Policies and Procedures on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

The following policies and procedures are designed to guide the evaluation practices for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of tenure track faculty in the College of Education and as such, shall apply equally to retention, tenure and promotion reviews conducted by Branch-level Primary RTP Committees as well as those conducted by the College level Secondary RTP Committee. These policies are intended to be consistent with those of the University ARTP policy and serve to supplement rather than supplant that document.

Election of Primary and Secondary Evaluation Committees

The Primary and Secondary Evaluation Committees of the College of Education are elected to perform certain specific tasks related to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Decisions relative to those items are to be made in terms of the regulations outlined in the University ARTP Policy, the criteria, policies, and procedures approved by the faculty of the College of Education, and the MOU. The Primary level or Secondary level evaluation committees shall be constituted in accordance with established College procedure and consistent with University policy and the Faculty Unit 3 Agreement (MOU).

Election of Primary Evaluation Committees

When possible, Primary RTP Committees shall be composed of at least three (3) tenured faculty from the candidate’s academic program or Branch with a rank higher than that of the candidates under review (UARTP 9.08.N). FERP faculty may participate on Primary RTP Committees as long as the review is conducted in a semester in which the FERP faculty is on campus active employment. At least one member of the committee shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member. In cases where fewer than three (3) faculty members within an discipline academic program or Branch are eligible to participate, additional members from related disciplines academic programs or other Branches in the College may be elected.

Normally, the Branch Chair shall serve as a voting member of each Primary RTP Committee within the Branch. If the Branch Chair does not serve on or meet with the Primary RTP Committees, he/she will conduct a separate review and submit an independent recommendation.

In addition, each Primary Committee shall include at least one alternate member. In the event that an alternate member must replace an elected member, the alternate shall serve as a regular working member in all policies and procedural matters and be eligible to vote when replacing a regular member who is unable to attend or who recuses themselves for possible conflict.

Comment [SB1]: This cannot be an either/or statement. We must decide now if the Chair is going to serve on the Primary RTP Committee as the 4th member OR do an independent review. This process must hold for ALL candidates.
Primary RTP Committees shall be elected by full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the Branch and serve for one academic year. Such elections shall be conducted by each branch. Election of Primary RTP members shall be conducted by the Branch Chair’s Office during the spring semester. Primary committee members shall be elected to specified open seats by secret ballot of the faculty. Those individuals elected shall be elected by a majority of the faculty members voting.

The membership of the Primary RTP Committee shall elect a Chairperson. The Chair shall convene the committee meetings, prepare official minutes and written communications as needed and obtain from the Dean’s office the WPAF files to be considered for review. In addition, the Chair, Dean or Dean’s designee shall keep the official Committee records such as minutes, agendas, ballots and recommendations.

Peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. (UARTP 9.08.N) Faculty unit employees being considered for retention, tenure or promotion are ineligible for service on Primary branch or Secondary review committee(s). (UARTP 9.08.N) Faculty members with close relatives being considered for promotion or tenure are also ineligible for peer review committee(s). (UARTP 9.08.N)

Election of Secondary Evaluation Committee

The Secondary Evaluation Committee (SEC) shall be composed of eight (8) tenured faculty, two from each of the three Branches and two members elected at large. The Secondary RTP members must be at a rank higher than that of the candidates under review. FERP faculty may participate on the Secondary RTP Committee as long as the review is conducted in a semester in which the FERP faculty is on active employment. In addition, the Secondary Committee shall include at least one alternate member from each branch. In the event that an alternate member must replace an elected member, the alternate shall serve as a regular working member in all policies and procedural matters and be eligible to vote when replacing a regular member who is unable to attend or who recuses themselves for possible conflict.

The members of the Secondary RTP Committee shall serve for two years. Branch representatives and alternates of the Secondary Committee shall be elected by the full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the Branch. The at large members of the Secondary Committee shall be elected by the full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the College and also serve for one academic year. Election of Secondary RTP members shall be conducted by the Dean’s Office during the spring semester. All voting shall be by secret ballot of the faculty. Those individuals elected shall be elected by a majority of the faculty members voting.

The membership of the Secondary RTP Committee shall elect a Chair. The Chair shall convene the committee meetings, prepare official minutes and written communications as needed and obtain from the Dean’s office the WPAF files to be considered for review. In addition, the
Chair, Dean or Dean’s designee shall keep the official Committee records such as minutes, agendas, ballots and recommendations.

Members of the Secondary Evaluation Committee are not eligible to participate in branch-level RTP deliberations. Peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion. (UARTP 9.08.N) Faculty unit employees being considered for retention, tenure or promotion are ineligible for service on branch Branch or Secondary promotion or tenure peer review committee(s). (UARTP 9.08.N) Faculty members with close relatives being considered for promotion or tenure are ineligible for peer review committee(s). (UARTP 9.08.N) Department Branch chairs shall not serve on the SEC.

