

# College of Education Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy

January 2019

## Contents

I. Policies and Procedures on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.....	2
II. Election of Primary and Secondary Evaluation Committees .....	2
II a. Election of Primary Evaluation Committees.....	2
II b. Election of Secondary Evaluation Committee.....	3
III. Duties and Responsibilities of Primary and Secondary Evaluation Committees .....	3
III a. Duties of Primary Evaluation Committees .....	4
III b. Duties of the Secondary Evaluation Committee .....	4
IV. Eligibility for Retention, Tenure and/or Promotion Review.....	4
IV a. Retention.....	4
IV b. Promotion and Tenure.....	5
IV c. Early Promotion and Tenure .....	5
V. Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Evaluation .....	5
V a. Retention.....	5
V b. Tenure and Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor .....	6
V c. Promotion Criteria: Full Professor.....	6
V d. Early Tenure and Early Promotion Criteria: Associate Professor.....	6
V e. Early Promotion Criteria: Full Professor.....	6
V f. Weights for Criteria.....	6
V g. Competent Teaching Performance .....	6
V h. Competent Teaching Performance Rating Criteria .....	7
V i. Contributions to the Institution .....	8
V j. Contributions to the Institution Rating Criteria .....	8
V k. Scholarly or Creative Achievements.....	9
V l. Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Rating Criteria.....	9
V m. Contributions to the Community.....	10
V n. Contributions to the Community Rating Criteria.....	11
VI. Faculty Files for Retention, Tenure and Promotion .....	11
VI a. Personnel Action Files .....	11
VI b. Inclusion of Student Evaluations in Personnel Action Files .....	12
VI c. Access to Personnel Action Files .....	12
VI d. Working Personnel Action Files .....	13
VII. Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Reviews .....	14

VII a.	Review of Probationary Faculty in Initial Year of Service.....	14
VII b.	General Procedures .....	14
VII c.	Review by Primary Evaluation Committee .....	15
VII d.	Review by Secondary Evaluation Committee .....	16
VII e.	Review by the Dean .....	17
VII f.	Faculty Rights to Reasons and Appeals.....	17
VIII.	Policies and Procedures on Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review) .....	17
VIIIa.	Election of Evaluation Committees .....	18
VIIIb.	Duties of Evaluation Committee .....	18
VIIIc.	Criteria for Evaluation .....	18
VIII d.	Review by the Branch chair or designee.....	19
VIII e.	Faculty Rights to Reasons and Appeals.....	19

Notice: All citations to University ARTP Policy herein are to the Policy as it stood when the University last approved this document. Subsequent changes to the language and enumeration of University ARTP Policy sections may not be reflected in this document. The reader is therefore strongly advised and urged to consult the most recently adopted text and enumeration of cited sections of University ARTP Policy posted in the University Policy Manual on the University’s website. Any discrepancy between the University policy and this document will be resolved in favor of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University policy.

## I. 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.

## II. 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 CBA. 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 (CBA).

### II a. Election of Primary Evaluation Committees

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 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 academic program or Branch are eligible to participate, additional members from related academic programs or other Branches in the College may be elected.

The Branch Chair shall not serve as a voting member of each Primary RTP Committee within the Branch. 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.

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 shall be elected by a majority of the faculty members voting.

The membership of the Primary 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. The Dean or Dean's designee shall keep the official Committee records such as minutes, agendas, ballots and recommendations.

Faculty members 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).

A branch may elect more than one Primary Evaluation Committee, each consisting of members of one or more program area groups.

## II b. Election of Secondary Evaluation Committee

The Secondary Evaluation Committee (SEC) shall be composed of eight (8) tenured faculty, two members elected 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.

Branch representatives and alternates of the Secondary Evaluation Committee shall be elected by the full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the Branch and serve a term of two years. The at large members of the Secondary Committee shall be elected by the full-time probationary and tenured faculty members of the College and serve for one academic year. Election of at large 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 Evaluation 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. The 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. Faculty members being considered for retention, tenure or promotion are ineligible for service on 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). Branch chairs shall not serve on the SEC.

## III. Duties and Responsibilities of Primary and Secondary Evaluation Committees

### III a. Duties of Primary Evaluation Committees

Primary Evaluation Committees serve the following major functions:

Conduct a substantive review of each candidate's Working Personnel Action File submitted relative to retention, tenure and/or promotion. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations require the participation of all elected Committee members or duly elected alternates.

