Superior~~ **Exceeds Expectations** in all three categories of evaluation: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community;

~~and (2) have exceeded the expectations of Superior in all three categories of evaluation; and (3) demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue, and(4-3) 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.~~

Appendix A

Guidance for transition to the current Summary Evaluation rating system.

The new rating system is intended to solve the following:

1. To more appropriately align the title of the Summary Evaluation to the RTP decision outcome.
2. To more appropriately establish & communicate the requirements and timing for accelerated tenure.
3. To eliminate the incentive to assign a low Summary Evaluation in early years of a career in order to show progress over time in the career.
4. When evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement, the shift in the language to “*appreciable*” rather than “*substantial and significant*” scholarship conveys the necessary trade off in producing influential scholarship and the quantity/types of scholarship produced. The definition of appreciable is “*large or important enough to be noticed,*” allowing evaluators to focus on the quality of work (i.e., *to be noticed*) rather than the quantity. This revision also comports with FPPP 8.1.3.e4 which specifically directs the candidate to “*keep in mind that the quality of these activities is more important than the quantity of activities.*”
5. The addition of “*professional activities*” to evaluation of Professional Growth and Achievement is intended to better account for the variety of activities beyond traditional scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) that constitute the professional growth and achievements of faculty. As noted in the existing standard, in the context of a teacher-scholar institution scholarly contributions may be made “*to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community.*” This additional language acknowledges that it is possible for candidates to grow and achieve through activities (scholarly or professional) that focus on students, the candidate’s discipline, or the broader professional community.
6. When evaluating Service, the shift to a list of three different

descriptors of service - *“assuming roles on significant committees, (2) involvement in the community or profession, and/or (3) facilitating activities”* - conveys that there are multiple pathways to serving the university including non-institutional roles and temporary activities. Specifically, evaluators should weigh evidence of service beyond formal institutional roles - such as task forces, mentoring, community engagement, or putting on events/activities that enrich the University. Additionally, all service contributions should be considered in the context of *“contributions to the university’s mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community.”* This concluding clause should encourage the candidates to frame and the evaluators to evaluate service with reference to the diversity of roles that CSU, Chico plays in the lives of students and the North State.

In general, it is recommended to translate Summary Evaluations into the new format in the following manner:

“Superior” would translate into “Exceeds expectations.”
“Effective” and “Adequate” could translate into “Meets expectations.”
“Inadequate” shall translate into “Does not meet expectations.”

However, the Unit’s department standards are the appropriate authority for defining expectations.

For example, if the Unit’s department standards for a specific area define a Summary Evaluation of “Effective” as the minimum rating for awarding tenure, then:

“Effective” could translate into “Meets expectations.”
“Adequate” could translate into “Does not meet expectations.”
“Inadequate” shall translate into “Does not meet expectations”

FPPP CHANGES EFFECTIVE 2022-2023

CBA

Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), also known as ~~the MOU~~, Contract or Agreement. It is an agreement between the Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association (CFA). The CFA is the sole and an exclusive representative of the Unit 3 bargaining unit. ~~a unit of employees’ union.~~

DISCIPLINE

Also known as “disciplinary action,” **and is defined as** ~~the~~ imposition of suspension without pay, demotion, or dismissal for cause. **In accordance to CBA 19.2** ~~Written reprimand or temporary and~~ suspension with pay are not disciplinary actions. **Unit 3 employees may request representation by the CFA, whereas the CFA representative is one that has been officially designated in writing. CBA Article 10, 17, 18, and 19 provide additional guidance on discipline, reprimands, and representation.**

FULL-TIME LECTURER FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEE

Lecturer faculty unit employees who have appointments equal to 30 Weighted Teaching Units (WTU) per academic year equivalent to a full-time (1.0) position. **Per the CBA 2.13.k., the term Lecturer Employee refers to a bargaining unit employee serving in a temporary appointment for a specified period of time.**

GRIEVANCE, CONTRACT

~~An officially filed allegation by a faculty member or the exclusive representative of the faculty that there has been a violation, misapplication, or misinterpretation of a specific term or specific terms of a collective bargaining agreement that has resulted in a direct wrong to the grievant.~~ **In accordance to CBA Article 10, a grievance is an officially filed allegation by a unit 3 employee or by the CFA that there has been a violation, misapplication, or misinterpretation of specific term or terms of the CBA. Additional guidance on grievance and CFA representation is found in CBA Article 10.**