Duties and Responsibilities of Primary and Secondary Committees

Duties of Primary Evaluation Committees

Primary Evaluation Committees serve the following major functions:

a. Conduct a substantive review of each candidate’s Working Personnel Action File submitted relative to retention, tenure and/or promotion. If there are omissions of documentation, information or recommendation in the materials submitted for review, the materials may be returned for amplification. Such amplification shall be provided in a timely manner. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations require the participation of all elected Committee members or duly elected alternates.

b. Provide recommendations on matters of retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on evidence in the candidate’s Working Personnel Action File.

c. Ensure that each Primary level evaluation and recommendation is the result of the proper application of approved Department Branch, College and University criteria, policies and procedures.

The Primary Evaluation Committee shall not be involved in the following RTP matters:

a. Appointments of faculty members or administrators.

b. Reviews and/or recommendations of faculty on joint appointments with departments outside the College of Education when the primary unit of affiliation is outside the College of Education.

Duties of the Secondary Evaluation Committee
After the election of the SEC, the Dean or Associate Dean shall convene the Committee for purposes of electing a chair and to conduct a review of its policies and procedures relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

The duties of the SEC chair are to:

a. Convene the Committee and chair its meetings.

b. Prepare for SEC approval official minutes of SEC actions as well as any other written communications with administrators, COE branches, or other University committees and/or faculty. Only the chair shall be required to signify by personal signature that communications are true records of the SEC. The chair does not speak for the Committee; the Committee speaks for itself.

c. Obtain from the Dean’s office the Working Personnel Action files for candidates to be considered for retention/tenure/promotion and return said files to the Dean’s office immediately after the Committee has completed its actions.

d. Keep the official records of SEC minutes, agenda, ballots, and recommendations

The Secondary Evaluation Committee serves the following major functions:

a. Conduct a substantive review of each recommendation submitted by each Primary Evaluation Committee relative to retention, tenure and/or promotion and determines whether the evidence supports the department recommendation. The SEC normally concurs with the department recommendation. If there are omissions of documentation, information or recommendation in the materials submitted for review, the materials may be returned for amplification. Such amplification shall be provided in a timely manner. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations require the participation of all elected Committee members or duly elected alternates.

b. Provides recommendations on matters of retention, tenure, and/or promotion based on evidence in the candidate’s Working Personnel Action File.

c. Ensures that each Secondary level evaluation and recommendation is the result of the proper application of approved department Branch, College and University criteria, policies and procedures.

d. Ensures that the materials for evaluation submitted by the faculty unit employee shall be available for review by the President. The written evaluation recommendations and relevant documentation form each level of review shall be forwarded to the President.

Any response(s) or rebuttal statement(s) of the faculty unit employee submitted pursuant to this provision shall also be forwarded to the President. The President shall consider all materials, recommendations, rebuttal statements and responses submitted. (UARTP 9.01 AA)
The Secondary Evaluation Committee shall not be involved in the following RTP matters:

- Appointments of faculty members or administrators.
- Reviews and/or recommendations of part-time temporary faculty.
- Reviews and/or recommendations of faculty on joint appointments with departments outside the College of Education when the primary unit of affiliation is outside the College of Education.

Eligibility for Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion Review

Retention, 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 all decisions of promotion and award of tenure in the College of Education.

Retention

Probationary faculty with an initial two-year appointment are subject to an annual evaluation during the second semester of their first year of appointment. This evaluation shall be completed before the beginning of the last week of instruction during the spring semester.

Probationary faculty in their 2nd through 5th years of review are subject to a periodic evaluation following the procedures outlined in this document the following sections.

Promotion and Tenure

A probationary faculty employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. (UARTP 8.01.C) Probationary faculty employees shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate. (UARTP 8.01.C)

A probationary faculty employee shall normally be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate rank at the time he/she is considered for tenure. This would normally occur in the 6th year of probationary service.

A tenured faculty employee at the rank of Associate shall normally be considered for promotion to Full Professor rank in the 6th year of service commencing in the year of the last performance review. This provision shall not apply if a faculty unit employee requests in writing that he/she not be considered. (UARTP 8.01.D)

Early Promotion and Tenure
Probationary faculty may elect to undergo review for early promotion and/or tenure. Normally such review should not take place any earlier than the 5th year of probationary service at any time prior to the regular cycle.

Tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor may elect to undergo review for early promotion to Full Professor. Normally such review should not take place any earlier than the 5th year of service since the last performance review at any time prior to the regular cycle.

Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion 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. These considerations shall be used by primary level (branch) and secondary level (College) RTP committees in determining which candidates shall be recommended for retention, tenure and/or promotion.

Retention

Faculty in their initial service year undergo a periodic evaluation in the spring semester of the first service year and are not subject to performance evaluation.

Second and third year probationary faculty must obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” in the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as in one of the three remaining evaluative areas (Scholarly and/or Creative Activities, Service to the Institution and Service to the Community).