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

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

### III b. 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 the files to the Dean's office immediately after the Committee has completed its actions.

The Secondary Evaluation Committee serves the following functions:

- a. Conduct a substantive review of each recommendation submitted by each Primary Evaluation Committee relative to retention, tenure and/or promotion. 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 Secondary level evaluation and recommendation is the result of the proper application of approved Branch, College and University criteria, policies and procedures.
- d. Ensure that the materials for evaluation submitted by the faculty member shall be available for review by the President. The written evaluation recommendations and relevant documentation from each level of review shall be forwarded to the President.

Any response(s) or rebuttal statement(s) of the faculty member submitted pursuant to this provision shall also be forwarded to the President (UARTP 9.01 .AA).

## IV. 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.

### IV a. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> years of review are subject to a periodic evaluation following the procedures outlined in the following sections.

## IV b. 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. Tenure is normally sought in the 6th year of probationary service, to commence in the 7th year of service.

A tenured faculty employee at the rank of Associate shall normally be considered for promotion to Full Professor rank in their 5<sup>th</sup> year of full-time service in their current rank. This provision shall not apply if a faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be considered (UARTP 8.01.D).

## IV c. Early Promotion and Tenure

Probationary faculty may elect to undergo review for early promotion and/or tenure 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 at any time prior to the regular cycle.

## V. 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.

The committees should take into consideration not only the quantity of evidentiary artifacts, but also the quality of work presented. The committees may adjust the criteria using their best professional and disciplinary judgement.

Primary and secondary evaluation committees that lack disciplinary expertise necessary to evaluate candidates are encouraged to seek additional consultations without breaching confidentiality.

### V a. Retention

Faculty in their initial service year undergo a periodic review 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).

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 “approaching criteria” in the third remaining evaluative area.

## V b. 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.

## V c. 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, i.e., 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.

## V d. 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 “outstanding” for the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as a rating of “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.

## V e. 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 “outstanding” for the area of Teaching Effectiveness as well as a rating of “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.

## V f. Weights for Criteria

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

- a. Competent Teaching Performances – 55%
- b. Contributions to the Institution – 15%
- c. Scholarly or Creative Achievement – 15%
- d. Contributions to the Community – 15%

## V g. Competent Teaching Performance

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

Besides the evidence related to the categories listed below, the WPAF 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 as required below. Evidence in categories 4-11 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 classroom observation by a qualified faculty familiar with the candidate’s discipline. Primary Evaluation Committees may request 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. For online courses, an equivalent process for observation that aligns with the University’s online course policy will be determined.
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.

## V h. Competent Teaching Performance Rating Criteria

<b>Does Not Meet Criteria</b>	Inadequate evidence in all three (3) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate OR Average Teaching scores below 3.0 on the overall student summative evaluations
<b>Approaching Criteria</b>	Evidence in all three (3) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate AND Average Teaching scores at or above 3.0 on overall student summative evaluations <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The faculty under review may include an explanatory statement as to why average scores are below 3.0 that the committee can consider exempting the faculty from the criterion.

<b>Meets Criteria</b>	Evidence in all three (3) required categories of teaching performance applicable to the candidate AND Evidence in 4 of the 7 other categories of the candidate’s individual teaching activities and performance AND Average Teaching scores above 3.0 on overall student summative evaluations
<b>Outstanding</b>	Evidence in all three (3) required categories of teaching performance as applicable to the candidate AND Evidence in 4 of the 7 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

## V i. 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 academic program level governance, committees, or taskforces.
2. Active participation in CSU, University or College level governance, committees, or taskforces.
3. Active participation in CSU, University, College, or Branch/academic program level orientation, or recruitment.
4. Service in roles of leadership or substantial responsibility in CSU, University, College, or Branch/academic program levels in committees or governance.
5. Development of accreditation and assessment (WASC, etc.) documents or CSU, University, College, or Branch/academic program review documents.
6. Advising of student organizations in the University, College or Branch/ academic program.
7. Service as an official representative of the CSU, University, College, or Branch/ 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.

