Preamble

The (X, Y Z) Branches, presents this document to the University Appointment, Retention, and Promotion Committee in efforts to advance the culture required of the disciplines in the CoE. The following policies and procedures on Appointments, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (ARTP) are consistent with those of the University and serve to supplement rather than supplant these documents.

Performance Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Promotion and Tenure are regarded as the recognition of the accomplishments of a faculty member and an indicator of trust in the potential contributions that will be made during their academic life. The doctoral degree is required for promotion and award of tenure.

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Primary Committee

Composition: Branch Primary Committees shall be composed of three (3) tenured faculty from the candidate’s academic discipline with a rank higher than those under consideration for promotion. FERP faculty can participate as long as the review is conducted in a semester in which the FERP faculty is on campus. One member of the committee is a full-time, tenured faculty member. In cases where fewer than 3 faculty members within the Branch are eligible to participate, additional members from related disciplines in the College of Education will be elected. An alternate shall serve as a regular working member in all policies and procedure matters and be eligible to vote when replacing a regular member who is unable to attend or who recuses themselves for possible conflict. If there are no tenured disciplined based faculty, or if the majority of the Committee is faculty external to the Branch, then the Branch Chair shall serve as an ex officio member for the purpose of
discipline specific, peer, and Branch specific discussions, but will not have a vote on the Committee.

The Committee shall be elected by full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the Branch and serve for one academic year. The membership of the Committee shall elect a Chairperson. The Branch Chair, will when appropriate, conduct a review and submit an independent recommendation.

Committee Procedures: The Committee will review, discuss and act upon requests and documentation materials for faculty retention, tenure, and promotion. Confidentiality will be maintained throughout this process.

In cooperation with the Branch Chair, the Primary Committee will ensure that evaluation procedures and criteria are made available to the faculty members to be reviewed prior to commencement of performance review.

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is that portion of the Personnel Action File (PAF) used for periodic or performance review. Each candidate, in conjunction with the Branch Chair, has the responsibility of preparing a WPAF according to the format designated by the College of Education Dean. SOMEWHERE IN THIS DOCUMENT WE SHOULD ADDRESS FORMAT INCLUDING WHAT IS IN PAF – APPOINTMENT LETTER, ETC. AND WHAT IS IN WPAF AND THE ISSUE OF EACH SECTION INCLUDING A NARRATIVE PREPARED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER THAT ORIENTS THE READERS.

Written comments received from the primary Committee shall be placed in the WPAF and copies of the material and rationale for the recommendation given to the candidate at least (5) five days prior to such placement. The faculty member shall have the right to submit a rebuttal in writing, and/or request a meeting with the Primary Committee no later than seven (7) days following receipt of the Primary Committee recommendation. A copy of the candidate’s written rebuttal shall accompany the WPAF and be forwarded to the Secondary RTP Committee.

In order to be able to cast a vote, committee members and elected alternates must be present during all committee meetings and discussions and must have reviewed the candidate’s WPAF file. Abstentions will not be counted as a negative vote.

Comment [SG3]: How does this conform to UARTP policy as to role of the chair in RTP?? Each primary unit may choose one of the following alternatives to govern the role of the chair in connection with periodic evaluation of full-time temporary faculty and probationary faculty not subject to performance review:

1. The primary unit chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate evaluation.

OR

2. The primary unit chair shall not serve on nor meet with the primary committee but shall conduct an independent review and submit a separate evaluation.

Comment [SG4]: Does this refer to the primary committee’s letter?

Comment [SG5]: The candidate can request a meeting but the committee is not bound to do anything other than listen

Comment [SG6]: Alternates must be present for all meetings and reviews? Is this practical?

Comment [SG7]: So does this mean an abstention is a non-vote? In CHDV at the present time I believe we have the opposite policy so this might be a point to clarify with discussion
A simple majority vote of Committee members will be required for any action. All votes will be conducted by secret ballot.