Third and fourth year probationary faculty must obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” in the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as in two of the remaining three evaluative areas.

Fifth year probationary faculty must obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” in the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as in two of the remaining three evaluative areas, and a minimum rating of “minimally meets criteria” in the third remaining evaluative area.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor

The evaluative areas and criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for retention. To be tenured and promoted to Associate Professor, candidates must obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas.

Promotion Criteria: Full Professor
The evaluative areas and criteria for tenure and promotion to Full Professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor, e.g., candidates must obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” in all four evaluative areas. The peer-reviewed publication used to satisfy “meets criteria” in the Scholarly and/or Creative Activities for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor cannot be the same publication used to “meet criteria” for promotion to Full Professor.

**Early Tenure and Early Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor**

The evaluative areas and criteria for early tenure and early promotion to Associate Professor are the same. To receive early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must obtain a rating of “exceeds criteria outstanding” for the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as a rating of “exceeds criteria outstanding” for at least two of the other three evaluative areas (Scholarly and Creative Achievements, Contributions to the University, or Contributions to the Community). The candidate must also receive a minimum rating of “meets criteria” for the remaining fourth evaluative area.

**Early Promotion Criteria: Full Professor**

The evaluative areas and criteria for early promotion to Full Professor are the same. To receive early promotion to Full Professor, candidates must obtain a rating of “exceeds criteria outstanding” for the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as a rating of “exceeds criteria outstanding” for two of the other three evaluative areas (Scholarly and Creative Achievements, Contributions to the University, or Contributions to the Community). The candidate must also obtain a minimum rating of “meets criteria” for the fourth remaining evaluative area.

**Weights for Criteria:**

The criterion weights for retention, tenure and/or promotion procedures are:

- Competent Teaching Performances – 55%
- Contributions to the Institution – 15%
- Scholarly or Creative Achievement – 15%
- Contributions to the Community – 15%

**Competent Teaching Performance**

*The candidate’s level of competent teaching performance shall be based on evidence included in the PAF and WPAF files.*

Besides the evidence related to the categories listed below, the WPAF file should also include the following information related to the faculty employee’s teaching performance:
a. Branch averages of student summative evaluative scores must be included in the WPAF.

b. Those summative scores must be drawn from the numerical scores on official standardized student evaluations administered in either electronic or paper and pencil format.

c. The file must include a statement describing the nature of the faculty member’s teaching assignment, including such factors as the number of course preparations, frequency of teaching the same preparation, whether courses are undergraduate or graduate, lower or upper division, whether a course is required or elective, class size, and any other relevant features of the assignment.

d. 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.

Evidence of teaching competence should include both judgmental and descriptive evidence. Candidates must submit evidence related to categories 1-3 and category 4 1-4 as required below. Evidence in categories 5-11 shall be included as appropriate to the candidate’s assignment and year of review.

1. Narrative statement summarizing the candidate’s educational/pedagogical philosophy, teaching assignment and reflecting on the candidate’s teaching performance during the period of review.

2. 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.

3. Quantitative results of student evaluations and written appraisal from student evaluations. Every faculty member is evaluated by summative student evaluation in all classes each semester.

4. Documentation of teaching effectiveness based on mandatory classroom observation by a tenured faculty from the candidates field of discipline during the first, second, and fifth probationary years. Candidates not in the first, second, or fifth probationary year may voluntarily request a classroom observation by a tenured faculty member and include the record of observation in their WPAF file. Primary Evaluation Committees may request additional classroom observation reports based on the Committee’s evaluation that a faculty employee may need to work on improving in an area of teaching effectiveness. For all classroom visits and observations, the faculty employee 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 observed or evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es). The written report of these observations will be included in the faculty member’s WPAF.
5. Direction and administration of students’ culminating experience (e.g. student teaching, master’s theses/projects, etc.) as part of their teaching assignment.

6. Documentation of participation in individual course and curriculum development and evaluation.

7. Development of learning models, learning resource materials, and/or new teaching methods for students or clinical faculty.

8. Program curriculum development and summative evaluation.

9. Participation in continuing education instruction, workshops, or trainings.

10. Formal recognition of teaching competence through reception of awards or citation from academic or professional units.

11. Submission by professional colleagues, both on and off campus, such as letters of evaluation and recommendations regarding teaching performance, reports of guest presentations, and lectures, etc.