PART-TIME LECTURER FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEE

Lecturer faculty unit employees who have appointments of less than 30 Weighted Teaching Units (WTU) per academic year, equivalent to less than a full-time (1.0) position. **Per the CBA 2.13.k, the term Lecturer Employee refers to a bargaining unit employee serving in a temporary appointment for a specified period of time. Also called a Lecturer Unit Employee.**

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The process of evaluating faculty for *retention*, tenure, or promotion that leads to formal *reports*, *recommendations*, and notices of results. **In the performance review, formal ratings in each category of evaluation are offered and a decision is made on whether or not to retain, grant tenure, or promote the candidate.**

REPRIMAND

An oral and/or written *reprimand* issued to a faculty unit employee by the appropriate administrator. A written *reprimand* must be clearly identified in the document as a “letter of *reprimand*.” **CBA Article 18 provides the details on process, rights, and representation.**

2.0 NON-DISCRIMINATION

2.2 It is University policy that there be no discrimination or harassment based on protected status as defined in the Interim CSU Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Exploitation, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation in EO 1096 and CBA 16.1 (~~EO 1096~~ and [CBA 16.1](#)).

2.3 CSU, Chico is an Equal Opportunity Employer. We are committed to recruiting, developing and retaining the most qualified people from a diverse pool without regard to differences as defined in Article I. Statement of Values in the Interim CSU Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Exploitation, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation. All students and employees have the right to participate fully in CSU programs, activities, and employment free from Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Exploitation, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation. If you should need to report an incident that may violate this policy or need assistance associated with enforcement of this policy, please contact the University Equal Opportunity & Dispute Resolution (EODR) office. We only employ individuals authorized to work in the U.S. ~~race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, genetic information, medical condition, disability, marital status, or protected veteran status and only employ individuals authorized to work in the U.S.~~

4.1 Personnel Committees – Composition of Committees

4.1.10 Personnel Committees – Composition of Committees – Membership by Department Chairs

4.1.10.c If the Department Chair serves on the Department committee, the committee's *report* shall be considered a Department ~~(or Department/Chair)-report~~, and the Department Chair **will not submit a subsequent report that will be considered a separate level of review.** ~~will not be considered a subsequent separate level of review.~~

4.1.10.d ~~Upon the Department Chair's request, the Department Committee may meet with the Department Chair to discuss personnel matters that are not part of the normal evaluation schedule. The main purpose of these meetings is to provide counsel to the Department Chair.~~

5.1 Hiring – Tenure Track (Probationary) Faculty

5.1.3 Hiring – Tenure Track (Probationary) Faculty – Procedures

- 5.1.3.b.1 Prior to any recommendation for hiring, all department faculty who have participated in finalist visits must be surveyed to gain their input, and the perspectives of those respondents shall be considered by the search committee prior to voting. That the department peer review recommendations shall be determined by a simple majority vote,
- ~~5.1.3.b.2 The procedure for determining the recommendation shall include a vote of all regular and auxiliary faculty who meet conditions set forth in the Department/Unit personnel policies. Regular and auxiliary faculty are defined in Section 3, Article III of the Constitution of the Faculty. All faculty voting on an appointment Recommendation must be provided with access to applicant materials as required by the position announcement.~~
- 5.1.3.b.3~~2~~ If a Department/Unit includes separate subunits, such as programs, options or areas of concentration, defined in its Department/Unit constitution, and its personnel policies give a subunit the authority to determine the Department/Unit recommendation for appointments to that subunit, all regular and auxiliary faculty in the subunit shall participate in the search committee, and shall be invited to provide input following campus visits by finalists. ~~be eligible to vote on the recommendation. The Department/Unit shall determine which faculty are members of the subunit for this purpose. Whether there are any participation requirements for the right to vote (e.g., attendance at candidate presentations), and the process by which all eligible voting faculty will have a reasonable opportunity to meet any participation requirements.~~
- 5.1.3.d A new Search Committee shall be formed for each new search. The purpose of the Search Committee is to assist in the recruitment of applicants, review applicant materials, and make an appointment recommendation to the Department. Confidentiality of all applicant materials and committee deliberations is required of members of the search committee throughout the process.
- 5.1.3.f Those eligible to be on Search Committees are the Department's:
- tenured faculty,
 - Probationary faculty at the discretion of the President