## V j. Contributions to the Institution Rating Criteria

<b>Does Not Meet Criteria</b>	No evidence of service at any institutional level
<b>Approaching Criteria</b>	Evidence of participation in service within one (1) Branch or academic program as described in category 1 AND Evidence of participation in service within the COE, university or CSU as described in category 2

<b>Does Not Meet Criteria</b>	No evidence of service at any institutional level
<b>Meets Criteria</b>	Evidence of service on 1 or more Branch or 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
<b>Outstanding</b>	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 AND Evidence of service activity in at least one of the remaining categories 3- 9. AND Evidence of substantial responsibility or leadership in at least one category of service activity

## V k. 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 newspaper, 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.

## V l. Scholarly and/or Creative Achievements Rating Criteria

Review Level	Probationary Year 2	Probationary Years 3-5	Promotion (Associate Professor and Full Professor) and Tenure
<b>Does Not Meet Criteria</b>	No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category	No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category	No evidence of scholarly/creative activity in any category
<b>Approaching Criteria</b>	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 2	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 2 AND Evidence in at least one other category	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category
<b>Meets Criteria</b>	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 2 AND Evidence in at least one other category	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category	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 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> or 4 <sup>th</sup> author) AND Evidence in at least one other category
<b>Outstanding</b>	Evidence of scholarly/creative activity in category 1 in progress toward publication AND Evidence in at least one other category	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	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

## V m. 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.

## V n. Contributions to the Community Rating Criteria

<b>Does Not Meet Criteria</b>	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
<b>Approaching Criteria</b>	Evidence of community involvement in two (2) or more of the then (10) categories AND Membership in two (2) or more professional organizations at the international, national, regional, or state level
<b>Meets Criteria</b>	Evidence of community involvement in three (3) or more of the ten (10) categories AND Membership in two (2) or more professional organizations at the international, national, regional, or state level
<b>Outstanding</b>	Evidence of community involvement in four (4) or more 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.

## VI. Faculty Files for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

### VI a. Personnel Action Files

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

An official Personnel Action File (PAF) shall be created for each faculty member at the time of initial appointment.

The PAF s 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 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 member 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 member will be accepted for placement in the file.

The faculty member 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 CBA (UARPT 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.

## VI b. 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 members 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 member's Personnel Action File.

## VI c. 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 (UARPT 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 member may request an 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 member shall have the right to have another person of the employee's choosing accompany him/her to inspect the Personnel Action File. (UARPT 4.05.B)

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

If after examination of the Personnel Action File, the faculty member 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 member 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 member shall have a right to submit the request to the President. Within twenty-one (21) days of such request to the President, the President or the President's designee shall provide to the faculty member a written response. If the President grants the request, the record shall be corrected or the deletions made, and the faculty member shall be sent a written statement to that effect. If the President denies the request, the response shall include the reason(s) for denial (UARTP 4.05E).

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 4.03B).

## VI d. 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 member (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:

- a. Competent teaching performance.
- 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 member, 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 member 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 member 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 CBA. Indexed materials may be returned to the faculty member (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.

## VII. Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

### VII a. 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 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.

### VII b. General Procedures

Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, promotion, termination, or any other personnel action shall be based solely on material contained in the Working Personnel Action File.

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, 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 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 member shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing no later than ten (10) 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 member 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.

## VII c. 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 must 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 only 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 (UARTP 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. A copy of the summary will be sent to the faculty member under review.

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. 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 (3) years. Ballots must be identified and submitted to the Dean of the COE as the official custodian of the PAF. 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 and branch Chair, in writing, of the committee's evaluation of the candidate performance and their recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion within seven (7) days of the date the evaluation and recommendations are made. The Primary Committee's recommendation letter shall be placed in the WPAF and a copy given to the faculty member under review. 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.

Branch Chair conducts an independent evaluation in parallel with the Primary Evaluation Committee's evaluation. The Chair may either indicate agreement with the Primary Evaluation Committee's findings by signing its letter, or write a separate letter to be forwarded to the candidate and all higher levels of evaluation.

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.

## VII d. 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 must 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 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. 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 retain all written ballots for a minimum period of three (3) years. Ballots

must be identified and given into the custody of the Dean of the COE as the official custodian of the PAFs. 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 ten (10) days of the date the evaluation and recommendations are made. The Secondary Committee's recommendation letter shall be placed in the WPAF 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 ten (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.