Competent Teaching Performance Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Not Meet Criteria</th>
<th>Inadequate evidence in all four (4) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate OR Average Teaching scores below 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria Minimally</td>
<td>Evidence in all four (4) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate AND Average Teaching scores at or above 3.0 on overall student summative evaluations²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria</td>
<td>Evidence in all four (4) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate AND Evidence in 3 of the 6 other categories of the candidate’s individual teaching activities and performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The faculty under review may include an explanatory statement as to why average scores are below 3.0 that the committee can consider to exempt the faculty from the criterion.
| Exceeds Criteria Outstanding | Evidence in all four (4) required categories of teaching performance as applicable to the candidate AND Evidence in 4 of the 6 other categories of the candidate’s individual teaching activities and performance AND Average Teaching scores of 3.5 or above on overall student summative evaluations |

**Contributions to the Institution**

Evidence of CSU, University, College, Branch, Program or other service should be demonstrated by the following criteria. Such evidence shall be required for categories 1 and 2. Evidence in categories 3 through 9 shall be provided as appropriate to the individual candidate’s service activity.

1. Active participation in Branch or Program level governance, committees, or task forces.

2. Active participation in CSU, University or College level governance, committees, or task forces.

3. Active participation in CSU, University, College, or Branch Program level orientation, or recruitment.

4. Service in roles of leadership or substantial responsibility in CSU, University, College, or Branch Program levels in committees or governance.

5. Development of accreditation and assessment (WASC, etc.) documents or CSU, University, College, or Branch Program review documents.
6. Advising of student organizations in the University, College or Branch/Program academic program.

7. Service as an official representative of the CSU, University, College, or Branch/Program academic program in the community.

8. Student advising when this activity extends beyond that of the normal program advising expected of all faculty. Candidates should explain the nature of this activity and provide evidence illustrative of student advising activities.

9. Evidence of collaboration with and supervision of students on research and pedagogy projects as well as supervising independent study.

Contributions to the Institution Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Not Meet Criteria</th>
<th>No evidence of service at any institutional level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria, Minimally</td>
<td>Evidence of participation in service within one (1) Branch or Program academic program as described in category 1 AND Evidence of participation in service within the COE, university or CSU as described in category 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria</td>
<td>Evidence of service on 1 or more Branch or Program academic program committees as described in category 1 AND Evidence of service on 1 or more College, University, or CSU committees as described in category 2 AND Evidence of substantial participation or developing leadership or responsibility in at least one category of service activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Criteria</td>
<td>Evidence of service on 1 or more Branch or Program committees as described in category 1 AND Evidence of service on 1 or more CSU, university or College committees as described in category 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of service activity in at least one of the remaining categories 3-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of substantial responsibility or leadership in at least one category of service activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly or Creative Achievements

Scholarly achievements shall be defined as research and/or creative activities, including instructionally related, discipline-based, applied, action and/or evaluation research. Evidence of an ongoing and sustained record of scholarly and/or creative activities should be demonstrated by the following categories. Such evidence shall be required for at least category 1 or 2. Evidence in categories 3 through 11 shall be provided as appropriate to the individual candidate’s service activity.

1. Dissemination of scholarly/creative work, either accepted, in press or published, in a peer-reviewed or peer edited professional book/text, book chapter, article or other peer-reviewed professional publication, in either online or print venues.

2. Evidence of an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress.

3. Participation in the writing and submission of grant proposals and reports, research reports, and other associated documents, evaluation reports, or equivalent.

4. Authorship of other creative works, e.g., on-line sites, blogging, vlogging, or newsprint, pertaining to the candidate’s scholarship and creative activities.

5. Written reports or equivalent for professional organizations or associations.

6. Peer-reviewed or invited submissions or presentations at international, national, regional, state, and local meetings and conferences.

7. Evidence of scholarship or creative activity in the development and/or application of technology.

8. Presentation of professional lectures pertaining to the faculty employee’s scholarship and creative activities.

9. Creative activity culminating in innovative programs, service learning projects, or policy proposals, programs or materials pertaining to issues of public concern.
10. The products of consulting, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise.

11. Participation as a reviewer or editor for grants, proposals, manuscripts, books and/or other publications.

**Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Ranking Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Level</th>
<th>Probationary Year 2</th>
<th>Probationary Years 3-5</th>
<th>Promotion and Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does Not Meet Criteria</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category</td>
<td>No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category</td>
<td>No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets Criteria, Minimally</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 2</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 2 AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
<td>One (1) scholarly/creative product published, accepted, or in-press in a peer-reviewed or peer edited journal, book, book chapter, or other peer-reviewed professional publication venue, either online or in print, during the review period (candidate must be 2nd, 3rd or 4th author) AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Criteria</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
<td>One (1) scholarly/creative product published, accepted, or in-press in a peer-reviewed or peer edited journal, book, book chapter, or other peer-reviewed professional publication venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First authorship of one (1) scholarly/creative product published, accepted, or in-press in a peer-reviewed or peer edited journal, book, book chapter, or other peer-reviewed professional publication venue, either online or in print during the review period AND Evidence in at least one other category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contributions to the Community**

Evidence of contributions to the community should be demonstrated by the following criteria. Candidates are required to submit evidence related to category 1. Evidence in categories 2-10 shall be included as appropriate to the individual candidate’s community activities.