- in response to the Department's request,
 - FERP faculty who are able to fully participate in the search process, and
 - one ~~tenured- augmented~~ faculty member from another department is recommended to enhance the diversity of perspectives, unless otherwise indicated by department policy. ~~if specified by the Department's personnel policy.~~
- 5.1.3.1.5 Evidence of the human relations skills and cultural competencies necessary to work with diverse students and colleagues;
- 5.1.3.m ~~Prior to making an appointment recommendation, s~~ Search Committees shall typically conduct campus interviews with ~~require~~ at least three-campus candidates. Exceptions to this must be approved by the College Dean and the Provost or Provost designee. ~~interviews prior to making an appointment recommendation.~~ At least two members of the Department Search Committee and, when possible, the Department Chair shall conduct each interview.

8.0 Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence

8.1.4 Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence – Teaching Effectiveness

- 8.1.4.a Evaluation of Faculty – Evidence – Teaching Effectiveness – Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT).
- 8.1.4.a.1 Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs) serves several purposes: First, the feedback provides a means of appraising the quality of teaching performance of faculty members in a course; second, the feedback should help faculty members improve their teaching and continue to develop innovative and inclusive pedagogy and assist in their general professional development; and, finally, it promotes meaningful student input and participation in their education.
- 8.1.4.a.2 ~~Written or electronic s~~ Student course feedback evaluations on of teaching (SFOTET) shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student course evaluations. See CBA 15.15.

8.1.4.a.3 Each academic Department/Unit may draw up its own **course** instruments and/or procedures subject to approval of the USFOT Committee. Proposed Department/Unit instruments must include a satisfactory plan for analysis and evaluation of results and shall be submitted for USFOT Committee approval.

8.1.4.a.3.1 Probationary faculty may use the SFOT **course** instrument under which their evaluations began for the duration of the probationary period for consistency in SFOT analysis. Probationary faculty making this choice will communicate it in writing to the College Dean for placement in the PAF, as well as the Department Chair.

8.1.4.a.4 Departments/Units shall file USFOT Committee approved Department/Unit instruments, procedures, and plans for analysis and evaluation of results in appropriate College and Department/Unit offices. These USFOT Committee-approved documents shall be kept on file for a minimum of five years. Upon request, these USFOT Committee-approved documents shall be made available to any faculty member or administrator.

8.1.4.a.5 ~~Evaluations shall be administered in an online or paper format, normally no earlier than the 14th week and no later than the 15th week of the class. For semester classes that end prior to the 14th week, evaluations shall be administered during the last two weeks of class. All evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with approved procedures.~~ **The faculty member will administer the SFOT instrument during the last two weeks of class.** The standard procedures for the administration and processing of SFOT instruments shall include all of the following:

8.1.4.a.5.1 **The duration of the administration of the SFOT instrument depends on the course's Mode of Instruction**~~Online Evaluations~~

8.1.4.a.5.1.1 ~~Students~~ **For modalities with published meeting times at which students are expected to be present (whether online or in-person), the duration of the administration of the**

course instrument will be at least twenty minutes during a regularly scheduled class meeting. ~~will be required to log in using their portal access account, user name, and password before they can access the evaluations for their courses.~~

8.1.4. a.5.1.2 For other modalities the faculty member shall establish a duration that is appropriate. An appropriate duration is the shortest amount of time during which students can be expected to receive and respond to the faculty member's call to provide their feedback on the course instrument. In no case shall the duration be longer than one week. ~~Only students registered during the evaluation period will be allowed to evaluate a course. Each student will only be allowed to evaluate a course one time.~~

8.1.4.a.5.2 In-Class (Paper) Evaluations

For in person course modalities, the faculty member should announce the intention of administering the SFOT in a subsequent class session. For electronically-administered SFOT instruments, the faculty member should remind students to bring a smart phone, tablet, or computer for filling out the instrument.