Data Reviewed: All materials serving as a basis for evaluation and used by the Primary Committee for substantive deliberations will appear in the WPAF prepared by the candidate. Material will be reviewed according to the timelines specified in Section 4.09 of UARTP Policy. The Dean of the College of Education, as custodian of the PAF, will submit materials to the WPAF which include documented material from the department faculty and colleagues, results of standard student evaluations and written comments, and other signed written comments.

Criteria for Evaluation: The following criteria have been adopted by the Branches of the College of Education consistent with University policies and procedures for retention, tenure and promotion. It should be noted that Teaching Effectiveness is recognized as the primary and essential criterion as referenced by the requirement of “meets criteria” at all levels of review during the retention and tenure process.
COMPETENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE:
Branch/Program (?) averages of student summative evaluative scores must be included in the WPAF. Those evaluative scores must be the official standardized student evaluations, administered in either electronic or paper and pencil format. Evidence of teaching competence should include both judgmental and descriptive evidence to be demonstrated by the following criteria:

1. Development of course syllabi and other course materials to include course outline, objectives, reading list and references, teaching strategies, evaluation, grading procedures, lecture outlines, handouts, electronic mediums (e.g., power point presentations, videos, etc.) and examples of tests and quizzes.
2. Development of learning models, learning resource materials, and/or new teaching methods for students or clinical faculty.
3. Active participation in individual course and curriculum development and evaluation.
4. Formal recognition of teaching competence through reception of awards or citation from academic or professional units.
5. Participation in continuing education instruction or workshops.
6. Documentation of teaching effectiveness based on classroom observation by a tenured faculty from the candidates field of discipline during the first, second, and fifth probationary years. Additional reports consistent with the Primary Committee’s request for an individual to work on improving an area of teaching effectiveness in subsequent evaluations the following year may be required by the Primary Committee. “When classroom visits are utilized as part of the evaluation of a faculty unit employee under this Article, the individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es).” (M.O.U. 15.14) The written report of these observations will be included in the faculty members WPAF.
7. Demonstrate currency in area(s) of assigned teaching via research or professional development.
8. Results of student summative evaluations and written appraisal from students. Every faculty member is evaluated by summative student evaluation in all classes.
9. Program curriculum development and summative evaluation.
10. Direction and administration of students’ culminating experience (e.g. student teaching, master’s theses/projects, etc.) as part of their teaching assignment.

[Additional Criteria ?????? TBD by AD Hoc Cmte.]

In cases where a portion of the faculty’s assignment is covered by assigned time or release time, a description of the duties involved should be provided along with an explanation about how this work contributes to the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

Criteria for Competent Teaching Performance Ranking:

Does not meet criteria: Less than X of the Y criteria met or scores below a 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluation scores.

Minimally meets criteria: X of Y criteria met and score at or above a 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluation scores.

Meets criteria: Greater than X of Y criteria met and score above a 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluation scores.

Exceeds criteria/outstanding: X of Y criteria met with student summative evaluation scores in the top quartile of branch faculty scores and documentation by discipline specific peers of outstanding teaching performance.

Comment [SG9]: Why is this criterion different from what was used in the other categories? Why not use a numerical indicator here as well?
SCHOLARY AND/OR CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS
Evidence of an ongoing and sustained record of scholarly and/or creative activities should be demonstrated by the following:

1. Dissemination of research results in peer-reviewed publications or equivalent.
2. Participation in the writing and submission of funded grants research reports, and other associated documents (e.g., Human Subjects submissions, evaluation reports) or equivalent.
3. Author, of professional books, book chapters, creative works, or equivalent, or equivalent
4. Peer-reviewed or invited presentations at international, national, regional, state, and local meetings and conferences.

Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Ranking Criteria:

- Does not meet criteria: No scholarly product in two years.
- Minimally meets criteria: One scholarly product every two years.
- Meets criteria: On average, one scholarly product every year.
- Exceeds criteria/outstanding: On average, two scholarly products per year for the most recent two years with at least one of these four products published in, or fully accepted/in press, a peer-reviewed publication or equivalent. Candidate must be a lead author on at least one of the products published in a peer-reviewed publication.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTION
Evidence of University, College, and Branch/Program service should be demonstrated by the following criteria:

a. Active participation in University, College, or Branch/Program governance, committees or task forces.

b. Contributions to the University/College, or Branch/Program such as membership on committees, student advising, orientation, or recruitment.

c. Leadership roles in/for the University/College, or Branch/Program.

d. Development of accreditation (WASC, etc.) documents or University/College, or Branch/Program review documents.

Contributions to the Institution Ranking Criteria:

Does not meet criteria: No service.

Minimally meets criteria: Branch/Program service on one committee and University/College service on one committee.

Meets criteria: Branch/Program service on more than one committee with evidence of increasing levels of responsibility, which may include assuming a leadership position or taking the lead on a special project sponsored by the committee and service on one College or one University committee.

Exceeds criteria/outstanding: Branch/Program service plus one College and one University committee. Evidence of increasing levels of responsibility on the College or University committee(s), which may include assuming a leadership position or taking the lead on a special project sponsored by the committee.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY
Evidence of contributions to the community should be demonstrated by the following criteria:

1. Membership in national, regional, state, or local professional organizations or societies (e.g., American Educational Research Association, CA AERAera).
2. Offices or leadership roles held in professional organizations at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.
3. Participation on committees of professional organizations at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.
4. Participation on committees of societies, agencies, commissions, panels, or organizations at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.
5. Participation or leadership roles on regional, state, or local boards (e.g., United Way, PTA, school board).
6. Participation in the peer review process of grants, manuscripts, books and/or other publications.
7. Volunteer, pro bono, or paid consultant activities.
8. Community service activities specific to area(s) of expertise.
9. Awards or other forms of community service recognition.
10. Clinical services provided to the University/College, or Branch/Program.

Contributions to the Community Ranking Criteria:

Does not meet criteria: Less than two criteria met. Is not a member of a national or state professional organization.

Minimally meets criteria: Meets two of the ten nine criteria.

Meets criteria: Four of ten nine criteria met

Exceeds criteria/outstanding: Six of ten nine criteria met with a leadership position in a professional organization at the international, national, state or regional level.
RETENTION & PROMOTION

Retention Criteria: Tenure-Line Faculty

For first and second probationary year faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve “meets criteria” in Teaching Effectiveness and one of the three remaining evaluative areas (Scholarly and/or Creative Activities, Service to the University and Service to the Community). For third and fourth probationary year faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in the area of Teaching Effectiveness and two of the remaining three evaluative areas. For fifth year probationary faculty, to be retained the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are the same. To be tenured and promoted to Associate Professor, the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas and have one peer-reviewed article on which the candidate is lead author published in a professional publication during their probation period.

Promotion Criteria: Full Professor

To be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must achieve a ranking of “meets criteria” in Teaching Effectiveness and “exceeds criteria/outstanding” in the area of Scholarly and Creative Achievements and one other evaluative area. The peer-reviewed publication on which the candidate is lead author cannot be the same article used to satisfy the Scholarly and/or Creative Activities for tenure. The two remaining evaluative areas must be ranked at the “meets criteria” level.

Early Tenure and Early Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor

The criteria for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor are the same. To receive early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “exceeds criteria/outstanding” for
the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly and Creative Achievements, and either Contributions to the University, or Contributions to the Community. The area in which the faculty member does not achieve the “exceeds criteria/outstanding” ranking must be ranked at the “meets criteria” level for early tenure and promotion to be achieved.

**Early Promotion Criteria: Full Professor**

To achieve early promotion to Full Professor, the faculty member must achieve a ranking of “exceeds criteria/outstanding” for all four evaluative areas.