1. Membership in national, regional, state, or local professional organizations or societies (e.g., American Educational Research Association, Deafhood Foundation).
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 or leadership roles on foundations, committees of societies, agencies, commissions, organizations, panels, or boards, at the international, national, regional, state, or local level.
5. Participation in the development process for grants, proposals, manuscripts, books and/or other publications.
6. Volunteer, pro bono, or paid presentations, consultant trainings/activities.
7. Community service activities specific to the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise.
8. Awards or other forms of community service recognition.
9. Participation in mass/social media (TV, press, radio, internet, blogs, vlogs, etc.) activities.
10. Clinical services provided to the community.
## Contributions to the Community Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Not Meet Criteria</th>
<th>Evidence of community involvement in zero to one (0-1) of the ten (10) categories AND Membership in zero to one (0-1) professional organizations at the international, national, regional, or state level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria, Minimally</td>
<td>Evidence of community involvement in two (2) or more of the ten (10) categories AND Membership in two (2) or more professional organizations at the international, national, regional, or state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria</td>
<td>Evidence of community involvement in three (3) or more (3) of the ten (10) categories AND Membership in two (2) or more professional organizations at the international, national, regional, or state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Criteria Outstanding</td>
<td>Evidence of community involvement in four (4) or more (4) of the ten (10) categories AND Evidence of substantial responsibility or leadership in a professional organization at the international, national, regional, or state level, or with foundations, committees of societies, agencies, commissions, organizations, panels, or boards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Files for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

**Personnel Action Files**

*The definition for the Personnel Action File can be found in the UARTP document.*

*The Personnel Action File is the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a*
faculty employee. For each faculty unit employee, the President shall designate an office in which the Personnel Action File shall be maintained and shall designate a custodian for the Personnel Action File.

An official Personnel Action File (PAF) shall be created for each faculty member at the time of initial appointment. The PAF files are held in the custody of the College of Education Dean’s Office.

The PAF contains the following materials which are submitted by the custodian of the file:
   a. Access log
   b. Appointment letter and other relevant appointment information
   c. Results of standardized student evaluations
   d. Written student comments and summaries of oral student comments, if any
   e. Submissions by professional colleagues both on and off campus such as letters of evaluation and recommendation regarding teaching performance, acknowledgment of teaching awards or honors, results of class visitations, opinions, and/or evaluation by peers
   f. Peer evaluations, if any
   g. All evaluations, recommendations, rebuttals, responses and decisions for each level of review for past review cycles

The PAF file contains the following materials submitted by the faculty member:
   a. Current resume/curriculum vitae
   b. Annual report of activities prepared according to the guidelines below
   c. Index to materials submitted

A faculty unit employee shall have the right to submit additional material to his/her Personnel Action File at any time prior to the closing date for the file review after which time a request must be made to the University Peer Review Committee. (UARPT 4.03.A)

Access to a faculty employee's PAF shall be limited only to persons with official business. The custodian shall log all instances of access to a PAF, other than routine recordkeeping. Such a log record shall be a part of the PAF.

A faculty employee may request an appointment for the purpose of inspecting his/her PAF. The manner of inspection shall be subject to reasonable conditions. The faculty employee shall have the right to have another person of the employee's choosing accompany him/her to inspect the PAF.

Any material identified by source may be placed in the Personnel Action File. Identification shall indicate the author, the committee, the campus office, or the name of the officially authorized body generating the materials. (UARPT 4.03.A) The custodian shall decide which materials submitted by persons other than the faculty unit employee will be accepted for placement in the file.
The faculty unit employee shall be provided written notice along with a copy of any materials to be placed in the Personnel Action File at least five (5) days prior to such placement. This provision shall not apply to materials referenced in the Temporary Suspension or Disciplinary Action Procedure Articles of the MOU. (UARTP 4.03.C)

A faculty member may request to meet with the custodian regarding material to be placed in the file. Such a meeting shall take place within ten (10) days of the request. Following this meeting, the custodian shall determine whether the material in question shall be placed in the file.

Should the custodian decide to place the material in the file, the faculty member may file a rebuttal or appeal. This provision shall not apply to material in the file related to evaluations or disciplinary actions. If a faculty employee believes any portion of the file is not accurate, he/she may make a written request to the custodian for a correction or deletion of the material.

Inclusion of Student Evaluations in Personnel Action Files

The College of Education has adopted a standardized, college-approved procedure for obtaining student evaluations. Branches within the College of Education must adhere to those procedures which must include, as a minimum, student evaluation of instructor’s performance in providing for student achievement of objectives. All of these procedures shall be subject to the approval of the Branch Primary RTP committees.

Written questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. Student evaluations shall be conducted in all classes taught by probationary and tenured faculty every semester. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee’s Personnel Action File.

Access to Personnel Action Files

A faculty employee shall have the right of access to all materials in his/her Personnel Action File, exclusive of pre-employment materials. (UARTP 4.05.A) A faculty employee shall have access to pre-employment materials in instances when such materials are used in personnel actions.