8.1.4.a.5.3 For in-person course modalities, the faculty member must leave the room for the duration of the instrument's administration.

8.1.4.a.5.4 Only students registered when the instrument is administered are eligible to evaluate a course. Each student may evaluate a course one time.

8.1.4.a.5.5 Electronically-administered SFOT instruments require students to authenticate using their portal credentials to gain access to the course instrument.

8.1.4.a.5.6 Paper-administered SFOT instruments shall include written instructions specifying that one of the students must

promptly deliver the completed instruments in a signed and sealed envelope to the Department/Unit office or such other place or time as approved procedure may determine.

~~8.1.4.a.5.2.1 Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning instruments must be administered during a regularly scheduled class meeting. The faculty member shall allow at least twenty minutes, at the start of a class session, for the administration of the instruments.~~

~~8.1.4.a.5.2.2 The faculty member must designate at least two students to administer the Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning instruments.~~

~~8.1.4.a.5.2.3 The faculty member must leave the room while the instruments are distributed, marked, and collected.~~

~~8.1.4.a.5.2.4 Written instructions shall specify that one of the students must promptly deliver the completed instruments in a signed and sealed envelope to the *Department/Unit* office or such other place or time as approved procedure may determine.~~

~~8.1.4.a.5.2.5 The sealed envelopes shall be collected from the *Department/Unit* offices and processed in accordance with procedures established or approved by the USFOT Committee.~~

8.1.4.b After processing, the raw data and summaries shall be made available using a secure mechanism to the appropriate College office and to the faculty member being evaluated.

8.1.4.c All student **course feedback** evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process must be anonymous and identified only by course and section. ~~For online evaluations,~~ **No** information linking an **individual** student to their answers will ~~not~~ be stored.

- 8.1.4.d Any faculty member who refuses to submit to an evaluation at the time and in the manner specified in this document shall have such refusal noted in their *personnel action file* by the *Appropriate Administrator*.
- 8.1.4.e For faculty at the rank of Professor or equivalent, ~~SFOTET~~ results shall be retained for five years. ~~SET results that have been removed from the PAF shall be returned yearly to the faculty member at the beginning of the following academic year, but after the deadline for all grievance activity.~~
 - 8.1.4.e.1 For *probationary* faculty who are promoted before they are tenured, ~~SFOTET~~ results that were available for consideration during promotion deliberations shall be removed from the PAF after tenure is awarded. Those materials that were available for consideration after promotion but prior to tenure deliberations shall be retained for consideration during the next promotion deliberations. ~~SFOTET~~ results that have been removed from the PAF shall be returned to the faculty member at the beginning of the next academic year.
 - 8.1.4.e.2 For all other faculty, ~~SFOTET~~ results shall be removed from the PAF after promotion or appointment at a higher rank, with the exception of a faculty member moving from *lecturer* to tenure-track status (see 10.4.4.a). ~~SFOTET~~ results that have been removed from the PAF shall be returned to the faculty member at the beginning of the next academic year.

9.0 EVALUATION OF LECTURER FACULTY

9.1 Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

9.1.2 Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty – Categories

- 9.1.2.a Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for appointment, reappointment, and range elevation of Lecturer faculty who teach.
- 9.1.2.b Lecturer faculty will be evaluated according to the professional standards of the disciplines in which they are appointed and as defined by the Department/Unit as appropriate to their work assignments.
- 9.1.2.c The following shall provide the basis for evaluating Lecturer faculty, as

documented by evidence in the personnel action file.

9.1.2.c.1 Evaluations of teaching performance for those who teach. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) shall be used, but shall not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching performance and shall not be used to determine a candidate's knowledge of their discipline. Consequently, it is in the candidate's best interests to carefully provide supplemental evidence in a manner that allows evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance. The candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence of teaching performance consistent with the candidate's Range classification and teaching responsibilities. ~~As long as this evidence is consistent with department standards, this can include peer letters; student letters; academic peer review of course modules and structure; evidence of revision and updating of course syllabi and materials; alternative student evaluation; lesson plans; inclusive pedagogy and diversity; equity development; extraordinary mentoring of students; contributions to improving graduation rates; HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiatives; etc.~~

