



**University Review Committee
California State University, Bakersfield**

59 ADM
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022

(661) 654-2155
FAX (661) 654-2131

DATE: January 10, 2008
TO: Department Chairs
Marla Iyasere, Dean HSS
Julio Blanco, Dean NSM
Mark Evans, Dean BPA
Curtis Guaglianone, Dean SOE
CC: Soraya M. Coley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Beth Rienzi, Associate Vice President Faculty Affairs
FROM: Vandana Kohli, Chair URC
SUBJECT: URC Recommendations and Guidelines Regarding the RTP Process

In Spring quarter of 2006 and 2007, and other years, the Chair of the URC submitted an end-of-the-year report summarizing some of the issues that emerged during that year's review cycle. As a slight departure from this past practice, I am sending the following recommendations on behalf of this year's URC before the commencement of the Winter RTP review cycle. When you share the contents of this memo with your department faculty, please note that all of the following suggestions (**in bold font**) are based on guidelines presented in the Faculty Handbook and/or the CFA Contract (**in shaded boxes**); they are not new procedures. I hope that as you review the following suggestions, you will take into account that your vigilance at lower levels of review will result in a significant gain in efficiency and a more meaningful review process.

I look forward to discussing these and other RTP issues with you at the next Department Chairs' Leadership Academy.

- **Recommendations for early tenure and/or promotion should demonstrate HOW the candidate satisfies the exceptional criteria.**

Handbook sections 305.2.4 Early Award of Tenure to Faculty, and 305.3.4 Early Promotion of Probationary and Tenured Faculty, faculty must have "compiled a record of exceptional performance in teaching and scholarly/creative activities and of acceptable performance in professionally related service at California State University, Bakersfield."

- **Reviews of joint scholarly research should indicate the contributions made by all co-authors and the candidate undergoing review.**

**University Review Committee
California State University, Bakersfield**

59 ADM
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022

(661) 654-2155
FAX (661) 654-2131

Handbook Appendix G.j.6 Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth, "When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, and grant proposals, the faculty must clearly indicate the extent of his/her contribution to the joint effort."

- The Unit and the candidate should ensure that the RTP file is organized, complete and accurate. This is not merely a matter of style, department culture, or personal preference; many different areas of the Handbook refer to this as a requirement.

Handbook section 305.5.3 Completeness of the RTP File, "The Unit RTP Committee and the faculty undergoing review shall be responsible for ensuring that the RTP file is complete and accurate before the start of the review process."

Handbook section 305.5.1 Preparation of the RTP File, "The faculty, with advice from the unit chair or designee, shall be responsible for selecting appropriate materials to document performance in accord with the unit RTP criteria, organizing the materials for convenient review by all levels, and maintaining and updating the RTP file for each subsequent review cycle."

Handbook Appendix G Contents and Organization of the RTP File (WPAF), "In each of the following sections, each document must have a unique identifying code that is also displayed on the Master Index. When a section contains materials from quarter-to-quarter and/or year-to-year, the materials shall be organized chronologically, preferably "reverse chronology," with most recent materials toward the front of the respective section."

- Access logs should be signed and dated, indicating the reason why the materials in the files were viewed.

Handbook section 305.5.2 Contents and Organization of the RTP File, "b. Access sheet – lists each person having access to the file, reason for access, and date of access."

- Reviews of teaching should be holistic including SOCs but not dependent on them, solely.



**University Review Committee
California State University, Bakersfield**

59 ADM
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022

(661) 654-2155
FAX (661) 654-2131

Handbook section 305.4.2.6 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, "... The evaluation of teaching shall involve multiple measures of a faculty's performance..."

The Contract Article 15.11 Evaluation "Recommendations pursuant to this Article shall be confidential except that the affected faculty unit employee, appropriate administrators, the President, and the peer review committee members shall have access to written recommendations."

- **Candidates should be evaluated against criteria established at the department or Unit level ONLY. Update the criteria as needed because you cannot use undocumented criteria to evaluate a RTP file.**

The Contract Article 15.3 Evaluation "Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process."

Handbook section 305.5.3 Completeness of the RTP File "No level of review may require that additional materials be included in the file other than those specified in the Unit RTP criteria document or Faculty Handbook. Further, if any level of review believes additional material needs to be included for a full evaluation, that request must go through appropriate campus processes: modification of Unit RTP criteria or the Faculty Handbook."

- **Please be professional in your review letters: avoid comments related to personality; be mindful of sexist language and implications; do not include anything discriminatory. Be mindful of the contract at all times and don't do anything that violates the faculty's rights as protected by the contract.**

In addition to these reminders, there are four additional recommendations that URC would like you to consider. Maybe, we can discuss these at the Chairs' Leadership Academy.



**University Review Committee
California State University, Bakersfield**

59 ADM
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022

(661) 654-2155
FAX (661) 654-2131

- *All sections relating to teaching, service, and scholarship should provide a summative recommendation such as meets expectations or satisfactory performance.*
- *The departmental/unit RTP criteria should be used for evaluating a candidate. For example, if it states in the Unit RTP criteria that a candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship or service will be evaluated as: "meeting expectations," "exceeding expectations," or "not meeting expectations," then each section should conclude in those terms.*
- *It is helpful to evaluate scholarly activities against some standard at the department, school, or professional level. In other words, help higher levels of review understand the relevancy of the scholarship. Similarly, teaching should be contextualized. For example, it is helpful for higher levels of review to know that a class is particularly hard to teach and students hate taking it etc. This is even more important if the candidate has not mentioned it in their personal statement.*
- *The URC intends to recommend some Handbook modifications to the Senate at the end of this year's review cycle BUT in the meantime, please encourage faculty members undergoing review to write a thoughtful, reflective, and engaging personal statement that is not too lengthy. This really helps the evaluation process. Currently, this is "optional" in the Handbook.*

Thanks everyone for your attention to these reminders and recommendations for the Winter review cycle. All of us at URC appreciate your hard work and diligence and offer these ideas as a way of streamlining this arduous process.