A faculty unit employee may request and appointment(s) for the purpose of inspecting his/her Personnel Action File. Such appointment(s) shall be scheduled promptly during normal business hours. The manner of inspection shall be subject to reasonable conditions. The faculty unit employee shall have the right to have another person of the employee’s choosing accompany him/her to inspect the Personnel Action File. (UARTP 4.05.B)

Following receipt of a faculty unit employee’s written request, the appropriate administrator shall, within fourteen (14) days of the request, provide a copy of all requested materials. The
faculty unit employee may be required to bear the cost of duplicating such materials. (UARTP 4.05.C)

If after examination of the Personnel Action File, the faculty unit employee believes that any portion of the file is not accurate, he/she may request in writing a correction of the materials or a deletion of a portion of the materials, or both. Such a request shall be addressed to the custodian of the file, with copies to the appropriate faculty committee, if a faculty committee and the appropriate administrator generated such materials. The request shall include a written statement by the faculty unit employee as to the corrections and/or deletion that he/she believes should be made, and the facts and reasons supporting such request. Such request shall become part of the Personnel Action File, except in those instances in which the disputed materials has been removed from the file. On this campus, “accurate” includes “relevant,” “timely,” and “complete.” (UARPT 4.05.D)

If the request is denied by the custodian of the file, not later than seven (7) days after the date of such a denial, the faculty unit employee shall have a right to submit the request to the President. Within twenty-one (21) days of such request to the President, the President shall provide to the faculty unit employee a written response. If the President grants the request, the record shall be corrected or the deletions made, and the faculty unit employee shall be sent a written statement to that effect. If the President denies the request, the response shall include the reason(s) for denial. (UARPT 4.05.E)

Any materials identified by sources may be placed in the Personnel Action File. Identification shall indicate the author, the committee, the campus office, or the name of the officially authorized body generating the materials. (UARTP 4.030B)

**Working Personnel Action Files**

The Working Personnel Action File is that portion of the Personnel Action File used during the time of periodic evaluation or performance review of a faculty unit employee. (UARTP 4.02.B) 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. The Working Personnel Action Files described below should be organized in either a loose-leaf or a clasp binder and sectioned by titled tabs.

During the time of periodic evaluation and performance review, the Working Personnel Action File must be submitted by the deadlines established by the University and the College.

The WPAF shall contain:

a. All PAF materials submitted by the file custodian as described above.
b. All PAF materials submitted by the faculty member as described above.
c. Additional documents and information provided by faculty employees, students, and academic administrators as per procedures described above.
d. Additional supporting material submitted by the faculty member, including materials related to the categories for evaluation as described below.

e. A clear statement of the faculty member’s workload assignment for each semester throughout the review period.

f. All faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and any rebuttal statements submitted.

g. Other materials as required by department or College policy.

h. Any other materials considered by the applicant to be pertinent.

Prior to the deadline for submission of WPAF files for review, faculty members shall be responsible for identifying and submitting materials in the WPAF file. Evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying and providing materials relating to the evaluation not provided by the employee.

Individual items of evidence submitted by a faculty employee shall be included in only one of the four categories for evaluation. In cases where there might be confusion about the category for placement of evidence, it is the responsibility of the faculty employee to provide an explanation for the inclusion of an item of evidence within a particular category. For each of the four categories, the faculty member shall also provide a reflective statement.

Supporting materials included in the file by a faculty employee shall be listed and referenced on the index of activities/materials. This index shall be permanently placed in the PAF and updated to reflect any material added to or deleted from the file during the course of the evaluation cycle. By choice of the faculty employee, supporting materials may be listed on the index but not physically present in the file. Such materials are considered to be included by reference on the index, and are to be considered part of the WPAF for any evaluation actions. A faculty member shall make these materials available to evaluation committees upon their request.

The following areas, described in the Criteria for Evaluation above, shall be referenced in a manner that will direct readers to the exact location in which supporting data for these areas may be reviewed:

b. Contributions to the institution.
c. Scholarly or creative achievement.
d. Contributions to the community.

All audio taped materials shall be reduced to writing by the person who requests placement of them into the file and shall be signed by the person providing the information.

Materials in the WPAF file to be used in evaluations shall be limited to those developed during the following periods:

a. Retention through Tenure: Materials submitted/received since date of initial appointment to probationary status through the date of file closure for each retention evaluation.
b. First Promotion and/or Tenure: Materials submitted/received since date of initial appointment to probationary status through the date of file closure for promotion review.

c. Subsequent Promotions: Material submitted/received since dates the files closed immediately prior to the evaluation which resulted in the last promotion.

d. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty: Materials submitted/received during previous five years.