## VII e. Review by the Dean

Following completion of review by the Secondary Committee, the Dean shall conduct a review of the WPAF 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 seven (7) days of the date the evaluations and recommendations are made. 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 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.

## VII f. 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 member, 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 (UARTP9.01.W).

## VIII. Policies and Procedures on Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

The following policies and procedures are designed to guide the periodic evaluation for tenured faculty member in the College of Education. The purpose of the evaluation is to assist tenured faculty members in maintaining and/or in improving their faculty effectiveness. (UARTP 9.06 1)

Tenured faculty shall be evaluated at intervals of five years. (UARTP 9.06 2).

The College shall develop a schedule specifying the order of evaluation of tenured faculty from year to year. (UARTP 9.06 4c)

Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator. (C.B.A. 15.34)

The College of Education Dean reviews the results of post-tenure reviews by Primary Evaluation Committees and conduct an independent evaluation. The Dean’s post-tenure evaluation letter shall be included in the Personnel Actions File. (CBA 15.35 and 15.37)

## VIIIa. Election of Evaluation Committees

The Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Review Committees of each branch shall be composed of at least three tenured full-time faculty of equal or higher rank of the faculty member being evaluated. A faculty member scheduled for this evaluation may not serve on the committee conducting a periodic evaluation of tenured faculty during the year in which he/she is subject to evaluation. (UARTP 9.06 4a)

The branch chair shall not serve on the peer review committee but shall conduct an independent evaluation and submit a separate evaluation report. (UARTP 9.06 4b)

## VIIIb. Duties of Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee serves the following major functions:

- a. Conduct a substantive review of each candidate’s submitted file. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations require the participation of all elected Committee members or duly elected alternates.
- b. Provide a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence in the faculty member’s file. The Periodic Review Committee provides a copy of this written report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the Working Personnel Action File. (UARTP 9.06 4h)

## VIIIc. Criteria for Evaluation

The following criteria have been adopted by the Branches of the College of Education consistent with University policies and procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.

Each of the four primary areas of responsibilities may be described as an “area of strength” or an “area of weakness” (CBA 15.36).

Areas	Area of strength	Area of weakness or Not Applicable (if materials were not submitted)
<b>Teaching</b>	Student evaluations at 3.5 or above Evidence of engagement in curriculum development, program assessment or accreditation	Student evaluations below 3.5 No evidence of participation in curriculum development, program assessment or accreditation
<b>Contribution to the institution</b>	Evidence of substantial engagement in service to the program, branch, college or the university	No evidence of participation in service activities
<b>Scholarly or creative achievements</b>	Record of scholarly publications and presentations or equivalent	No record of scholarly publications and presentations or equivalent
<b>Contribution to the community</b>	Evidence of substantial involvement in service to the local, regional, national, or international organizations or equivalent	No evidence of service to any organization outside the University

The evaluation committee must consider student evaluations conducted since the last evaluation of the

faculty member's performance.

In addition, other evidence may also include:

1. Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member's teaching effectiveness only if the faculty member has been provided an exact copy of each statement at least five days before the evaluation.
2. Material submitted by the faculty member being evaluated in support of their teaching effectiveness. This evidence may include, but not be limited to, the following: Teaching materials, curriculum development, participation in professional meetings, professional lectures, seminars, workshops, consultant work, publications, leave activities (UARTP 9.06 4e)
3. Other materials in support of a tenured faculty's effectiveness in service, scholarship and creative activities.

### VIIIId. Review by the Branch chair or designee

The branch chair, or designee, shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report as required by UARTP, containing an assessment of the evidence. He/she shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the Personnel Action File. (UARTP 9.06 4i)

The branch chair and the chair of the Primary evaluation committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement. (UARTP 9.06 4j)

### VIIIe. Faculty Rights to Reasons and Appeals

State law and University policy guarantee to faculty the right of confidentiality. Consequently, substantive deliberations having to do with periodic evaluation of tenured faculty members shall be open only to committee members. (UARTP 9.06 4d)

The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the evaluation committee and/or the branch chair prior to the submission of either report.

The evaluation statements shall be placed in the Personnel Action File. The faculty member shall have the right to submit written rebuttals to them and these rebuttals shall also be placed in the Personnel Action File.