NOTE: This is a subsection of the Proposed COE RTP Draft document that addresses only the sections related to the four areas of performance, including evidence/activities in each category and criteria for evaluation for each.

COMPETENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

Branch/Program (?) averages of student summative evaluative scores must be included in the WPAF.

Those summative evaluative scores must be drawn from the numerical scores on 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 any or all of 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. Demonstrated currency in area(s) of assigned teaching via research or professional development.
8. Quantitative results of student summative evaluations and written appraisal from student evaluations. 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.
11. 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.

Evidence illustrative of student advising activities, including assisting advisees to clarify career goals, develop educational plans, select appropriate courses. Other activities may also include collaborating with students on research and pedagogy projects, supervising independent study and other related projects and experiences. Submissions by professional colleagues, both on and off campus, such as letters of evaluation and recommendations regarding teaching performance.

[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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet criteria:</th>
<th>Less than X of the Y criteria met or scores below a 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluation scores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimally meets criteria:</td>
<td>X of Y criteria met and score at or above a 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluation scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria:</td>
<td>Greater than X of Y criteria met and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds criteria/outstanding:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. An active program of scholarly or creative work in progress.

c. Evidence of scholarship or creative activity in the development or application of technology, or both.

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

e. Creative activity culminating in innovative programs, service learning experiences or policy proposals, programs or materials pertaining to issues of public concern.

f. The products of consulting, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise.

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.

e. Student advising when this activity extends beyond that of the normal program advising expected of all faculty – explain the nature of this activity.

f. Advising of student organizations in the department.

h. Service as an official representative of the department, college, or university in the community.

Contributions to the Institution Ranking Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet criteria:</th>
<th>No service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimally meets criteria:</td>
<td>Branch/Program service on one committee and University/College service on one committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds criteria/outstanding:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 AERA).
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
   a. Participation in the mass media.

Contributions to the Community Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet criteria:</th>
<th>Less than two criteria met. Is not a member of a national or state professional organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimally meets criteria:</td>
<td>Meets two of the ten criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets criteria:</td>
<td>Four of ten criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds criteria/outstanding:</td>
<td>Six of ten criteria met with a leadership position in a professional organization at the international, national, state or regional level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [WPL1]: My only concern about this metric is that it does not allow for someone who really invests deeply in a community service activity. This seems to privilege doing many potentially unconnected activities over doing one or two activities that may have a large impact. Can we account for that somehow?

Comment [SG2]: What about cost factors in requiring faculty to belong to professional organizations and also to participate in conference presentations, etc.???

Comment [WPL3]: I would like to assume they are all professionally related…this gets us away from community service actually being service to my family….

Comment [SG4]: Again, to require this specificity related to leadership positions in professional organizations seems too much to me
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.