During the time of periodic evaluation and performance review of a faculty unit employee, the Working Personnel Action File, which includes all information, materials, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, shall be incorporated by reference into the Personnel Action File. (UARTP 4.03.G)

Materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty unit employee shall be deemed incorporated by reference in the Personnel Action File, but need not be physically placed in the file. An index of such materials shall be prepared by the faculty unit employee and submitted with the materials. Such an index shall be permanently placed in the Personnel Action File. Materials incorporated by reference in this manner shall be considered part of the Personnel Action File for the action set forth in the MOU. Indexed materials may be returned to the faculty unit employee. (UARTP 4.03H)

Faculty members are encouraged to maintain and retain a duplicate copy of materials in their Personnel Action File and keep and index of all materials by date, and/or other mode of identification.

Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Periodic Review of Probationary Faculty in Initial Year of Service

The evaluation of probationary faculty employees on a two year initial contract shall be conducted by the relevant branch and discipline based primary RTP committee and by the College of Education Dean, using the same procedures set forth in this document. A written record of the periodic evaluation shall be placed in the probationary faculty employee’s Personnel Action File and a copy of same shall be provided to the employee.

General Procedures

Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, promotion, termination, or any other personnel action shall be based primarily on material contained in the Working Personnel Action File. If a personnel recommendation or decision is based on reasons not contained in the Working Personnel Action File, the party making the recommendation or decision shall commit those reasons to writing and this signed written statement shall be placed in the Working Personnel Action File and provided to the faculty unit employee.
Consideration is limited to that which is relevant to the established criteria set forth in this document. Decisions shall be based solely upon the candidate’s ability, qualifications, experience and fitness for the position as supported by information in the candidate’s personnel file without regard to race, handicap, age, sex or sexual orientation. Experience before hire shall not be given special consideration, except in consideration of early tenure.

Evidence is limited to that which was available to the Primary and Secondary Committees when they considered the file. If after the deadline for submission of the Working Personnel Action File the faculty member under review requests to insert additional material into the Working Personnel Action File, the faculty member must have approval of the University Peer Review Committee and is limited to items that became available after the closing date. Upon approval, the faculty member shall insert the materials in a timely manner new and substantive information is received which might alter the committee recommendations, and the file and evidence are referred back to the Primary Committee for consideration.

In the evaluation of academic personnel assigned to administrative duties, careful consideration shall be given to the quality of performance in the assigned responsibilities. Strong additional emphasis will be given to the individual’s contributions to the University. Such individuals must show evidence of teaching competence through previous teaching experience. In no case will the reduced amount of teaching load for academic-administrative personnel be interpreted or evaluated to the disadvantage of the individual. Persons on reassignment shall be considered as if they were full-time, regular on-campus faculty for purposes of RTP procedures and other actions.

Faculty members on leave who are candidates for retention, tenure, and/or promotion shall be considered as carefully as if they were not on leave. They must ensure that their Working Personnel Action Files are up-to-date and should inform their department chair or Branch Chairs of their current and projected activities which might have a bearing on retention, tenure and/or promotion.

At all levels of review, in periodic evaluation or Performance Review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the faculty employee shall be given a copy of the recommendation which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation. The faculty unit employee shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing no later than seven (7) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the Working Personnel Action File and also be sent to any previous levels of review. (UARTP 9.01.X)

Upon request, the faculty unit employee may be provided an opportunity to discuss the recommendation with either the Primary or Secondary Committee. This provision shall not require that the timelines be altered.

Review by Primary Evaluation Committee
The Primary Committees within each branch 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 Chairs, the Primary Committees will ensure that evaluation procedures and criteria are made available to all faculty members, including those faculty members to be reviewed, prior to commencement of performance review and no later than 14 days after the beginning of the academic term.

All substantive evaluations and final recommendations shall require the participation of all elected committee members or duly elected alternates. Participation shall include reviewing the Working Personnel Action File of each candidate whose performance will be evaluated by the primary and secondary committee and attending each and every meeting of the committee at which substantive deliberation takes place or final recommendations are made, or both. The candidate’s effectiveness in meeting the criterion requirements as evidenced by his/her file shall be the basis for these decisions.

Students may, with the concurrence of the Primary Committee and the Branch chair, be provided an opportunity to consult with the Primary review committee. (UARPT 5.05.E.2.c) Oral student testimony before a primary RTP Committee may be summarized by the primary committee and signed by the primary committee chair.

After discussion of the merits of each candidate’s record, each eligible member of the primary level RTP committee shall vote to grant or deny retention and/or tenure. In order to be able to cast a vote, committee members must be present during all committee meetings and discussions and must have reviewed the candidate’s WPAF file. A simple majority vote of Committee members will be required for any action. All votes will be conducted by secret ballot. Abstentions will not be counted as a negative vote. Each eligible member of the Committee shall also vote either yes or no as to whether the required procedures for review were followed.

The Primary Committee shall retain all written ballots for a minimum period of three years. Ballots must be identified and given into the custody of the Dean of the COE as the official custodian of the PAF files. Faculty members may request access to ballots cast in any evaluation at any time during the three (3) year period following an evaluation.