~~The candidate is not alone in this process; as stated above, it is each Department's/Unit's responsibility to assist the candidate in building the evidentiary basis, in this case by providing peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year. Colleagues should visit classes and provide developmental and evaluative feedback. The records of these visits should be included in the candidate's WPAF. Peer evaluation of instruction is not limited to departmental colleagues, of course; the candidate may request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on some aspect of instructional effectiveness. For example, one visitor may be well versed in classroom communication techniques, while another may focus on the content of the instructor's presentation. Classroom visitations can be initiated by the candidate or the University (see FPPP 8.1.1.e.).~~

10.0 EVALUATION OF TENURE TRACK (PROBATIONARY) FACULTY

10.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty – General

10.1.12 In an academic year or work year in which a *probationary* faculty unit employee is not subject to a *performance review for retention*, the *probationary*

faculty unit employee shall be subject to *periodic evaluation*. *Periodic evaluation* of *probationary* faculty shall include sequential evaluations by the *Department/Unit Personnel Committee*, the Department Chair, and the College Dean. *Department/Unit* Chairs may participate as members of the *Department/Unit Personnel Committee*. In such cases, the written evaluation shall be considered a *Department/Unit report*, and the *Department/Unit* Chair will not **submit a subsequent report that will** be considered a subsequent separate evaluation.

14.0 MISBEHAVIOR

14.1 Misbehavior – University Responses to Faculty Misbehavior

14.1.1 The University's responses to faculty misbehavior includes:

14.1.1.a Temporary Suspension (See CBA, Article 17)

14.1.1.b *Reprimands* (See CBA, Article 18)

14.2.1.c Disciplinary Actions (See CBA, Article 19)

14.2.2 **Unit 3 Employees may request representation by the CFA in accordance with the CBA including Articles 10, 17, 18, and 19.**

APPENDIX III

FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND ETHICAL STANDARDS

Responsibility: We hold ourselves to professional standards of conduct, accept appropriate responsibility for our behavior, and seek to manage conflicts of interest that could lead to exploitation or harm.

Integrity: We seek to promote accuracy, honesty, and truthfulness in teaching, scholarship, and all other practices of our profession.

Respect for People's Rights and Dignity: We strive to respect the dignity, **equality**, and worth of all people and the rights of individuals to privacy, confidentiality, and self-determination.

Stewardship: **We recognize the ecological unity and interdependence of all species and resolve to act ethically to sustain the long-term stability, viability, and aesthetic beauty of the natural world and all its resources in perpetuity.**

Guided by these principles, we establish the following standards for our conduct.

HARASSMENT

We must not engage in behavior that constitutes harassment. Harassment means oral, written or physical behavior or visual display that is abusive or is intended to persistently annoy others and which the instigator knows, or ought to know, creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive working, learning or living environment. A reprisal or threat made to the individual who has reported harassment is also a form of harassment. Additionally, knowingly making a false or mischievous allegation of harassment also constitutes harassment.

When we become aware of an incident of alleged harassment, we have an ethical responsibility to offer to the recipient of the alleged action both appropriate support and advice regarding correct avenues of possible redress.

(Please see current policies about Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation **as set forth in the California State University Interim CSU Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Exploitation, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, Stalking and Retaliation** in EM 15-012 ~~{pending meet and confer with the CFA} and EO 1096~~).

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The integrity of the faculty-student relationship is the foundation of the University's educational mission. This relationship vests considerable trust in the faculty member who, in turn, bears authority and accountability as mentor, advisor, educator and evaluator. The unequal institutional power inherent in this relationship heightens the vulnerability of the student and the potential for coercion.