Each primary level RTP committee shall inform each candidate, in writing, of the committee’s evaluation of the candidate performance and their recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion within 7 days of the date they, the evaluation and recommendations are made. The Primary Committee’s recommendation letter shall be placed in the WPAF file and a copy given to the review candidates. The faculty member shall sign the file copy of this document indicating that it has been received and read. In the event of an adverse decision, the primary level RTP committee shall explain in writing the reasons for not recommending retention, tenure, and/or promotion.
A candidate may request a hearing with the Primary level RTP committee prior to the submission of the Primary committee’s recommendation to the Secondary Evaluation Committee. Such request must be submitted in writing to the chairperson signing the statement within 10 days of the date of receipt of the committee’s recommendation.

The faculty member shall have the right to submit a rebuttal in writing no later than ten (10) days following receipt of the Primary Committee recommendation. Upon receipt of such a request, the primary level RTP committee will schedule a meeting with the candidate to be held in no more than 10 working days. A copy of the candidate’s written rebuttal shall be included in the WPAF and be forwarded to the Secondary RTP Committee for consideration.

Review by Secondary Evaluation Committee

The general processes for review by the Secondary Committee shall be the same as indicated above for the Primary Committees.

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

All substantive evaluations and final recommendations shall require the participation of all elected committee members or duly elected alternates. Participation shall include reviewing the Working Personnel Action File of each candidate whose performance will be evaluated by the Primary and Secondary committee and attending each and every meeting of the committee at which substantive deliberation take place or final recommendations are made, or both. The candidate’s effectiveness in meeting the criterion requirements as evidenced by his/her file shall be the basis for these decisions.

After discussion of the merit of each candidate’s record and the department Primary Committee recommendations, each eligible member of the Secondary Evaluation Committee shall vote to concur or not concur. In order to be able to cast a vote, committee members must be present during all committee meetings and discussions and must have reviewed the candidate’s WPAF file. A simple majority vote of Committee members will be required for any action. All votes will be conducted by secret ballot. Abstentions will not be counted as a negative vote. Each eligible member of the Committee shall also vote either yes or no as to whether the required procedures for review were followed.

The Secondary Committee shall consult with branch Primary RTP committees to seek additional information, as it may deem necessary.

The Secondary Committee shall retain all written ballots for a minimum period of three years. Ballots must be identified and given into the custody of the Dean of the COE as the official custodian of the PAF files. Faculty members may request access to ballots at any time during the three (3) year period following any evaluation.
The Secondary Evaluation Committee shall inform each candidate, in writing, of the committee’s evaluation of the candidate performance and their recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion within 7 days of the date they are made. The Secondary Committee’s recommendation letter shall be placed in the WPAF file and a copy given to the review candidates. The faculty member shall sign the file copy of this document indicating that it has been received and read. In the event of an adverse decision, the Secondary Committee shall explain in writing the reasons for not recommending retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

A candidate may request a hearing with the Secondary Evaluation Committee prior to the submission of the Secondary Committee’s recommendation to the Dean. Such request must be submitted in writing to the chairperson signing the statement within 10 days of the date of receipt of the committee’s recommendation.

The faculty member shall have the right to submit a rebuttal in writing no later than ten (10) days following receipt of the Secondary Committee recommendation. Upon receipt of such a request, the Secondary Committee will schedule a meeting with the candidate to be held in no more than 10 working days. A copy of the candidate’s written rebuttal shall be included in the WPAF and be forwarded to the Dean for consideration.

The Secondary Evaluation Committee does not serve as an appeals body to the decisions of branch Primary Committees. Appeals shall be made directly to the relevant Primary Committee. All appeals and Primary Committee replies become part of the candidate’s Working Personnel Action File.

Review by the Dean

Following completion of review by the Secondary Committee, the Dean shall conduct a review of the WPAF files for candidates undergoing retention, tenure and/or promotion review. The Dean shall inform each candidate, in writing, of his/her evaluation of the candidate’s performance and the recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion within 7 days of the date they are made. This review shall be based upon evidence in the candidate’s Working Personnel Action File.

The Dean shall also make his/her recommendations and reasons known to the Secondary Committee, to the Branch RTP committee and to the faculty employee under review prior to submission of the WPAF file to the President. Should the recommendations of the Dean and those of the Secondary Evaluation Committee differ, the Committee may take the initiative to confer with the Dean.

Faculty Rights to Reasons and Appeals

All discussions and deliberations pursuant to retention, tenure and promotion review are to be conducted in confidence, privileged only to the relevant Primary or Secondary Committee members and to faculty grievance and/or disciplinary actions committees as applicable.
Recommendations pursuant to retention, tenure and promotion shall be confidential except that the affected faculty unit employee, the appropriate administrator, the President and the peer review committee members in a Performance Review or a periodic evaluation shall have access to written recommendations. (UARTP 9.01.W)