A CSU Employee shall not enter into a sexual or romantic relationship with a Student or Employee over whom that employee exercises or influences direct or otherwise significant academic, administrative, supervisory, evaluative, counseling, or extracurricular authority. In the event such a relationship already exists, the Campus shall follow its established procedure to reassign such authority to avoid violations of this policy. ~~The professional relationship between faculty member and student must be protected from influences and activities that can interfere with discovery and learning consistent with the goals and ideals of the University.~~

~~Because romantic or sexual relationships between faculty member and student contradict these principles, we strongly discourage and avoid such relationships. Faculty-student personal relationships of any kind should not hinder the student's academic progress or create a situation in which a student is advantaged or disadvantaged on grounds other than academic performance. Faculty must avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest.~~

APPENDIX V

DEPARTMENT RTP STANDARDS

At a minimum, department RTP standards should:

1. Define Expectations, and indicate the performance necessary to earn the ratings “Meets Expectations”, “Does Not Meet Expectations”, and “Exceeds Expectations”, clearly stating the criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion to Associate and Full Professor, whether in text or table format.
2. Include criteria for early tenure and accelerated promotion (including the updated language in **FPPP 10.5**; accelerated promotion to full **FPPP 11.1.3**), as well as lecturer evaluation and 5-year review of tenured faculty.
3. State who is responsible for guiding candidates through the RTP process and when that will occur.
4. Include website links to current FPPP and CBA documents.
5. Recognize evidence of inclusive pedagogy, regardless of discipline, to meet the needs of CSU Chico’s diverse student body.
6. Recognize service that demonstrates evidence of contributions to historically underserved populations.
7. Require documentation of quality as well as quantity of service per **FPPP 8.1.3.e.4**:
“[o]ther materials that would help evaluators assess the candidate’s performance in Other Contributions [Service] to the University and Community should be included. When compiling these materials, the candidate should keep in mind that the reviewers will assess the quality as well as the quantity of activities; therefore, this section of the dossier should provide reviewers with the information necessary to make accurate judgments about such quality and quantity.”
8. Use inclusive language throughout (e.g., their and they instead of his/her, he/she).

Recommended Practices

Departments are encouraged to include equity-minded evaluation policies and practices. The

strongest RTP standards include enough detail to guide candidates under review and are concise and clearly written. Recommended practices for facilitating the success of all faculty throughout the RTP process, as well as those specifically related to workforce equity, diversity and inclusion goals include:

1. Table of Contents and page numbers.
2. Glossary of terms in text or as an appendix (e.g., FPPP, CBA, WPAF, periodic evaluation, performance review)
3. Current FPPP, CBA and RTP calendar website links.
4. The frequency of RTP department standards review.
5. Procedures for orienting candidates under review to the evaluation process and for dossier development (e.g., candidate meets individually or the point person provides a fall orientation for everyone in the department under review that year)
6. Correct nomenclature for offices and initiatives (e.g., Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) vs. Faculty Affairs, University Diversity Council priorities vs. Diversity Action Plan goals).
7. Current University Strategic Plan priorities (include as appendix or website link).
8. Review mission statement(s) and relationship to RTP standards.
9. Clearly articulate the expectation that faculty support the success of all of our diverse student population.
10. Address joint appointment evaluation policies and procedures, if applicable
11. Flexibility to add a member external to the department to the personnel committee
12. Template for dossier content as well as RTP curriculum vitae if different from discipline specific CV.
13. Template/rubric for peer class observation; online class observation procedures and Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) rubric; encourage the candidate to invite additional peer class observations.
14. Under evaluation of Instruction, expand beyond Chickering's 1987 Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education (e.g., use of AAC&U Equity-Minded

practices; LEAP criteria: essential learning outcomes, principles of excellence, high impact practices, authentic assessments, and students' signature work; Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics).

<https://www.aacu.org/publications/step-up-and-lead>

<https://www.aacu.org/leap>

<https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>

15. State that Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOT) data should not weigh heavily in evaluation of instruction per **FPPP 10.2.5.a**: *“[t]eaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, or promotion of teaching faculty. 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.”*
16. Recognize leadership/officer positions in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success (e.g., Black Faculty Staff Association, Chican@/Latin@ Council, 1st Gen and Proud Faculty and Staff Association, LGBTQ Faculty and Staff Association, Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association).
17. Recognize participation in and/or presenting at diversity, equity and inclusion professional development opportunities (e.g., Faculty Learning Community on Inclusive Pedagogy, Diversity Academy and/or Certificate Program, Safe Zone Ally Training).
18. Recognize extraordinary time advising and/or mentoring students.
19. Recognize contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, Basic Needs Initiative priorities, healing-centered campus priorities, etc.

APPENDIX VI RTP DEADLINE CALENDAR